

9-2010

Teachers' Resistance: Japanese Teachers Stories From the 1960s

Reiko Kato

University of Massachusetts Amherst, rkato@educ.umass.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/open_access_dissertations



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kato, Reiko, "Teachers' Resistance: Japanese Teachers Stories From the 1960s" (2010). *Open Access Dissertations*. 286.
https://scholarworks.umass.edu/open_access_dissertations/286

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.

**TEACHERS' RESISTANCE:
JAPANESE TEACHERS STORIES FROM THE 1960S**

A Dissertation Presented

by

REIKO KATO

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts Amherst in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

September 2010

Education

© Copyright by Reiko Kato 2010

All Rights Reserved

**TEACHERS' RESISTANCE:
JAPANESE TEACHERS' STORIES FROM THE 1960S**

A Dissertation Presented

by

REIKO KATO

Approved as to style and content by:

Theresa Austin, Chairperson

Laura A. Valdiviezo, Member

Agustin Lao Montes, Member

Christine B. McCormick, Dean
School of Education

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation to the teachers who shared their stories of teaching. I would also like to thank their students, parents, and colleagues; whom I have never met in person, yet came to know through the stories told by the teachers.

I would like to thank my advisor, Theresa Y. Austin, and the members of my committee, Laura A. Valdiviezo and Agustin Lao Montes for their support throughout my journey of writing dissertation.

Last but not least, I want to thank all my family and friends, who helped and supported me to be here today. A special thank you to Janaki Natarajan for her kind and warm support, as well as her brilliant ideas that inspired me to initiate this project.

ABSTRACT

TEACHERS' RESISTANCE: JAPANESE TEACHERS STORIES FROM THE 1960S

SEPTEMBER 2010

REIKO KATO, B.A., OSAKA UNIVERSITY OF FOREIGN STUDIES

M.A., SCHOOL FOR INTERNATIONAL TRAINING

Ed.D., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

Directed by: Professor Theresa Y. Austin

The purpose of this study is to listen to teachers' stories and reconstruct their classrooms in the midst of the global upheaval of people's movements in the 1960s-70s through teachers' narratives. The primary research questions are: *How did social movements in the 1960s-1970s influence their teaching practices? What was their intention and how did they carry out their daily teaching practice?*

In the educational research field, narrative inquirers explore teachers' stories, their life experiences and teaching practices, in order to understand how teachers view the world. I collected stories, through in-depth interviews, of ten Japanese teachers who taught in Japanese public school system, and were active in social and educational movements during the 1960s-70s in order to understand how teachers understood and resisted dominant oppressive forces which create and perpetuate social inequality.

Teacher narratives were analyzed using two complementary methods: contents analysis and interactional positioning theory. First, stories of teachers' struggles in their classrooms and schools were contextualized in a wider social struggle for humanity and a more just society, in order to explore teachers' understanding of social oppression and their resistance, and multiculturalism in Japanese classrooms in the 1960s-1970s. Through their stories, an indigenous multicultural nature of Japanese classrooms was revealed, even before the multiculturalism became an imported educational topic in the 1980s. Furthermore, using interactional positioning theory, I discussed how teacher activist identities were constructed during the narration, at the same time, uncover how social stigma of being an activist possibly suppressed the participants overtly constructing an activist identity in narratives.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
ABSTRACT.....	v
CHAPTER	
I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Background Discussion	1
Purpose of the Study	4
Significance of the Study	5
Parameters of the Study	6
II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	8
Globalization: Struggle for Humanity	9
Education and Globalization: Domination and Resistance.....	16
Teachers in Social Struggles.....	21
III: CONTEXT OF STUDY	25
Globalization and Japanese Education Polices.....	25
Westernization/Modernization of Japanese Education.....	25
Democratization of Education	31
Summary.....	36
IV: STUDY DESIGN AND METHODS	38
Research Overview	38
Participants.....	40
Data Collection	41
Analysis of Data.....	43
V: STORIES OF TEACHERS FROM THE 1960S: IN RESPONSE TO INTERVIEWS 46	
Characterization of the 1960s	47
Building Up the Momentum	48
Dynamism: Coalition and Separation.....	50
Rapid Change in Society.....	53
Confusion.....	56
Summary	58
Educational Issues in the 1960s: Regulation and Resistance.....	59

Meritocracy: Control of Assessment	59
Teacher Evaluation, National Guideline and Teacher Resistances:	
Control of pedagogy	69
Summary	76
Meeting Needs of Diverse Students: Multiculturalism in Practice.....	77
Zainichi (Korean) Studetns	77
A girl without a word.....	78
Buraku Boy	79
Senryu Kyoshitsu	80
Summary	82
 VI: STORIES OF TEACHERS FROM THE 1960S: POSITIONING	 84
Interviewer Contribution.....	85
Teacher as Activist.....	86
Integrating Social Issues into Curriculum.....	86
Organizing Teachers' Strike	90
Freedom Attained Through Struggle	95
Resisting Common Sense	97
Summary	99
Social Stigma of Activists: Self-censorship Enacted.....	100
Stranger	100
Progressive Thoughts.....	102
Summary	103
 VII: SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS	 105
Summary and Discussion.....	105
Implication	109
 APPENDICES	 113
A: GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR AN UNSTRUCTURED INTERVIEW	114
B: SAMPLE OF CODING CHART (KISO).....	116
C: TRANSCRIPTION SAMPLE (KISO)	119
D: TABLE: CONTROL ISSUES & TEACHERS' RESISTANCE VOICES	129
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	 130

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background Discussion

For if humanity only poses itself problems that it can solve, as Marx claims, this by no means implies that the solutions come immediately and without pain. On the contrary, the history of humankind is the story of its painful combat to transcend the contradictions arising from its own development (Amin, 1989, p.127).

Everyday we hear news of more atrocities, more poverty, and more suffering of peoples around the world. Under aggressive economic globalization forces, people of the world are experiencing greater social stratification and more inequality in societies (Ahmed, 1997; McLaren, 1998; Rizvi and Lingard, 2000). Many scholars, such as Amin (1997), Sassen (1998), and Tabb (2001) assert, “We are now entering a new phase of globalization.” This globalization occurs at the same time imperialism and colonialism continue to operate. Under the influenced of these embedded realities, there are political leaders who may act not even in their national interest, but in the interest of a very powerful few, who use/create fears among people so that they can once again benefit from exploitation on a global scale. For example, Naomi Wolf (2007) compares, the policies of the Bush administration, especially those that led the country to the Iraq war, with those of Nazi Germany leading to World War II and even argue that the Bush administration was indeed, fascistic government. Now using the same discursive move, drawing on widely accepted repudiation, the right wing in the US (e.g. Pastor Manning, quoted in Leo, 2009; Rush Limbaugh quoted in Graham, 2009) is asserting that Obama is a Hitler. In Japan, more and more discussions are heard to amend the Pacifist Constitution, in order to remove the Article 9, which renounces all forms of war. Many

scholars and/or activists, responding to the proposal of new constitution, have raised voices of concerns. For example, Takahashi and Saito (2006) argue the current constitution permits Japan to fight in defense, therefore the purpose of amendment must be aiming at taking a more direct role in wars in near future, especially along with the United States. Indeed, many peace activists argue that the “post-war” time has already passed in Japan, and we are now entering “pre-war” conditions. In this context of hardship, I write this dissertation to learn lessons from the past to find hope in the future.

The dominant discourse portrays Japan as mono-racial, “except a few exceptions” (Nagai, 2002) and mono-cultural. Perhaps, this is due to an extensive assimilationist policy by Japanese government since Meiji era to “unify,” or control, people of its territory. For Japanese educators, “multiculturalism (**Tabunka Shugi** 多文化主義)” is a relatively new term, compared to other terms such as “internationalism (**Kokusai Shugi** 国際主義)” and “intercultural understanding (**Ibunka Rikai** 異文化理解).” Nonetheless, it does not mean Japan is, or ever was, a mono-cultural state or it lacks practices of multiculturalism. On the contrary, people in Japan are diverse. People have always lived in multicultural societies, and multiculturalism, inclusion of experiences of people who were conquered, enslaved, exploited, and dominated, has long been negotiated.

This dissertation research is an attempt to challenge such dominant discourse by exploring practices of multiculturalism in Japan. What I hope to attain through this research is manifold: to explore multiculturalism in Japanese classrooms, to obtain documentation of life histories of teachers’ struggles for humanity and more just society, and to learn about people’s political and social movements. Multicultural educators find it very important to teach young people about these movements so that students will

understand social change as people's struggle, rather than social evolution (Moulder, 1997). This dissertation research will enhance my understanding of social change as people's struggle and at the same time contribute to a wider audience.

The era between the 1960s and early 1970s connotes an important moment of people's history: historical record of "the lives and activities of ordinary people trying to make a better world, or just trying to survive" (Zinn, 1995). On one hand, there was the horrific war in Vietnam, yet on the other hand, there was the great rise of social movements: the Cultural Revolution in China, May 1968 in France, etc. People in the United States, too, experienced massive people's movements including the Civil Rights Movement and the anti-Vietnam War movement: Workers, soldiers, and students of all races, ages, and genders resisted against various social oppressions. It was a moment when people heard "the sound of freedom flashing" (Harman, 2008).

During this time of social upheaval, educators in the United States took part in this greater social struggle and fought to attain schools and other educational institutions that would provide educational equality to both male and female students from diverse racial, ethnic, and social-class groups (Banks, 2001). In fact, multicultural education, a resistant movement within the educational system to challenge the status quo of existing curricula, emerged through the struggle. Still today, multicultural educators of all races, genders, and social groups tirelessly continue to make great efforts for a better society in the United States, as a part of social movements through education, by developing various practices of multicultural education in everyday teaching. Teachers on one hand are often faced with mono-cultural curricula, which are oppressive and dehumanizing. Yet, on the other hand, they can make efforts to oppose and resist such curricula and

work towards humanity in their daily teaching practices, and develop their relationships with students.

In Japan, the 1960s and 1970s was also an era of upheavals: anti-US Japan security treaty movements, anti-pollution struggles, labor struggles, etc. In midst of such social movements, what did teachers teach? In the height of people's struggle, what did teachers do to contribute to social development? What do they remember? How do they describe it? In his exceptional work "A People's History of the United States," Zinn (1980) writes:

My viewpoint, in telling the history of the United States, is different: that we must not accept the memory of states as our own. Nations are not communities and never have been. The history of any country, presented as the history of a family, conceals fierce conflicts of interest (sometimes exploding, most often repressed) between conquerors and conquered, masters and slaves, capitalists and workers, dominators and dominated in race and sex. And in such a world of conflict, a world of victims and executioners, it is the job of thinking people, as Albert Camus suggested, not to be on the side of the executioners. (pp.9-10)

As a student, a teacher, a researcher, and a thinking person of this world, I would like to share my learning and writing about the experiences of ordinary people from their points of view, especially the experiences of teachers who opposed and resisted oppressive social systems.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to document teachers' stories and from these reconstruct their classrooms in the midst of the global rise of people's movements in the 1960s-70s through teacher narratives. My study will be an attempt to reconstruct teachers' practices of multiculturalism as movements of resistance to oppressive monocultural curriculum in their classrooms in Japan. I will focus on teachers' experiences in the 1960s-1970s in order to explore the following research questions: how did social

movements in the 1960s-1970s influence their teaching practices? What were their intentions? How did they carry out their daily teaching practices?

The first area of the study will be constructing teachers' life histories. What were their experiences? How did they understand social conditions? What did they attempt to do and how did they do it? Combining social contexts and teachers' personal stories, the first endeavor of this study is to write teachers' life histories in collaboration with each teacher.

The second area of research will be exploring multicultural education practiced in Japan through teachers' life histories. The study of individual experiences has the potential to contribute to understanding multiculturalism in education (Connelly, Phillion, & He, 2003). By putting together teachers' life histories, the second challenge of this research will be revealing practices of multiculturalism in Japanese classrooms, which were a part of the greater society, prior to the general influence of the multicultural movement in the 1980s.

Significance of the Study

A leading post colonial scholar, Ngugi Wa (1992) argues for the inclusion of voices of "Third World people" in order to understand the world that we live in, for dependence only on European literature will give a very distorted picture.

Thus, if people were really to depend on European literature, even at its best, they would get a very distorted picture of the modern world, its evolution and its contemporary being. The twentieth century is a product of imperialist adventurism, true, but also of resistance from the people of the Third World. This resistance often reflected in the literature of the Third World and it is an integral part of the modern world, part of the forces which have been creating and are still creating the heritage of a common culture. They come from Asia. They come from South America. They come from Africa. And they come from the oppressed national sectors and social strata in North America, Australasia, and Europe. The Third World is all over the world (p. 18).

Using a postcolonial lens, we can also claim they come from Japan, too. As a practice of multiculturalism, the inclusion of experiences of people who were conquered, enslaved, exploited, and dominated, this study will attempt to reveal resistances of the people in Japan through narratives of teachers who tried not to take on the side of the executioners. While these struggles occurred in the recent past, they have not been made widely public despite their relevance today.

Teachers and students in Japan are now experiencing another shift in their school lives under the revised Fundamental Law of Education, issued in December 2006. This new version of the educational law is understood to have more totalitarian and nationalistic agenda, which tries to limit and control students' as well as teachers' freedom of thought and expression. It rings alarm bells for many people, teachers and others, in Japan and its former colonized countries, for it certainly reminds us of the horrific experience of World War II and the social conditions leading up to the war. Harman (2008) writes: "History is about the sequence of events that led to the lives we lead today. It is the story of how we came to be ourselves. Understanding it is the key to finding out if and how we can further change the world in which we live" (p. ii). This study may contribute to further understanding how conditions have been produced in the past with an eye toward understanding principles in particular struggles against an oppressive system.

Parameters of the Study

Using in-depth interviews, I made sense of the particularity of experiences that were shared by selected teachers who taught in Japanese public school system during the 1960s. Therefore, my study consists of meeting small samples of teachers, gathering and

interpreting their robust accounts of understanding the society. I locate this effort within an interpretivist research frame that honors each teacher's different experiences in the world through their person-specific narrative. Therefore, this study will not be a general description of teachers, rather a construction of the shared realities through an analysis of overlapping themes. Thematic and discursive analysis allow me to build insights and theorize about human agency under similar conditions.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Education as the practice of freedom - as opposed to education as the practice of domination – denies that man is abstract, isolated, independent, and unattached to the world; it also denies that the world exists as a reality apart from people. Authentic reflection considers neither abstract man nor the world without people, but people in their relations with the world. In these relations consciousness and world are simultaneous: consciousness neither precedes the world nor follows it. (Freire, 1970, p. 69)

Education as the practice of freedom, as opposed to education as the practice of domination, reflects people in their relations with the world (Freire, 1970). In this dissertation research, therefore, I attempt to reflect on Japanese teachers' experiences in the 1960s in their relations with the world. How did these teachers construct meanings to be a teacher or to teach in the society at the time? How did they make sense of the society in which they were teaching? In order to contextualize teachers' narratives in relation to greater society, first of all, I will begin this section with the review of literatures, which discuss the world and society, from a globalization perspective, as the base of the study. Secondly, as my focus is on education, I will review literatures on the effects of globalization on education. Carnoy and Rhoten (2002) suggest: "In assessing globalization's true relationship to educational change, we need to know how globalization and its ideological packaging affect the overall delivery of schooling, from transnational paradigms, to national policies, to local practices (p. 2). Thirdly, therefore, I will review studies that examine the role of teachers in relationship to social struggles against oppressive globalization forces, as local practices.

Literatures that discuss globalization, social reproduction theory, and transformative education are reviewed. In order to identify the literatures, search tools

such as ERIC, Social Science Citation Index, and Education Complete are used. The keywords used to identify literatures includes “multicultural education,” “critical multiculturalism,” “globalization,” “role of teacher,” “democratic education,” “organic intellectual,” “teacher activists,” and “transformative education.” It is a compilation of literature reviewed from 2002 to 2010. The literatures include those written by leading scholars in the fields, and yet also include others who do not directly speak to education itself. This is in order to situate education in social relationships.

Globalization: Struggle for Humanity

“Throughout recorded history, men and women have traveled great distances – in pursuit of trade, of empire, of converts, of slaves – shaping the material and spiritual culture of many places with objects and ideas from far away,” K. Anthony Appiah writes (Forward in Sassen, 1998). By defining globalization as “the interpenetration of cultures and forms of life,” Appiah recognizes the antiquity of the process of globalization. Apparently, he is not unique in his position to suggest the long history of globalization. Modelski in 1972 claimed that the conquest of the Moslem world at about 1000 AD was “the opening of the period of globalization” which was followed by Europe, then by the United States of America, and possibly by some other parts of the world in the future. Modelski’s argument is based on a definition of globalization as “the process by which a number of historical world societies were brought together into one global system” (p. 55). Wallerstein’s capitalist world-system, on the other hand, suggests that globalization dates back to the beginning of Western expansion in the sixteenth century (2004). Yet, “still others consider that globalization started with the ending of fixed exchange-rates or the collapse of the Eastern bloc” (Beck, 2000).

“When did globalization begin?” Beck (2000) argues this is “the truly thorny question” (p. 20). In order to understand globalization – “the historical process that is defining the world scenario” (Castro, 2000, p. 249), or the condition of our lives, I reviewed literatures that discuss effects of globalization. Overwhelmingly many scholars write about globalization. As I read more to grasp the meaning of globalization, I found the effects of globalization to be very ambivalent. Some claim it is equalizing, advancing, and democratizing. Others argue that it is oppressive, polarizing and colonizing. Some say it is standardizing and yet others say it is diversifying. Held and McGrew (2003) collected works of contesting scholars to show how deeply the concept of globalization undergoes “the great debate.” These arguments conflict with each other, yet Tabb (2001) suggests that globalization is not simply a matter of “good” or “bad.”

The debate is often presented in the form of a stark dichotomy of whether globalization is “good” or “bad.” Matters are more complicated, and it is an important task to sort through the intricacies of who globalization is good or bad for, at a given moment, and how it might be made better for those who are paying unacceptably high costs (p. 28).

Surely, globalization holds benefits for a certain group of people while disadvantaging others. But why is it that how we understand and react to globalization differs so greatly? An answer for my question came from Harman (2008):

At each point human beings make choices whether to proceed along one path or another, and fight out these choices in great social conflicts. Beyond a certain point in history, how people make their choices is connected to their class position. The slave is likely to make a different choice to the slave-owner, the feudal artisan to the feudal lords (p. iv).

How we understand globalization, too, is greatly influenced by our class position. The opposing discourses that I found were actually a contradiction coming from class struggle. Globalization forces may be understood as advancing and equalizing if one is in the class

position to benefit from the system. On the other hand, it is certainly a polarizing force for those who are exploited, dominated but struggling for equity. This disparity, however, seems so natural once I look at globalization from class perspective. People regardless of their class position are affected by globalization, yet, their decisions about how to respond to it are different depending on their class. People who are colonized are likely to make a different choice than those by the colonizer, soldiers of capitalism, or resisters of exploitation.

“When did globalization begin?” - This question is in fact a political question. One may say: It is just a recent phenomenon with advanced technologies and multinational corporations. Or one could say it is human nature, not only Western capitalism that is inclined to conquer and expand to territories of other people. Both of these arguments, however, consequently ignore centuries of exploitation and oppression on a global scale by Western capitalism, which shapes our present society and silences voices of oppressed people around the world. Both of arguments will therefore distort the reality of our current social experiences as Ngugi (1992) writes, “Any study of cultures which ignores structures of domination and control and resistance within nations and between nations and races over the last four hundred years is in danger of giving a distorted picture” (p. 18). Amin (1997) argues that “History since antiquity has been characterized by the unequal development of regions. But it is only in the modern era that polarization has become the immanent byproduct of the integration of the entire planet into the capitalist system” (p. 1). Thus, in order to understand the current conditions under which we live, I came to realize that it is critical to recognize the

structures of domination and control, and resistance of the past four hundred years of Western capitalism. Globalization is indeed a class struggle.

The more profound question that I should ask is perhaps “how” rather than “when.” How does this globalization under Western capitalism affect our lives, to dominate and control people? How have these processes of globalization been manipulated by the ruling class, and how have they been resisted by the oppressed?” Tabb (2001) argues globalization is “the nature of the operation of the capitalist system.”

The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolutionizing the instruments of production, and without them the whole relations of society,” as Marx and Engels wrote in the *Communist Manifesto*. Globalization, which they presciently described in that document, among other places, continues the search for lower waged workers through geographic expansion; this has long been central to the nature of the operation of the capitalist system. Landes writes of early industrialism, “rural manufactures expanded easily by opening new areas – moving from the environs of the manufacturing to towns into nearby valleys, invading less accessible mountain regions, spreading like a liquid seeking its level, in this case the lowest possible wage level. It was in this way that the woolen industry filled the dales of Wiltshire and Somerset and came to thrive all along the Welsh marshes by the end of the sixteenth century.” Globalization at the start of the twenty-first century is a continuation of this process on a wider scale (p. 25).

McLaren (1998) emphasizes that globalization can be understood as global restructuring of industries and work organization in the interest of global capitalism. It is, in the reality of people’s life, the exploitation of masses by a few – a resurgence of monopoly capitalism, however, the faces of ruling force may have changed from elite in a nation-state boundary to global capitalists or transnational comprador elite. Globalization is, in other words, another reconfiguration, yet again control, of modes of production, laboring class and hierarchy in the global society (e.g. Amin,1997; Winant, 2001).

Aligned with Marxist theory about class reconfiguration under capitalism, in order to fully understand globalization and its effect on people, it is necessary to discuss

the tradition of resistances by the people who are dominated. St. Denis (2000) emphasizes “colonized and Indigenous people have been dealing for along time with many of the currently identified effects of globalization, such as seizure of their lands and their resources, and their confinement into structures of cheap labor” (p. 37), and we must continue to provide analysis of practices of domination and how these function both locally and globally in order to advocate for the resistance. Ngugi (1992) writes:

The slave trade and slavery bringing about mass relocation of peoples; colonialism bringing about immense economic, political, cultural and psychological violence on colonized communities, have meant that there is no culture which has not been affected adversely or otherwise by those relationships of dominance and domination. But they have also been affected by the traditions of resistance from the dominated. This external domination and the resistance to it can be paralleled, in the colonized communities and in the dominating nations, with the internal disempowerment of peoples and resistance to this (pp. 27-28).

Dominant forces of globalization are resisted externally as well as internally. Therefore, here I examine dominant discourses of globalization in light of resistances.

In discourses that advocate economic and political globalization, advanced technology, spread of freedom (or free market) and democratization are often used as examples of the merits of globalization. Bauman (1998) captures such discourses as folklore:

As the folklore of the new generation of ‘enlightened classes’, gestated in the new, brave and monetarist world of nomadic capital, would have it, opening up sluices and dynamiting all state-maintained dams will make the world a free place for everybody. According to such folkloristic beliefs, freedom (of trade and capital mobility, first and foremost) is the hothouse in which wealth would grow faster than ever before; and once the wealth is multiplied, there will be more of it for everybody (p. 73).

However, Bauman continues in the next paragraph: “The poor of the world – whether old or new, hereditary or computer-made – would hardly recognize their plight in this folkloristic fiction” (p. 73). Amin (1997), likewise, challenges the dominant capitalist

discourse of globalization, which tries to convince people that “market expansion necessarily ‘leads to’ social progress and democracy, and that the ‘difficulties’ (the ‘pockets’ of poverty, unemployment and social marginalization, as they are called) are really only transitory,” however, “[n]o one gives much thought to whether the transition will last a few years or several centuries!” (p. xii).

In order to challenge such dominant discourses of globalization, evidences of the increasing gap between poor and rich are pointed out (Amin, Brecher et al., and Tabb, among many others). Many expose the cruel reality of the world’s ordinary people. For example, the UN reported, in 1998, that the total wealth of the top 358 ‘global billionaires’ equals the combined incomes of 2.3 billion of the poorest people, 45 per cent of the world’s population (Beck, 2000). Bercher and Costello (1994) argue that even “democracy” has been jeopardized by global monopoly by the capitalist class. Rizvi and Lingard (2000) write, “major worrying of all concerns is the fact that the benefits of globalization are unevenly distributed. The global economy has created greater social stratification and more inequality in society” (p. 2).

Another capitalist dominant discourse, which attempts to control people and Amin (1997) suggests to dismantle, is the feeling of helplessness. The dominant discourse tries to convince people that the process of globalization is beyond our control. Bauman (1998) writes, “‘Globalization’ is not about what we all, or at least the most resourceful and enterprising among us, wish or hope *to do*. It is about *what is happening to us all*” (p. 60). In order to oppose such attempts by the dominant class, Amin writes:

Our aim here is to provide a systematic critique of the simplistic ruling discourse about the ineluctability of globalization. It must be recognized that interdependence has to be negotiated: that nationally necessary forms of development have to be framed and supported, and that initial inequalities have to

be corrected rather than left to grow more profound. To recognize these necessities, then, is to understand that development is not synonymous with market expansion. (Amin, 1997, p. xii)

It is humans who negotiate to regulate both internal and external relationships; it is we, not the market or the system, who have control over what happens to us in daily lives. Development is “an increasing capacity to regulate both internal and external relationships” (Rodney, 1981, p. 3) for humans.

Globalization forces are multi-dimensional, neoliberal or humanitarian, and negotiations and resistances to inequalities and dehumanization are undertaken at local levels. Another important aspects of globalization is that those people’s struggles, or more proactively people’s movements, are making connections on a global scale, as Bercher and Castello (1994) call it “Globalization from Below.” Globalization from below can be said to consist of “an array of transnational social forces animated by environmental concerns, human rights, hostility to patriarchy, and a vision of human community based on the unity of diverse cultures seeking an end to poverty, oppression, humiliation, and collective violence” (St. Denis, 2000, p. 46). Such movements, indeed, confirm for us that globalization “holds tremendous potential for development, the eradication of poverty and fostering well-being in conditions of social equality for all humanity” (Castro, 2000, p. 249). When I understand globalization as class struggle, the resistance to capitalist oppression and exploitation at local level consists of, of course, racial/ethnic, gender and other struggle particular to each local situation. Gimenez (2001), from Marxist perspective, argues race and gender and other aspects of people’s identities are sites of exploitation.

The working class is of course composed of women and men who belong to different races, ethnicities, national origins, cultures, and so forth, so that gender

and racial/ethnic struggles have the potential of fueling class struggles because, given the patterns of wealth ownership and income distribution in this and all capitalist countries, those who raise the banners of gender and racial struggles are overwhelmingly propertyless workers, technically members of the working class, people who need to work for economic survival whether it is for a wage or a salary, for whom racism, sexism and class exploitation matter. (para. 12)

Gimenez further recognizes the importance and potential of those individual struggles in class struggle at large as “a site where the potential agents of social change are forged.” People have resisted and are resisting colonization, military occupation, exploitation and dehumanization, which they face in their everyday life, and each forms of struggle differs depending on the site of exploitation they face.

The world may be, “still very far from materializing the potential of globalization” as Castro (2002, p249) argues. It is actually constant challenges that people undertake at local levels with our own situation in order to maximize such potential. Critical multiculturalism is certainly one of many ways that creates a space for addressing the issues. In this dissertation, the local context of Japan will be described further in Chapter III and particularity of people’s struggle in Japan will be discussed in more detail in the following Chapters. Once again, however from a Marxist point of view, particularity of individual struggles must be understood in relationship to the realities of class exploitation, for “how people make their choices is connected to their class position” (Harman, 2008).

Education and Globalization: Domination and Resistance

I will now turn my attention to the influences of multi-dimensional “globalization” forces on education, both as dominant forces as well as resistance forces from a class point of view. If we are to understand globalization as a form of capitalist expansion, modern schooling is an integral part of capitalism and hardly ever was the “equalizer” as

dominant discourse tries to portray it. The two main objectives of dominant classes in educational policy are “the production of labor power and the reproduction of those institutions and social relationships which facilitated the translation of labor power into profits” (Bowles and Gintis, 1976, p. 129). Modern-schooling as an integral part of capitalism, “rarely...promoted either social equality or full human development” (Bowles and Gintis, p. 18), but rather legitimizes inequality of society. Scholars such as Louis Althusser, Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, Pierre Bourdieu and Jean- Claude Passeron, and Basil Bernstein articulated social reproduction theories in education developed on Gramsci’s notion of hegemony: education as the principal mechanism for the promotion of the dominant ideology and for the engineering of consent to exploitative structures in capitalist society (Clayton, 1998). Bowles and Gintis articulate the mechanism of schooling that serves the interest of capitalists by legitimizing the system.

[T]he ostensibly objective and meritocratic selection and reward system of U.S. education corresponds not to some abstract notion of efficiency, rationality, and equity, but to the legitimization of economic inequality and the smooth staffing of unequal work roles. (Bowles and Gintis, 1976, p. 108)

Liberal discourse, however, depicts education as equalizer of society: “Education provides equal opportunity to everybody regardless of their social status.” With this liberal discourse, universal education is strongly pushed globally by organizations such as World Bank and USAID.

From the perspective of formal education, one essential aspect in confronting the demands of globalization is to create the capacity to provide quality educational opportunities to all citizens. In this respect, globalization presents a very simple challenge to society: *The population must increase its schooling and must acquire, through schooling, a quality education.* (Rincon, et al., 2005, p. 24)

Roger Dale (2000) analyzes the discourse of Common World Educational Culture (CWEC), developed by John Meyer and colleagues at Stanford University, in order to

sketch outlines of a theory of relation between globalization and education. According to Dale, the CWEC approach demonstrates the existence of universal models of education based on universal norms, culture and value –taken from those of Western nations, and sees the change as “progress” and “development.” CWEC suggests that educational structures and curricular content be institutionalized at the world level so that education becomes relatively standardized around the world. CWEC sees mass schooling is the key symbolic form of membership in the modern polity. In addition, “standardized tests are touted as the means to ensure the educational system is aligned well with the global economy, which is now expanding beyond nation-states by an international standard” (McLaren 1998 p. 438).

Labaree (1997) identifies the fundamental conflicts in education in any liberal democratic society as the tension between democratic politics (public rights) and capitalist markets (private rights), between majority control and individual liberty, between political equality and social inequality. Teachers and students are caught in the conflicts in classrooms everyday. Leistyna (1999) writes, “Although a majority of educators across the ideological spectrum have subscribed to the idea of equality for all students, they by no means have agreed on the content or purposes of public education, that is, on whose terms equality will exist” (p. 1). Even multicultural education, which lacks a critical analysis of dominant discourses, faces the danger of reinforcing the dominant discourse and hence may serve the interests of oppressors.

Instead of recognizing schools as a product of the larger society of inequities and struggles, they are viewed within this reactionary multicultural model as the great equalizers, the all-encompassing panaceas to “cultural and physical deficiencies,” as well as to societal problems. Educational institutions are thus understood as the solution to, rather than the perpetrators of, social injustice and demise (Leistyna, 1999, p. 12).

As a result, victims of the system are still to be blamed for their failure. We must here stop “blaming the victims,” but rather, question the system itself as Bowles and Gintis (1976) suggests:

The intractability of inequality of income and of economic opportunity cannot be attributed to genetically inherited differences in IQ. The disappointing results of the “War on Poverty” cannot be blamed on the genes of the poor. The failure of egalitarian school reforms reflects the fact that inequality under capitalism is rooted not in individual deficiencies, but in the structure of production and property relations (p. 123).

The economic realities of the world also expose a great discrepancy between the dominant discourse and people’s experiences. The Globally Structured Educational Agenda (GSEA) developed by Dale suggests that “modern” education is driven by the need to maintain the capitalist system rather than by any set of values. Dale argues the system of “legitimization” is now globalized (2000). Sassen (1998) reaffirms this argument. In global cities, there is an increasing gap of salary between highly educated workers, global capitalists, and those who clean their offices, immigrants, women, African Americans in U.S. cities, people of color, oppressed minorities. Clearly, education has different meanings and purposes depending on one’s class position. People in Africa, Latin America, Asia and native people in colonial countries experienced colonization through education. People were “educated” to become “civilized” persons. Colonized people have a very different understanding of schooling than those who are educated in privileged schools in the colonizing countries. Experiences of working class and middle class African American students in the US schools may be quite different from experiences of White students from the same social classes in the same schools (Tatum, 1997).

Despite the dominant attempts to use schooling as a tool of oppression, early critical social theorists, Bowles and Gintis (1976) remained positive about the role of education as a part of resistance and say, “educational reform can become an integral part of an assault on privilege” (p. 85). Recently Torres (2002) argued that the effect of globalization on education can work to spread international human rights. We must remember that resistances to the “legitimization” and “dehumanization” have always been at work by people. Representing teachers as a monolithic part of the dominant school system, as reproducers or perpetuators of inequality, perpetuates a very limited and distorted picture. For example, Angela Davis (1981) brings our attention to the white women allies in Black people’s struggle in the United States through education:

The most outstanding examples of white women’s sisterly solidarity with Black women are associated with Black people’s historical struggle for education. Like Prudence Crandall and Margaret Douglass, Myrtilla Miner literally risked her life as she sought to impart knowledge to young Black women (p. 102).

Such transformative and emancipation educational traditions for equity and humanity include, but are not limited to, indigenous education movements (Parkipuny, 1989), social justice education, peace education (Reardon. 1999), multicultural education (Banks, Sleeter, Gorski, among many other), etc. The resistance has been always a part of our history in “modern” education. In order to continue struggles, “[i]t requires the progressive articulation of and commitment to a social order that has at its very foundation not the accumulation of goods, profits, and credentials, but the maximization of economic, social, and educational equality” (Apple, 2004, p. 10). As globalization from below suggests, such practices of humanizing education must be sought out by teachers, parents, and students, at local levels and in this dissertation, I will particularly focus on teachers who seek to implement practices of humanizing education.

Teachers in Social Struggles

Finally, in this section, I review the studies that examine the role of teachers in relationship to social struggles against oppressive globalization forces. Historically, there are many teachers who have fought as a part of social movements against oppression. Angela Davis (1981), as quoted above, reminds us that White teachers, in solidarity with Black women, struggled against racial oppression. Walker (2005) brings attention to Black teachers' resistance during de jure segregation in the South between 1879 and 1938, even before the formal collaborations with the NAACP. Brady and Ohmann (2008), in their introduction to "Radical Teacher" reflect:

When this magazine started up in 1975, the founders didn't need to think a lot about its aims. Those came directly out of the 1960s movements in which we were active. The Vietnam War was over, but not U.S. militarism. We wanted to oppose it and support liberation struggles. We wanted to fight white and male supremacy and, by 1975, straight supremacy. We had various relations to left movements: none of us belonged to a Leninist party, but some thought of ourselves as working towards a (far-off) socialist revolution. All opposed the kind of capitalism that had organized the post-war world. And all supported working class struggles, though with skepticism. We agreed with the student movement that teaching and learning should be "relevant," though everything in that mantra needed unpacking and practical classroom work. We believed, also, that as teachers we could strengthen student activism; some thought progressive teaching could and should contribute to the "radicalizing" of students. (Brady and Ohmann, 2008, p. 2)

There is certainly a tradition of teachers who resist and oppose oppressive dominant forces in solidarity with the oppressed. It may not have been, or may never be, an easy path, as Swell (2005), in reviewing the work of Jonathon Kozol, writes, "History has not been kind to reformers who have attempted to wrestle control of public schools from bureaucracies that impair school quality." Even so, it is important for us to remember that there have been teachers who struggled, or attempted to struggle, against social

oppression and researchers who struggled against social oppression by revealing those teachers' practices.

Teachers' forms of resistance are manifold of course, as dominant forces are multi-dimensional. The system of control is in every aspect of school life; e.g. curriculum, employment system, as well as funding system. Mogadime (2008), for example, using teacher narrative, brings up a Black woman teacher's "pioneering experience as the first Black woman in a predominately White school board to actively attempt the process (during the 1980s) of working toward 'a promotion to a position of added responsibility' (PAR) as a school administrator (p. 88). In this study, Mogadime shows how an African teacher in Canada resisted the hiring system, which excluded teachers of color.

Cornbleth reveals teachers' challenges against dominant discourse in curricula:

Public schools in the United States have long been arenas in which Americans have fought battles over national values and priorities (e.g., Kliebard, 1986, 1992). Curriculum is continually contested, and America remains a continuing project, not a finished product to be transmitted to future generations like the passing of the baton in a relay race. (Cornbleth, 2000, p. 644).

In this study, Cornbleth examined eleven classrooms and her finding suggests "many teachers neither accept nor convey images of an unsullied, progressive America. The conventional story has been disrupted, and there is no equivalent successor in sight."

Cornbleth (2000), while recognizing teachers' effort, also argues that most of the teachers in her study "presented the U.S. as imperfect, but still the best" (Sleeter, 2000).

In her analysis of Cornbleth's work, Sleeter writes:

According to that narrative, historic unjust treatment has been largely a matter of prejudice, and as people become more enlightened, prejudice is diminishing; the U.S. has always absorbed newcomers with some difficulty, but over time things work out. (Sleeter, 2000, Narratives for Citizenship)

Cornbleth (1998) herself critiques the teachers in her study that “there is a sense of inevitable movement; things just happen without explanation or reasons being offered. Problems exist and are resolved, more or less, but there is little or no hint of human suffering, agency, conflict, or struggle. They simply are not mentioned” (p. 629).

In order to overcome such shortcomings, teachers must struggle, not merely against the curriculum per se, but also in relation to social structures of domination and control and resistance. Sleeter (2008) argues, “while democratically minded teachers can navigate accountability pressures up to a point, No Child Left Behind, rooted in corporatocracy, limits teachers’ ability to enact democratic teaching, particularly in schools not meeting test score targets” (p. 139). This is even more reason that teachers, who are committed to democratic principles, must go beyond the classroom to struggle against injustices in the social system in order to make their own classroom practice become spaces for critical thinking and using more powerful tools for their learners.

Teachers’ struggles do not stay inside the classroom or end when the school bell rings. Montañó, López-Torres, DeLissovoy, Pacheco, and Stillman (2002) write about the co-relationship of their teaching practice and activist work in community organization.

In our research, we found that our cohort of teacher activists faced a unique challenge as they engaged in activist work in community organizations. When prospective teachers sit in university courses they often read about inequitable conditions in urban schools; they discuss the lived experiences of poor and working people who send their children to dilapidated schools; and they are exposed to the latest research on inequity in education, but they do not necessarily see or directly experience the injustice. We found that as these activists engaged in their political work, they witnessed firsthand the inequitable conditions faced by students and parents in urban schools. In addition, through their work they developed new political and personal relationships with diverse constituencies - parents, students, and community. This new political relationship enabled them to learn about different perspectives, hear different languages, and interact with people whose lives and experiences they had only encountered in texts. The

participants became increasingly angry at injustice based upon race and class and learned to become advocates for and with members of oppressed groups and marginalized students. This process of advocacy, in which they began to struggle on behalf of a particular group - e.g., their own students or community - was part of a broader effort to transform society for the benefit of many groups, not only those with whom they identified. The teachers believed this advocacy work often placed them in opposition to the local school board who determines educational policy, the school district administrator who implements policy, and many of their colleagues who deliver instruction based on these policies. However, to be successful, these teacher activists also discovered ways to bring these different voices together in a productive way. (Montaño et al., 2002, p. 272)

From my review of these studies, I am made aware of the dimensions that need to be included in the questions for interviewing teachers. Those are: influences of social movements in 1960s-1970s on their teaching practices, their intention as well as daily teaching practices. As my contribution to social development of humanity, I would like to hear the voices of teacher activists, teachers who were actively involved in social movements: how they understood society and how they resisted in the classroom in relationship to the greater social context. These struggles need to be written and shared with teachers and beyond who wish to oppose social oppressions to continue the tradition of people's struggle.

CHAPTER III

CONTEXT OF STUDY

Globalization and Japanese Education Policies

This chapter will provide the socio-historical and political context of Japanese education system to situate the particularity of teachers as a part of the people's struggle in Japan. Three historical developments are useful to understanding contemporary Japanese education (Sato, 2004): pre-Meiji, Meiji-WWII, and post WWII with the Occupation by the US-led Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers (SCAP/GHQ). However, even though prominent scholars such as Edwin Reischauer and Ronald Dore recognize the increase of literacy in feudal times before the Meiji Restoration, because of my focus on globalization - class reconfiguration under capitalism, I will start my discussion on education policy after the turn of the Meiji government drawing on materials that historically review Japanese education with class perspectives. In the first section of this chapter, I will discuss how education was used as a tool to shift Japanese society to the capitalist mode of production, and to configure working class by the Meiji Government. Second section will focus on education reform in post-WWII, and re-configuration of working class driven by the capitalist globalization forces.

Westernization/Modernization of Japanese Education

The Meiji period is considered as an era of modernization in Japanese history (Reischauer, 1989). Unable to unite the **Daimyo** (feudal lords 大名) before Western massive military power, the Tokugawa Shogunate quickly lost prestige and authority. The imperial court, supported by groups of anti-Edo feudal lords, “restored” power from the Tokugawa Shogunate, and the Meiji Government was established in 1868. The new

government put great effort into modernizing Japanese society under the policy called **Fukoku Kyohei** (enrich the country and strengthen the military 富国強兵). Those who supported the Meiji Restoration saw clearly the threat of European and American colonizing forces and pushed for modern governing, modern military, as well as modern industrialization in order to avoid colonization. Therefore, the Meiji Restoration in 1868, in fact, was the shift in mode of production in Japan, from feudal to capitalist mode of production, shifting drastically from manual to industrialized manufacturing. In order to face Western colonial power, the Meiji Regime took a more aggressive role in the global capitalist system, and soon embarked on ambitious policies of colonization. The Meiji regime hence was the first central government, which spread out to the entire territory, now considered as Japan, conquering Ezo (Hokkaido) and Ryukyu (Okinawa). Japan, then gradually expanded colonial rule to East and South East Asia, which naturally triggered resistances of those peoples.

It is equally important to remark that the Meiji government, in fact soon after taking power, abolished class restrictions on professional fields. This change was not, however, the abolishment of all class distinctions, for privilege remained for **Kozoku** (the Emperor's family 皇族), **Kazoku** (the hereditary peerage 華族) and **Shizoku** (the feudal lords 士族). But it certainly helped the shift in the mode of production; people of lower rank samurais, farmers, craftsmen, merchants, all alike, then became the laboring force for the newly developed industrialized manufacturers. In 1871, the Meiji government put in force the emancipation law of **Burakumin** (outcasts 部落民), granting them full legal equality, although social discrimination against them remained and remains strong even today. The **Burakumin**, hence, were integrated into the laboring forces in the newly

developed economic structure. Women were also the target of exploitation, and their stories of suffering of cheap labor and dire work conditions are often told in reports as well as in novels, such as **Joko Aishi** (women factory workers' sad stories 女工哀史) and “**Ah, Nomugi Toge** (ああ、野麦峠).”

The Meiji leaders clearly recognized the need for new skills and knowledge (Reischauer, 1989), in order to accelerate modernization, which was essentially the Westernization of Japanese society (Shinbori, 1986). Beauchamp writes:

Eager to learn the secrets of the West's success and transform the country into a modern nation-state, the Meiji government saw education as a key to achieving political integration and training the diverse personnel needed to reach their goal. Elementary education was made compulsory and emphasis was placed on practical and scientific learning (Beauchamp, 1995, pp. 67-68).

1873 marked the first year of the modern school system, signaling a breakdown of the feudal class structure (Sato, 2004). A new education system was established, modeled after the Western system (Sakai, 1999). Virtual universal elementary education attendance was attained by 1907 (Reischauer, 1977). However, Passin (1965) points out that it was not an equal opportunity to education that the traditionally educated classes were favored under this system. “In principle, complete equality of educational opportunity was established from 1872 onward. In practice, however, the various segments of the population were differentially prepared, sometimes financially and sometimes culturally, to take advantage of it” (p. 117).

From a viewpoint of globalization under capitalism, the new education system was never aimed to achieve social equality. It was clear, from the beginning, that the education system adopted by the Meiji government was intended to produce effective laboring forces for modernized industry (Sakai, 1999). The educational policy under the

Meiji regime is represented by **Kyoiku Chokugo** (The Imperial Message on Education 教育勅語, 1890), which remained as the foundation of education until the end of World War II. It's stated to educate children to become "good and faithful subjects" of the Emperor and his Government. Under this policy, the Meiji government promoted the notion of monocultural/monoracial Japan in order to enhance nation building and its industrialization (Coulmas, 2002). It was also during this time that the Japanese government designated the upper class Tokyo accent as "standard" Japanese and the Ministry of Education directed schools nationwide to promote the use of standard Japanese (Noguchi, 2001). Okano emphasizes on the role of education in assimilating minority groups:

The system of education has played a major role in disseminating 'modern' knowledge and in nurturing a sense of what it is to be 'Japanese'. Modern Japan adopted an ethnic-nationalism based on a major ethnic group (in contrast to the civic-nationalism of modern India), and has taken various measures to assimilate other ethnic groups under its umbrella. (Okano, 2006, p. 338).

The image of "mono-cultural" Japan was used against the people from the country-side, Ainu, Okinawa. Moreover Tai (2003) argues that this newly developed notion of "mono-cultural Japan" was used to colonize the rest of Asia. In actual reality, the creation of a "mono-cultural" Japan was used to justify viewing and treating ethnic minorities, colonized people of Korea, China and others in Asia as inferior, hence as suppliers of cheap labor of industry.

On the other hand, as this policy by Meiji government evidently shows, it is clear that Japan was, and is, not a monolithic and mono-racial country (Amino, 1999; Ishii and Yamauchi, 1999). The resistance movements against hegemonic educational policy can be traced back as early as the time of the development of the "modern" schooling system.

Maehira (1999), for example, reveals the story of Iha Huyuu, an Okinawan, who resisted in order to protect the identity of the Okinawan against Japanese assimilationist educational policy in the early 1900s.

During the Taisho Era (1912~1926), Japanese people experienced democratic movements. Reischauer describes the period as:

Here in microcosm we see a temporary union of labor, and incipient leftist political movements, the Christian social movement, liberal party politicians, journalists, and scholars that characterizes the brief span between 1917 and 1920. The same ideological variety can be found in various student societies established at this time in Tokyo. A magazine put out by one carried pictures of Lincoln, Rousseau, Kropotkin, Marx, Lenin, and Rosa Luxemburg. (Reischauer, 1977, p. 238)

The upheavals of people's movements during this period are referred as Taisho Democracy Movements, which included civil rights for outcasts and women, as well as those who were brought to Japan as forced laborers from Korea and China. As a part of this surge of social movements, there were educators who challenged the national curriculum and implemented education to reflect needs of individual student's (Sakai, 2001). **Taisho Jiyuu Kyoiku** (Taisho Liberal Education 大正自由教育), led by educators such as Suzuki Miekich, Hani Tomoko, Noguci Entaro among others, was greatly influenced by the New School movements in Europe and the US. Among progressive educational practices during this time, Kitagawa and Kitagawa recognize **Seikatu Tsuzurikata** (learning through writing 生活綴り方) teachers as teachers who were concerned about the lives of the young people they deal with.

Seikatsu tsuzurikata was to spring from a turbulent period in modern Japan. The worldwide depression in 1929 hit Japan with full force. Problems in farming communities were compounded, particularly in northeastern Japan, by unusually cold weather in 1931. A war in Manchuria, in which Japan was deeply involved, also began in 1931. Japan was hurtling toward militarism under the pressure of nationalism. The Shino-Japan War began in 1937, and Japan finally plunged into

World War II in 1941. It was a time of national convulsion dictated by right-wing ideologies, in which the value of human existence was measured solely in terms of its service to the national interest. It was their own human values even against the spirit of the times. From the late 1920s to the end of the 1930s, many compositions were written under the guidance of those classroom teachers across Japan, particularly in the northeast region, where financial straits were the most severe. Most of these compositions – which were to be popularly referred to in subsequent years as *seikatsu tsuzurikata* – articulated the authors' actual lives, and the teachers had to cope with the descriptions of hardship written in them. The **seikatsu** movement, as popularly conceived, grew out of those teachers' desires to help their students, whose lives contained little but despair. There arose the aim of encouraging the kind of self-determinism that could not be overcome by hardship (Kitagawa and Kitagawa, 1987, p43).

While the teachers' movements gradually took root in their everyday practices, the Government and the Ministry of Education, with concerns of losing control, strengthened totalitarian policies against such democratic and socialistic ideology in 1917 (Kikkawa and Todoroki, 1996). Japanese education, hence, quickly was turned into fascistic education. In 1925, military officers were placed in each school to carry out the military training, and as Japan entered the Fifteen-year War, education was used by the military to produce soldiers and workers for the country.

It is important to note, however, that implementation of such totalitarian policies did not put an end to resistance movements of educators who opposed such fascistic government policies. Although they were therefore arrested and tortured, they still maintained their hope for democratic education, continued to resist the dehumanizing curriculum, and struggled for humanity.

Democratization of Education

Education shall aim at the full development of personality, striving to nurture the citizens, sound in mind and body, who shall love truth and justice, esteem individual value, respect labour and have a deep sense of responsibility, and be imbued with the independent spirit, as builders of the peaceful state and society. (The Basic Act on Education, 1947)

1945 marks a historical turn for Japanese society and people. Horio (1997) argues 1945 was “the entrance to the Global Age” for Japan. Even though I argue that Japan was in fact a part of globalization much before 1945, it was unquestionably a great turning point for Japanese society. Sato (2004) recognizes the significance of the restructuring of the Japanese education system in this era.

The third major development occurred after World War II with the Occupation. The Japanese school system was restructured and modeled on the American system: a 6-3-3-4 system was adopted making schooling compulsory through ninth grade (Passin, 1965; Inagaki, 1986). Content changed to correspond roughly to subject matters taught in the United States, but the major thrust of Occupational reforms was to eliminate any militaristic, ultranationalistic elements from the curriculum (Passin, 1965). As Reischauer and Befu note, compared to the prewar elitist and sexist education, postwar Japanese schools became coeducational and public. (Sato, 2004, p. 25)

Educational policy under the Occupation Forces is considered, often times, as the introduction of “democratic” education to Japan (Beauchamp, 1998; Wray 1991; Sato, 2004; etc). Beauchamp (1998) indeed asserts that one of the primary goals of postwar American policy was the democratization of Japan, and democratic education was believed to be vital in this quest. Furthermore Amano writes:

Equal opportunity in education was also the result of the social and economic reforms implemented under the Occupation. The liberalization of farmland, dismantling of the zaibatsu, and reform of the family (*i.e.*) system played especially important roles in transforming the class structure, creating opportunities for social and economic upward mobility and firing people’s desire for education. (Amano, 1997, pp. 74-75)

Under the American Occupation policy, the teachers' union was established. Beauchamp suggests this was also a result of democratization of Japanese education by the American Policy.

One of the major results of the American Occupation of Japan was the creation of a strong teachers' union which, since its birth in the years following World War II, has consistently been politically to the left of center. Less interested than their American counterparts in bread-and-butter issues, the Japan Teachers Union is committed to a socialist model of an egalitarian society as part of a peaceful world order. Inculcating democratic values is, therefore, an important part of the union's ideological commitment. If, indeed, an important part of what a child learns in school is a result of what educators refer to as the "hidden" or "latent" curriculum, then it seems not unreasonable to suggest that teacher attitudes and behaviors have exerted an important influence on the political socialization of young people (Beauchamp, 1998, p. 143).

Kikkawa and Todoroki (1996) state Post World War II education has achieved the democratization of social consciousness of Japanese people. It is important, however, to draw attention to a point that Siromaru (1984) makes: "After the war, the Emperor's regime was greatly dismantled not only because of the Occupation Forces, but also was because of people's forces to put an end to it" (p. 84).

On the other hand, this "democracy" under American occupation was, unsurprisingly, questionable. For example, the Korean ethnic education movement, begun soon after World War II (Ryang, 1997; Motani, 2002), was actually dismantled by GHQ, as the United States was anticipating the Korean War. A Red purge of teachers was commanded by GHQ in 1949, where teachers who were believed to be communist or sympathizers of communists were forced out of their occupation, which resulted in a political shift of the teachers' union (Histology of Post-war Education 戦後教育史料集成 vol.5). Siromaru (1984), reflecting his experience, writes, "First we struggled against education for the Emperor's regime, and then imposed American style education." (p. 83)

In 1952, Japan re-gained sovereignty by signing the Treaty of San Francisco. Japanese government, ruled by the Liberal Democratic Party, put in force an education policy which was called **Kyoiku no Seijoka** (normalization of education 教育の正常化), including national curricula and textbooks, teacher evaluations, standardized testing and equal access.

The push for curricula in accordance with ministry guidelines and reinforcement of the textbook authorization process can be considered part of the ministry's overall policy of achieving equality in the schools. Nikkyoso and the progressives strongly resisted moves to limit or usurp teachers' academic freedom, but ultimately children up to the age of 15 received the same level and type of education based on standardized curricula and textbooks. Even at the high school level, about 70% of students attended non-vocational schools providing a uniform curriculum of academic subjects, including English. Academic subjects were also compulsory at vocational schools, though less time was devoted to them (Amano, 1997, p75).

However, this "normalization" is viewed as "reverse" course of "democratic" education by scholars, such as Beauchamp and Gottlieb, who saw American Occupation policy as "democratic." Gottlieb writes,

The period since the end of the Allied Occupation of Japan has seen a number of attempts to reverse several Occupation policies. Some, such as the revoking of administrative decentralization of education and the police force, have been successful, while others, such as constitutional revision, have not. In general, the period since the 1950s has seen a pattern of conservative social change backed by the Liberal Democratic Party (Gottlieb, 1994, p. 1175).

Beauchamp also notes:

During the "reverse course" of the 1950s the Japan Teacher's Union fiercely resisted the conservative politicians' efforts to undo the democratic educational reforms imposed by the Americans, and during the turbulent 1960s and 1970s, its members were in the forefront of opposition to the Vietnam War, Japanese rearmament, U.S.-Japan security arrangements, and so forth (Beauchamp, 1998, p. 143).

Regardless of one's position, whether the education policy by the re-formed Japanese government was "granting equal access" or "reversed," it is clear that teachers were very

much involved in the struggle for education improvement. The question of whether “a period of post-war democratic education” was really a democratic one or not, however, seems to create a dichotomy in discourses of Japanese education, and distracts the struggles of Japanese educators as merely a struggle for “democratic” education. It is important to recognize, taking the social, political and economic reality of the society into consideration, that globalization and reconfiguration of labor forces, was also an important element of the struggle. GHQ policy was in coordination with the Marshall Plan to rebuild Japan to be a part of the American global system. When US occupation forces left Japan, the push for becoming an integrated part of globalization was continued by the Japanese ruling class. What teachers were struggling against were: a conservative, backwards Japanese government and/or forces of globalization in which the Japanese government was eager to take part.

In 1956, the government amended the Basic Act on Education in order to change the selection of the local Board of Education, from public election to appointment by the Governor of the Prefectures. In other words, it strengthened the authority of the Ministry of Education. One may argue this as a backlash on American led democratic education. However, on the other hand, it was an outcome of the conversation between H. Ikeda and the Assistant Secretary of State, W. Robertson in 1953. Their major concern was the recruitment of young people to the Self-Defense Forces (SDF). What this actually meant was to educate young people so that they will voluntarily join the SDF, because the Constitution prohibits the draft system. In 1956, the Hatoyama Cabinet introduced the Six Year Plan of National Defense, aiming at re-establishing Japanese Military. This was a significant part of the Japan Teachers Union (JTU) struggle against the government

education policy. JIU constantly keeps their focus of the struggle on re-armament of Japan. It is shown in their slogans such as “Do not send our students Again to battlefields” and “Teacher evaluation is a milestone to a war” (Histology of Post-war Education 戦後教育史料集成 vol. 6, pp. 7-8).

Military partnership was not only the focus of the Japan-US relationship, however. Behind the “security” discussion, there lay economic interests. The Japan-US Security Treaty of 1960, which was mostly a renewal of the Treaty in 1952 that allowed US military forces to be stationed in Japan, encompassed one significant change:

Article II: The Parties will contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being. They will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage **economic collaboration** (emphasis added by the author) between them. (Japan-US Security Treaty of 1960)

Alongside the Treaty, the Ikeda Cabinet introduced the Income Doubling Plan, which led Japan’s so-called “Japanese post-war economic miracle.” As Japan was successfully merging into the global economic system, the economic sector quickly increased its influence on education policy, in order to meet the needs for workers who could support Japan’s growth and success in the global economy. Shimbori (1968) summarizes those needs as: need for high technological knowledge and skill, efficiency to respond to rapidly developing technological knowledge and skills, and enhancing meritocracy. The demands from the economic sector were met and implemented by government policies, such as appointment system of the Board of Education, diversification of secondary education, standardized testing, etc.

In 1966, the Central Council for Education used a term “Japanese who can compete in the world” in their suggestions to the Ministry of Education. With this suggestion, education policies were focused on high efficiency of education for economic development:

The efficiency improvement of the investment in education became the important focus of education policies. Identify high talented individuals as early as possible and concentrate the investment on those individuals, so that manpower necessary for the age of the technical improvement is secured. On the other hand, low talented individuals will receive educational training that suites their ability, so that they can become good production-line workers that are needed by the industrial sector. (Histology of Post-war Education 戦後教育史料集 vol. 8 p. 9)

JTU’s demand for the universal secondary education, along with Mothers’ movement, Labor Unions, as well as other democratic organizations, therefore faced fierce criticism and opposition from the Ministry of Education. At the same time, teachers were faced with the standardized testing along with the “examination war” which stratifies and trucks students to a certain type of education.

Summary

As soon as the Japanese government shifted the country to a capitalist production, education system became used as a tool to socialize and prepare for this production. The system oppressed people from diverse ethnicities both internally, such as Ainu, Okinawa and so forth, and externally, immigration of Japanese to China as well as forced immigration to Japan of Korean and Chinese, etc. Other major sites of exploitation included gender, language, and clans/family background. Through out the history of Japanese modern education, however, we can observe conflicts and negotiations between the government and teachers: The changes were implemented by the government but

opposed by teachers, teachers' movements were initiated and government's regulations were put forth to weaken the movements.

In discussion of the postwar education, the conflicts between the JTU and the Ministry of Education are often highlighted (Aizawa, 2005; Beauchamp, 1998; etc). It is no doubt that the JTU served as a driving force for teachers' movements and had a significant role in negotiation with the government in the postwar education system. Educational movements led by JTU members became very lively in the turbulent of the 1960s: teachers took initiatives to improve pedagogy to include the diverse pupils and students in the school (Aizawa, 2005). However, teachers' struggles are often represented in the frame of "democratic" education or academic "freedom," and the effects of economic globalization are more difficult to find. Yet, teachers were indeed struggling against globalization forces, exploitation of the masses by the few. Moreover, what teachers faced and understood somehow remains underrepresented. Therefore, in the following chapters, I hope to contribute to this discussion by presenting individual teachers' experiences facing globalization forces through teachers' narratives.

CHAPTER IV

STUDY DESIGN AND METHODS

Research Overview

Using the narrative inquiry method, researchers strive to understand how people experience the world. Researchers who employ narrative inquiry as a theory and a method of collecting data claim “humans are storytelling organisms who, individually and socially, lead storied lives (Connelly and Clandinin, 1990), and “we as human beings make sense of random experience by the imposition of story structures” (Bell, 2002). Polkinghorne (1995) recognizes the value of a storied narrative as “the linguistic form that preserves the complexity of human action with its interrelationship of temporal sequence, human motivation, chance happenings, and changing interpersonal and environmental contexts” (p.5). Hence, narrative inquiry is the study of experience (Clandinin and Connelly, 2000), and it offers a way to understand the culture from the inside (Cortazzi, 1993). Furthermore narrative analysis produces stories in such a way that “we are able to bring them ‘up close’ as opposed to ‘out there’ distant and abstract” (Gudmundsdottir, 1997, p.1).

In the educational research field, narrative inquirers explore teachers’ stories, their life experience and teaching practices, in order to understand how teachers view the world. Teachers’ stories, their narratives of experience, are understood to be both personal—reflecting teachers’ life histories—and social—reflecting the milieu, the contexts in which teachers live (Clandinin and Huber, 2002). Researchers appreciate “teachers’ culture” through teachers’ thoughts, perceptions, beliefs and experience

(Cortazzi, 1993), and recognize teachers' stories as "a form of knowledge" (Connelly and Clandinin, 1990; Zhao and Poulson, 2006).

Narrative inquiry shares with feminist studies an interest in the voices of storytellers (Connelly and Clandinin, 1990). Narrative inquirers make great effort to avoid subordinating otherwise muted voices by giving due analytic weight to the nature of personal narratives (Coffey and Atkinson, 1996). Teachers resist oppressive educational policies set by the government, and teachers struggle against oppressive social system. Teachers, as members of a society, are in fact a part of social development. Those voices of struggle and resistance of teachers can be brought forth by the narrative inquiry, as Cortazzi (1993) argues, the teacher's voice may emerge at its strongest in teachers' narrative accounts and use of narrative methods of research can allow us to develop descriptions of teachers' culture which preserve their voice.

In addition, narrative inquiry is much more than "just telling stories" (Clandinin, Pushor, & Orr, 2007). It is retelling and reliving of stories. As it progresses, the two narratives of the participant and the researcher become, in part, a shared narrative construction and reconstruction through the inquiry (Connelly and Clandinin, 1990). In the process of narrative inquiry, a researcher works in collaboration with the teacher(s). This collaboration facilitates a shift from life stories to life histories:

A life story is the personal reconstruction of the experience of the teacher, the story told of his/her professional life. A life history draws on a wider range of evidence: interviews discussions, relevant texts and contexts. In this shift from simple narrative to interpretation the life story is located in a broad contextual background which is built up through the joint activity of the teacher and researcher (Cortazzi, 1993, p. 14).

Use of narratives in research, indeed, offers an opportunity for marginalized groups to participate in knowledge construction (Bell, 2002). In addition, many researchers who

employ narrative inquiry acknowledge the multiple voicing. This stance of “multiple-voice” challenges researchers to critically examine reflexivity, representation of complexities.

For this dissertation research, I will focus on teachers’ experiences as they represented their activities in the 1960s-1970s in Japan using narrative inquiry. My research questions are: How did teachers experience at the time of global social movements in the 1960s-1970s? How did social movements in the 1960s-1970s influence their teaching practices? This study will be an attempt to construct the participating teachers life histories in the context of globalization, in order to understand the relationships between globalization and its implication in the classrooms in the 1960s-1970s. Furthermore, this study contributes to portraying Japanese teachers as organic intellectuals who take an important role in social transformation.

Participants

In order to gather data, I interviewed ten retired teachers who taught in Japanese public schools during the 1960s-1970s. In order to identify the participants, I contacted a local chapter of the Retired Teacher’s Association and also attended meetings organized by **Minkyoren** (Association of People’s Education Movements). In cooperation with leaders of those organizations, I generated a list of teachers and identified those who meet the criteria for the study: 1) teachers who taught in schools during the 1960s-70s, and 2) teachers who were actively involved in social or education movements during the same time period. Five teachers were initially identified and then during the interview sessions with those five participants, I asked for other names that they know who meet the criteria in order to increase the number of participants.

I sought cooperation from teachers with different perspectives, in order to gain data, which reflect social issues in Japan. The factors I took into consideration were ethnic minority background, class, and gender. In addition, I considered if they implemented teaching practices such as **Seikatsu Tsuzurikata Kyoiku** (learning through writing 生活綴り方教育) or **Dowa Kyoiku** (equity education 同和教育), **Heiwa Kyoiku** (Peace Education 平和教育), etc., because these practices were recognized as a part of social activism. Hearing stories from teachers with different social positions allowed me to understand teachers' resistance to social oppression from multiple perspectives.

Data Collection

A number of different data collection methods are used in narrative inquiry. Data can be in the form of field notes of the shared experience, journal records, and interview transcripts. They also include other observations in genres such as storytelling, letter writing, and autobiographical writing. It is reasonable to incorporate documents such as class plans and newsletters, and their writing such as rules, principles, pictures, metaphors, and personal philosophies. It is the researcher's task to seek for possible sources of data, and then draw out the data that serve to render a refined and rich description of the experience. Data for narrative inquiry "are not simply lying about on the surface ready to be gathered up; rather, the researcher is required to dig below the surface to bring up experiential accounts" (Polkinghorne, 2005, pp. 141-142). The sense of the whole is built from rich data sources with a focus on the concrete particularities of life that create powerful narrative tellings (Connelly and Clandinin, 1990).

My first step of data collection with the participants consisted of unstructured interviews. The unstructured interview is often used as a data collection tool in narrative inquiry. In my case, I asked participants to share their experiences and tell stories about their teaching experiences in the 1960s-70s. I kept in mind that our discussion during the interviews would yield answers to my research questions if I were attentive to the opportunities to probe for answers. In addition I could also learn about matters that may be more significant to the teachers and thus provide an expanded or focused view. I purposefully asked open-ended questions in order to reveal their autobiography, their description of the social movements, and stories of their everyday teaching practice (See Appendix A for the guiding questions). At least three interview sessions per participant were arranged in order to obtain sufficient quality interview data to produce valuable findings. During interviews, Polkinghorne (2005) suggests that researchers “need to attend to establishing a trusting, open relationship with the participant and to focus on the meaning of the participant’s life experiences rather than on the accuracy of his or her recall” (p. 142). In order for me to initiate and build such a trusting and open relationship, I asked each participant to have an informal meeting with me prior to recorded interviews. During the first meeting, I shared my interests of study, as well as my background. In the hope that I could support the participants to recall their experiences, I also familiarized myself with social context of the 1960s-1970s, by reading books and memoirs, and reviewing education policies during the period. However, I tried to be sincere and honest that I was in the process of learning about the movements and the specific time period, and their stories would help me understand more deeply the specific era. During the interview, I also made it clear that participants should focus on the meaning, rather than

on the accuracy, of their life experiences. That is; it is not necessary for them to be able to recollect exact dates or names, but rather give attention to their understanding and responses to the events.

I collected a total of approximately 30 hours of recording, two to four hours per teacher. The recorded interview data was indexed and coded (see Appendix B), in order to identify the places for the transcription for further analyses. I also took field notes on our research relationship as a second source of data. The third source of data is comprised of documents such as writings, artifacts, and pictures which helped me to produce a thick description of our experience. These data were collected in the process of conducting the interviews. All data contributed toward my construction of participants' life histories.

Analysis of Data

I understand there are different ways to analyze narratives. Scholars, such as Labov and Polanyi, developed methods in order to analyze contents of narratives using evaluation devices. Others, such as Wortham, suggest examining and analyzing narrative data for interactional positioning. Qualitative data in their oral form are a product of the interaction between participant and researcher (Polkinghorne, 2005). Narratives serve not only as recollections of participants' experiences, but also as self-construction of narrators (Wortham, 2000). The participants as narrators, and the researcher, as a listener, engage in interactional positioning at the time of narrating. Therefore I decided to have two complementary stages of analysis. First, I did a content analysis of themes relevant to the period of interests, and then secondly, I did an analysis of how the participants and I constructed the narratives about this period. Throughout the analytical processes, I

searched not only for common patterns and themes in the content, but also for issues that represent the participants' particularities in order to address my research questions: What did teachers experience at the time of global social movements in the 1960s-1970s? How did social movements in the 1960s-1970s influence their teaching practices? I explain the two procedures in more detail below.

Chapter V presents the first part of the analysis. I first identified the themes, and then, in order to contextualize narratives in society and comprehend participants' narratives more deeply, I built a connection to related education policies as well as social issues in the 1960-1970s. I follow Hughes' suggestion that, "The more complete the narratives and stories, the better they are contextualized and allow more possibilities for a deeper understanding of themes." Thus all interviews are reviewed and woven into the data analysis, which provides a context for teacher-narratives and helps reveal conflict of interests among the participants. The documents I gathered relate to education policies, social issues and movements found in the archives of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT), records of the Japan Teachers' Union as well as *Historiography in Post war Japanese Education (戦後教育史料集成)* Volumes One through Twelve. The policies include: **Gakushu Shido Yoryo** (curriculum guidelines 学習指導要領), **Kyokasho Kentei** (textbook screening 教科書検定), **Kinpyo** (teacher evaluation 勤務評定), **Koko Zennyu Undo** (universal secondary education 高校全入運動), and **Gakuryoku Test** (student assessment testing 学力テスト). Social issues include: **Anpo** (Japan-US Security Treaty 日米安全保障条約), **Okinawa Henkan** (Reversion of Okinawa 沖縄返還), **Kogai Sosho** (Pollution Litigation 公害訴訟),

Buraku Kaiho (Emancipation of Burakumin 部落解放) etc. The analysis of these documents was used to connect the society at large to the teachers' relationships and their lives in this study.

Chapter VI presents the analysis using the interactional positioning theory. Because of my interest in language and culture, and how culture is constructed through use of language, I examined the interview data by using Wortham's representational and interactional theories of narrative self-construction. This second level of analysis allowed me to find out how participants construct self-identities during the moment-by-moment experience of the interview. Wortham lists five types of cues that can be used to interpret interactional positioning: choice of words and expressions to denote narrators' characters, choice of verbs to describe the past event of speaking, quoted speech, evaluative indexicals, and epistemic modalization. Wortham argues that narrators' positions narrated and enacted are parallel. Narrators act out in telling their stories the self-identities that are described in the narratives. By analyzing interactional positioning, their experiences as well as their values and cultures can be understood more deeply. This is one of the ways for me, a researcher, to share the past experience of participants in the present time.

CHAPTER V

STORIES OF TEACHERS FROM THE 1960S: IN RESPONSE TO INTERVIEWS

In this chapter, I present a narrative reconstruction of 1960s as experienced by the participating teachers. In all the interviews, I started with asking participants to share their memorable moments of life/teaching during 1960s. Even though I had a set of guiding questions that I intended to ask each teacher, the interactional patterns of an unstructured interview were maintained as I encouraged participants to share their stories as they remembered them. The teachers' responses to my general question about memorable moments and this particular time frame allowed me to analyze their narratives as a reconstruction of the social and educational issues during the decades, through professional and individual struggles of teachers.

After the interviews, I created charts for all the participants (see Appendix B for an example) with brief descriptions of the contents, which were used for coding. Initial coding was decided based on the issues that teachers narrated. The coding included themes; Japan-US Security Treaty, struggle, teacher evaluation, standardized testing, textbook issue, national guideline, social movements, self-selected materials, etc. Through the process of analyzing the open coding, major themes arose, which produced three parts in this chapter: Characterization of 1960s, Educational issues in 1960s, and Multiculturalism in 1960s. Characterization of 1960s contains four subsections: building up momentum, Dynamism, Rapid Change in Society, and Confusion. This section describes how each of these teachers understood the society during the decade. Educational issues in 1960s consist of three subsections: Meritocracy, Authorized Textbook and Self-selected Materials, and Teacher Evaluation, National Guideline and

Teacher Resistances. This section presents various practices of teacher resistances against the control of education by dominant forces. And finally, multiculturalism in 1960s is comprised of narratives of teachers, who attempted to embrace diversity in their classrooms. This section will reveal the multicultural nature of Japanese classroom in 1960s, even before the multiculturalism became a formally acknowledged educational issue in 1980s.

Characterization of the 1960s

“The 1960’s was an age of convulsions,” Kiso recalled (interview on June 5th, 2008). Indeed, waves of upraise and revolution of people global-wide surged through Japan. People rose to protest against Japan-US security treaty, mine workers at Mitsui and Miike fought against the restructuring of the labor forces, women spoke up against gender discrimination, Zainici raised voices against discriminatory immigration law, etc. When reflecting the decade, the **Anpo** (Japan-US Security Treaty, 日米安全保障条約) Struggle of 1960 is perhaps the first thing comes to minds of many people. Indeed, memoirs of the 60s often started with the **Anpo** Struggle in 1960 (Kawakami & Okubo, 2007; Mikami, 2000; Suga, 2006), which was a massive people’s movement.

Experiencing the rises of people’s movements, teachers in this study revealed how the **Anpo** Struggle during the 1960s was significant in their collective memory. The frequently used tropes by the teachers includes *“lively” “free,” “creative,”* and *“organizing movements”*

“It was all over the media. There were buses organized from S city to go to Tokyo and we took turns to go to the Diet to demonstrate” (Miya, interview, June 24th, 2008). *“My children were playing shouting ‘Anpo! Anpo!’ mimicking the demonstration”*

(Iwata, interview, July 8th, 2008). *“I canceled my class and went to **Anpo** demonstration and I didn’t know at that time but my students followed me. Only two cases like that in entire prefecture”* (Anou, interview, June 3rd, 2008). *“Students organized a march and I went to see it to support them”* (Shitomo, interview, February 23rd, 2008). *“It was a big thing, nothing compared to the current struggle on social security, for we are fighting against the US, the big boss”* (Nakamura, interview, June 3rd, 2008). While organizing an **Anpo** demonstration, *“even in the areas where labor unions were weak, there was coalition among unions, for the first time”* (Maeda, interview, July 31st, 2008). These teachers lived and taught in rural villages and towns, where people’s main livelihoods were farming and fishing, in southern part of Japan, very far removed from urban life in Tokyo. This, itself, shows how the movements or “the sound of freedom” (Harman, 2008) reached teachers, parents, and children in every corner of Japan.

Building Up the Momentum

In their late twenties to thirties at the time, however, teachers seemed to understand the situation from a sociohistorical perspective: the stage for these vast movements resulted from a continuation of the struggles from the previous decade. Miya emphasized, *“The 60’s **Anpo** was prolonged struggle people had been fighting throughout the 1950s”* (interview, June 24th, 2008). Shitomo recollected his struggle, along with the Japan Teachers Union (JTU), in the 1950s regarding the issue of Treaty of San Francisco. *“JTU, along with Labor Unions, demanded an overall peace treaty, while the government sought separate treaties”* (interview, February 23rd, 2008). The turmoil of World War II and the Occupation by the US was still vividly present in people’s collective memories. Maeda recalled the thread of rearmament in 1950s, *“With*

the new Constitution of 1946, which renounces all forms of wars, we thought Japan would never go to war again. But as the Korean War started and National Police Reserve was established in 1950, we were already facing the threat of war again” (interview, July 31st, 2008). In the 1950s, a little more than five years since the end of WWII, teachers realized that they were already facing the distraction of “*freedom, democracy, and peace*” that they, together with students, were trying to build (Anou, interview on June 3rd, 2008). *The government always had sought ways to increase control over society* (Miya, interview, June 24th, 2008) in order to compete and take as much advantage as possible in global society.

As education policies were revised in order to increase the control of people’s lives, in order to rearm Japan (see more for Chapter III), teachers’ resistances were provoked. Some of the educational issues teachers faced in 1960s, such as **Kinpyo** (Teacher Evaluation 勤務評定) and **Shido Yoryo** (National Curriculum Guidelines 学習指導要領) had already taken place in the 1950s. Responding to such governmental control, teachers started to organize education movements, such as **Kinpyo** struggle and **Jishu Hensei** (self-selected curriculum 自主編成) movements. Kushida brought up the teachers’ movements against the rearmament of Japan: “*JTU launched on a campaign against re-armament of Japan and started **Kyoken** (National Meeting for Studies on Teaching 教育研究全国集会) to protect post-war peace and democratic education in 1951. About that time, there was also a group of teachers who made efforts to revitalize and strengthen the **Minkyoren** (a people’s education movement 民間教育運動), which had been existed before the War.” All these movements became the foundations for the **Anpo** struggle of 1960. Kiso remembered, “*Because of **Kinpyo** struggle which started in**

late 1950s, teachers were already organized and had a foundation for fighting to support the Anpo struggle. That is why, we were very quickly able to respond and protest in such a massive ways.”

These teachers urge us to understand people’s movements in a historical context, that the 1960s upraise in Japan did not “just happen” because of events occurring throughout the world, but there were specific reasons and important negotiations of relationships happening at local level.

Dynamism: Coalition and Separation

Indeed, 1960s was full of energy of social movements, as Maeda putted, *“I felt very lively and free in the school and classrooms. The curriculum had been nationalized but there was not any legal restriction, so we were able to teach as freely”* (interview, July 31st, 2008). Through social struggles, teachers built relationships in wider society and formed broad coalitions. *“I saw my students’ parents at the May Day demonstration and then we were able to make a connection as workers.”* (Kiso, interview, May 19th, 2008). *“Many local labor unions, such as Teachers’ union, Postal workers’ union, or municipal workers’ union, organized together for an Anpo demonstration.”* (Miya, interview, Jun 24th, 2008). *“We always had banners of “Return of Okinawa” and “Anti Vietnam War” when we were demonstrating for the teacher’s union”* (Kiso, interview, June 11th, 2008).

“As I mentioned before, teachers cannot just teach in the classroom, when you truly face children. Teachers must take care of the community. That realization made our education movement expand. So what is the community? When you take a look at a child, it is not only one child in a classroom, but a group of children. That is a community first of all. Then, each child has his/her own family background, so teachers need to know their family situation in order to teach them. So we look at families. Then you find out the situation of each family, like economic situation or parents hope for education. Teachers wanted to

respond to those situations. So we thought it is important to look at the community, not only the classroom, but also the village, and its social political and economical condition. Our movement gradually grew and our presence became visible.” (Kiso, interview, June 11th, 2008)

Through social movements, teachers approached community in order to make allies. It enhanced their relationship with parents.

“Both parents and teachers, as well as people in the community took education seriously. When teachers raised issues at school, parents responded and when parents came up with an issue of their living situation, teachers took it seriously. Parents and teachers together discussed how we want to raise our children. It was not only in my district but I think there were many such districts. It wasn’t like ‘they can do it because they are there,’ but each community thought for themselves, what we should regard as most important.” (Tado, interview, June 27th, 2008)

These alliances, not only strengthened the major social movements, such as **Anpo** Struggle, but also enhanced struggles that people were fighting in every corner of society.

In our union meetings, we discussed various social issues. We had reports of struggles nation-wide from our Tokyo headquarters. We also discussed our local issues, too. In Y-city, there was a very bad pollution problem. Some of us heard about a very dire situation, that people were suffering from asthma. We talked about it, and learned about it by interviewing people and inviting local people to our meetings. We also had children gargle at school, but when we visited their homes, we found that elders were suffering even more, suffering asthma attacks at night, getting a doctor in the middle of night, and going to the emergency room and so on. Some of the situations were so severe that we thought “this is not acceptable” and we acted on the issue. Of course, it was difficult to organize a movement to involve teachers in the entire prefecture. But, teachers in Y-city, facing children’s everyday situation like that, smelling sulfur dioxide on the train, hearing stories of black dots on laundries, we had to raise our voice. (Kiso, interview, June 11th, 2008)

Teachers decided to act in solidarity with their community, which strengthened the people’s resistance to heavy-industrial companies.

On the other hand, internal struggles among teachers were evident as well in the interviews. Teachers experienced the division among teachers, which weakened teachers’ movements. The dividing forces came from multiple levels. One of them was driven, of

course, by those who are in power to control individual teachers. Kushida was an active member of **Minkyoren** group, which organized study groups to discuss curriculum issues as well as education movements in order to realize democratic education. When he decided to run for the position as chairperson of the local union, he faced interference from the administration.

*It was the time when JTU was preparing for the 10.21 strike. At the national assembly of JTU, the strike was already proposed, so everyone knew that it was coming. We also had started to talk about it in our local meetings. **Kochokai**, (Principal' association 校長会) became very concerned about my candidacy saying "if he becomes the chairperson, he will make the union focus on strikes and this will destroy education in the area." And they openly supported a rival candidate and confrontation became open. In a small chapter like us, it was really rare case. (Kushida, interview, July 29th 2008).*

The union was divided and became a place for confrontation among teachers. *"I succeeded for the first time to be elected as the chairperson supported by **Minkyoren** members, but the second time around, I was burnt out because of fierce opposition and interference from the administration"* (Kushida, interview, July 29th 2008).

Another dividing force, however, was internal. The division between Socialist and Communist Parties was reflected in the leadership of the Teacher's Union. JTU decided to take a position to support the Socialist Party, and started to exclude the supporters of the Communist Party from leadership positions.

Many members of the Teachers Union in Osaka and Kyoto belong to the Communist Party, so they are strong in ideological struggles. But we were not. It was more of union struggles. Such an anti-Communist sentiment! Communist teachers were under attacks. The conflict between Communist members and non-communist members was so fierce among teachers. Now because of that, all the communist teachers were excluded from the leading position in the Union. So there is no way to have a say in anything. You know, each chapter made sure to exclude a sympathizer of the Communist Party from becoming a member of the executive committee (Nakamura, interview, June 3rd, 2008)

It really started in 1949, when there was a strict red purge of teachers' community, as instructed by the GHQ. So the union was completely disfunctionalized and in the process of re-building the union, anti-communist feeling was very much strengthened. Then JTU decided that it would support the Socialist Party and required all teachers to become involved in election campaigns. If you were against it, you were excluded. This was around late 60s. (Maeda, interview, July 31st, 2008)

As a result of internal division, Shitomo found himself alienated from any coalition. *"I thought division is not good. We need to fight in solidarity. But I was not able to persuade both sides and I was isolated from both"* (Shitomo, interview, March 15th, 2008).

Teachers' narratives reveal the complexity of their struggle. While teachers were able to build coalitions with other people's movements, they faced division at home, amongst colleagues in each school and in each local union. These teachers, who struggled in the forefront of people's movements, felt a sense of both uplift and defeat hand-in-hand, for conflicts were not only against dominant oppressive forces but also power struggles within their organizations. While they were successfully making "connection" with parents and involving "community," "divisions" were created and those without administration support were "excluded" and therefore "isolated."

Rapid Change in Society

1960s was the time when *"living conditions of people changed greatly"* (Miya, interview, June 24th, 2008). As mentioned in Chapter III, the focus of **Anpo** (Japan-US Security Treaty) was not only the military partnership. Behind the "security" discussion, economic interests laid. **Anpo** of the 1960s encompassed economic collaboration between Japan and US (See more in Chapter III). The effects of the so-called "Japanese post-war economic miracle" were experienced in all aspects of people's lives.

Tado and his colleagues believed that the phrase of “economic collaboration” in **Anpo** changed the life style of people in their community for a great deal. As Japan and US collaborated economically, the amount of agricultural product imported from the US increased. In 1961, Japanese government put forth the Agricultural Basic Act, which advocated for large scale farming in order to compete with the price of imported agricultural products. This Act enhanced farm land reforms, resulting in small farmers being forced to give up their lands. Tado taught in a rural village and many of the households of students were small farmers. The environment surrounding students and their family was changing rapidly. In order to understand social conditions and respond to protect their lives and their education, teachers, along with farmers/parents started “Farmers’ School” where they studied about the Agricultural Basic Act, agricultural product trade, the effect of mega farming technology, etc. by inviting specialists. Tado recalls this movement:

*The biggest change was brought by the 60’s **Anpo**. It shifted the production structure in Japan, from primary to secondary sector of the economy. It changed the agricultural system. The farmland reform enlarged the size of rice paddies so that bigger machines could be introduced. Also the industrial production grew tremendously. So small farmers began to think, “It is better to go work for a factory, rather than staying in farming. One can make more money that way.” Those who had larger land holdings were able to stay in agriculture, but most of the farmers around here, who only had a small bit of land, went to work at factories to make money to buy machines. If you have machines, the farming work could be shortened. Then with that extra time, you can go back to work at factories. So the farming became a side job. They could make more money working in a factory than from working in agriculture. That changed many farmers’ mind. Those farmers were parents of my students. So, it meant that parents’ expectations were changing. It became apparent especially from mid-60s to 70s. “You can’t survive by farming, we will give up farming with our generation. We want our children to study hard, go to a good school, and get a good paying job.” This was what the majority of parents thought. If the parents think that way, children become uninterested in their parents’ work. So even though they grew up in an agricultural area, they didn’t know the difference between rice and wheat. So teachers who were interested in the issue discussed*

the situation and started what we called a “Farmers’ School.” It was around 1965. There, teachers brought up educational issues in school, and parents brought in the reality of children’s lives and questioned the education. It was a place where parents and teachers discussed their children’ education, not about the philosophy, but how to raise children responding to the social situation at the time. We called it “Education in Inabe’s soil. (Tado, interview, June 27th, 2008)

Kiso, on the other hand, taught in a heavily industrial district. The 1960s was the time when Japanese heavy industry developed rapidly. Kiso recalls the changes in his community when he fought against the “destruction in disguise of development.”

First, history teachers focused on protecting historical objects, especially, ancient tombs and artifacts varied in the community. Those artifacts were being excavated because of the “development” of the area. But for us, it was destruction of the artifacts. They would excavate an ancient tomb and destroy it to make a road over it. Or where there was an ancient resident ruin, it was developed into a housing complex. That means the historical heritage of people is destroyed. That is not acceptable. There is the Act on Protection of Cultural Properties, so using the Act, we filed a charge against the governor of the prefecture, it was Governor Tanaka at that time, and we sued the Governor. I was one of the plaintiffs. Well, now looking back at that, we didn't succeed, our tactics were not good enough, but it was a beginning of our struggle. Then from protecting our historical heritage, gradually, we got to the anti-pollution struggle. Pollution. Development of a town is not about building factories, not about the increase in population. This is not development. The population of Y city increased and there were neon signs glittering at night, looking like an urban city. It became the largest city in the prefecture. But people who lived there, children were suffering from pollution. There were children who died from pollution sickness, whose parents committed suicide, or whose parents lost their livelihood, which was fishing. Then it does not mean the city was developed. So we organized the struggle against pollution. It was also around the 1960s. (Kiso, interview, June 11th, 2008)

As people faced the structural changes in society, they had to find ways of survival. Teachers, facing children everyday at schools, also needed to respond to shifting needs of children and parents. These teachers, not only reacted to the rapid change of society, but also took initiatives to understand the social condition and acted against capitalist exploitation as members of community.

Confusion

While the average person experienced a massive raise of the people's movement and heard a "sound of freedom," they also faced oppressive social system because of the influences of capitalism. Tado reflected on "confusion" that he observed among children. On one hand, students saw social movements demanding equality among people. On the other, they were forced to take the standardized tests and entrance exams, which would stratify them in to different social classes which served the interest of cooperation. They were keen to the gap between the reality of their lives and what "democracy" movements demanded. Tado gave one example of many, which he, as a teacher, attempted to respond to the students' confusion.

From mid 1960s to 1970s, junior highs nation wide, especially those with Dowa (outcast) Districts, faced lots of violence of children. It was because, even though it was called the era of "post-war democracy," discrimination was never resolved, not even changed a bit. It was the time when people in the area started the movement for anti-discrimination. There were different reaction of people about the movement, some people became politically aware, and some thought it was a negative thing. So children were confused and the confusion was reflected in the school, as violence or problem. There were so many troubles at schools.

For example, when I go to my class, there are two or three students missing, students from Dowa area. "Where are they? Are they absent?" "No, they were here, somewhere in the school." "Well then, we have to find them. "Teacher, usually, they are smoking in the attic." Other students would tell me. The school building had the rooftop and they were smoking there. So I went there, told them "Hey, (the building) will catch on fire. Dangerous!" and brought them down. But they would not come to classes. So I would visit their houses at night after school, meeting with their parents and telling them to come to school. But a father told me, smoking, "Well, even my daughter or son went to school, they don't understand and they are troublesome for you. It's better they didn't attend." In short, they didn't trust schools. It is not because the parent is wicked, but it is the school that is making him to act in that way. School is the problem, I came to realize after talking to several parents. I talked with them and told them "Come to school tomorrow" but they didn't come. I went to their homes whenever I had spare time. They hid in the crawl spaces under the floor when they heard my steps. But, it was funny, they sneezed, because they were hiding among the spider webs. "Oh, they are under the floor. Bring them up. Let's go together" and I would bring them to school. That was what teachers at the Dowa schools did, in

the mid 1960s to 1970s. That was the way. So we talked to them. Then they would come to school for two or three days, but again they would stop coming. So I went back again to their houses and talked. One of the students told me, "Teacher, you came all the way to get me, but it is no use." "Why?" "Well, I don't understand, I am just sitting there and teachers are just talking about what I don't understand. There is no use to just sit there to listen and not understand." I thought what he was saying is so right. So I took the issue to the teachers' meeting, I told everyone about what we had been discussing. It is good for us to go to their homes and bring them, but even if they came, well, even for those students who are there everyday, learning is difficult, so of course they don't understand what is going on. So we have to change how we teach so that even those students could understand. We discussed among teachers. It was truly so, that we didn't think about that. We go to their homes to bring them but it is so superficial, we haven't done really anything to meet their needs. We have to teach so that they understand. Just teaching in classrooms were not enough. We asked parents in Dowa area for cooperation to start a night school. Teachers took turn, everyday would be too much for us, so two or three times a week, we went to the Settlement building to teach. That's how we started to teach there and we continued to do so for a long time. That's what we did. Students learned and changed, and also teachers changed, too. Teachers started to look at the students, not as children from Dowa area, but as precious children of our school. It enabled us to talk to children from their perspective, and then they gradually started to come to school. At first, they came to school, but they still went to the rooftop to smoke or did some mischief in the bathroom or so, but gradually that became less and less frequent. One of the students, then, had an issue with other students. Even when he started to come to school, other students would not talk to him, because, they didn't know how to interact, they were afraid that they might make him angry or he might beat them up. So other students ignored him. Then he was frustrated "Others are avoiding me, why are they afraid of me?" So I had a classroom discussion and asked him to share his frustration. He said, "Because you, teacher, came and told me, I started to come to school, but others think bad of me and ignore me." Then other students in the class realized "well, that's true what he said." So gradually, after talking, entire class started to change and everyone calmed down and was able to focus on studying. (Tado, interview, June 27th, 2008)

Students, as well as Tado, understood opposing discourses of globalization: people's uprising and oppressive global capitalist forces. People demanding equality and equal opportunity of education, however, at schools, they were made to fail. This is just one example of how students responded in their own way to deal with their situation, while Tado, as a teacher, tried to oppose an oppressive system by working with students.

Schools can be sites for addressing inequities when teachers work with families, students and communities to identify the issues that oppress them.

Summary

1960s was in deed the age of “*convulsions*” with coalition, division, change and confusion. It was certainly the time when people’s efforts from a previous decade built momentum for a later people’s movement and reached new levels of social transformation. It was also the time when people were inspired by the momentum. Society was changing greatly and rapidly, and people were very keen to the change as well as confused. Even so, each teacher experienced challenges in their particular struggles. Perhaps, it was not the “good old days” that teachers felt “*lively and free,*” but it was themselves who acted against oppressions, which enabled them to remember themselves in the past as “*lively and free.*”

Educational Issues in the 1960s: Regulation and Resistance

Now I would like to turn my focus to educational issues and how the teachers understood and resisted domination. Many policies were implemented to control teachers, how they taught, what they taught, who they taught, as well as how they assess the achievement by the Ministry of Education and its enforcement branch, the local Boards of Education. These governmental policies conflicted with teachers' belief for democracy, freedom, and peace, as well as the reality of students. Hence, teachers resisted systematic control of the Ministry of Education such as top-down decision-making, and struggled against national guidelines for teaching, against standardized testing, and against the national curricula, etc. Sometimes, their tactics of struggles were not quickly supported by their colleagues (Maeda, interview, July 31st, 2008) or by the community (Iwata, interview, June 6th, 2008), but collaborations were gradually built and their struggles were fought in solidarity with colleagues, parents, and community. For teachers in this study, their lives as teachers were constant struggle, ideologically as well as in his/her daily practices. Every aspect of their school life was a significant part of this struggle. I gathered many of their stories about movements in their schools, communities and the nation at large. Here, I will present narratives of teachers that tell us how they faced, understood, and opposed many attempts of control by authorities.

Meritocracy: Control of Assessment

As the economic structure of the Japanese society shifted, from primary to secondary sector of economy, needs for education also changed. People faced the reality of needing education in order to obtain jobs in newly developed industry section. *"Parents wished to send their children to higher education"* (Tado, interview, June 27th).

The new expectations for education eventually led to **Koko Zenny Undo** (the universal secondary education movement 高校全入運動), and in 1959, JTU had decided to take an action, responding to especially mothers' voices. This movement was joined not only by **Hahaoya Taikai** (the Mothers Association 母親大会連絡会), but also by the labor unions as well as other people's organizations. This movement started to grow larger and in 1962, the committee for the universal secondary education was held supported by 12 organizations over 20 prefectures including JTU, **Sohyo** (the General Council of Trade Unions of Japan 日本労働組合総評議会), **Hahaoya Taikai**, and **Nihon Nomin Kumiai** (Japan Farmers Union 日本農民組合). Their resolution was to provide high school education for all those who wish to pursue it and to build high schools funded by the national budget. The resolution emphasized three high school principles; small school district, co-education, and integrated education, in education reform in 1946 (Histology of Post War Japanese Education vol. 7, 1983 translated by the author). People had demanded universal secondary education, based on the constitution, which guaranteed these rights for education.

The government, however, denied people's demand based on the interpretation of the phrase in the Basic Act of Education "All people shall have the right to receive an equal education *correspondent to their ability* (italicized by the author) as provided by law," justifying the entrance exam for each levels. According to the 1983 Histology of Post War Japanese Education vol. 7 (Sojinsha, 1983), there was also a demand from the economic sector supporting this issue. As Japan started successfully emerged into the global economy, the focus of education became efficiency and meritocracy. Education policy was focused on what is effective for economic development. In 1963, **Keizai**

Shingikai (Economic Council 経済審議会) put together a report with suggestion to “reinforce the meritocracy in education as well as in the society, where people will be educated and trained according to their merit and obtain a job that is suitable for their ability.” Moreover, the Minister of Education Araki criticized JTU for politicizing “parents’ sincere wish” and merely using the issue as recruiting people for their political interests (Histology of Post War Japanese Education vol. 7, 1983, translated by the author).

The government denial of parents’ demand quickly intensified the competition for college entrance exam known as **Juken Senso** (Exam War 受験戦争). Miya taught in a rural fishing area, where the area was developed rapidly as a resort place by the tourist industry. Miya remembers the affect of this shift to exam heavy society on students.

I don't exactly remember when, but more and more students started to go to I-city from S-town for high schools. All the way. In the old days, it was only the ones from rich families, because they had to arrange a boarding house. But in ten years or so, since I started to teach, more and more students have started to go out to I-city for their education. Then school bus, they made... school bus to take students from the every corner of S-town to I-city, to newly established Y-Commercial School and I-high school, or Y-high school. In the evening, the bus will return to S-town, leaving I-city around five o'clock. I think it was maybe in late 1960s to 1970s. Then what changed was the students mind. They started to feel inferiority. Their friends who went to the junior high together, maybe they received good grades, but they used to play together, now they are going to I-city in the morning, saying “good bye.” So they felt something was wrong. There were some students who said “there is nobody who would become the students representative in S-high school. Those kind of people all go to I-city” like that. Quite a few students said that. So I told them, “That’s not it.” I felt we have to practice education, which will value each and every student. It may be something you guys from the city have never experienced, but it was like that. Including those issues, we discussed often in our study groups. (Miya, interview, July 1st, 2008)

Along side, the push for the standardized test came. It was to ensure the efficiency of education: find “highly-talented” students as early as possible and educate

them effectively, in order to secure the man power necessary for the age of new technology, and stratify students into elite and non elite. Even more, it was important to educate those non-elite as a docile labor (Histology of Post War Japanese Education vol. 8. p10). JIU launched nation-wide **Gakute** (Achievement Test, 学力テスト) struggle. Teachers in this study also resisted use of standardized testing as well as contested their role in valuing the test. Ano, who taught in a high school oriented toward preparation for college exams, remembers feeling of resentment against standardized testing and how it created competition among students, teachers, and schools.

I think schools have to be enjoyable place, but (now there is) too much focus on examination and scores. When I was young, there were achievement tests, we opposed fiercely. The testing created stupid issues, like teachers cheating, by telling students in advance what will be in the test. (Ano, interview, June 3rd, 2008).

Miya, being aware of the meritocratic nature of standardized tests, remembered that he and his colleagues used assessment as a tool to understand the needs of students in order to improve their teaching methods, rather than “efficiency.”

For example, standardized testing by the Ministry of Education. That is to divide a few percent of elite and others. Those few elite, who would become leaders of Japanese society, and others who are just the masses. That was the purpose of the standardized testing. Of course, we were against it. JIU used to say, “a good union member is a good teacher” which means that union members are not only to oppose the authority, but “practice good teaching” that is we teach students necessarily skills to live in society, not to educate a few elite, but to educate children to become good citizens...

There were wide gaps in individual students’ basic understanding and skills, especially in math. So during the first year of high school, we arranged smaller classes for lower level students. Each semester, or maybe mid-semester, I don't quite remember, but we rearranged the class based on exam results. It also affected how we teachers prepared for the class. Some students, who were placed in an upper-level class, requested, that “I got lucky for the exam, but really I am not this level. Please let me be in the lower class” like that. But I don't remember any students from lower class being upset and requesting to go to upper level. Rather, those students who were placed in lower class tried hard to understand

the basics of math. Well, otherwise, there is no point to have ability-based class. I don't know if any school does such placement now. Even if they have the ability-based classes, they do it for efficiency reason. But our case, it was not the efficiency, but it was to teach students, who were having trouble, to help them understand. (Miya, interview, July 1st, 2008)

Nakamura argued that standardized testing disadvantaged students in rural areas. He taught in a junior high school, in a very remote village, where students had no access to cram schools, yet had to take the same exam as students in the cities to enter high schools. He was critical about the implementation of standardized testing and entrance exam, at the same time; he offered extra tutoring for his students in order them to survive the exam heavy society.

Whenever I had free time, I offered extra tutoring sessions for high school exam, when I was teaching in the junior high. In the evening, around four or five o'clock, after the teachers meetings. So we started around four o'clock. Exam season is January-February-March, so it already started to get dark at four, day light time is short. So we were lucky that there were no accidents, staying late at school, after the dark. I told students "I have some time, so will give you extra lessons, if you want." Many students stayed and studied hard. We practiced the exam problems. That's what we did. So children in mountain area had less chance, poor things, unlike children in a city, where there are cram schools, that they can easily go to. So no matter how hard I tried, it was limited. In a sense, the national guidelines are unrealistically put together. Once you try it for yourself, you'll understand, but the committee members for the guidelines all live in cities, nobody is from schools in the mountain areas, but all are from exam schools in Tokyo. Those are the people who decide the guidelines. It is so unrealistic. For us, it was really nonsense, so I never followed it. (Nakamura, interview, July 3rd, 2008)

The issues each teacher faced are particular to their cases; however, teachers were aware of the effect, and even hidden agenda, of meritocracy. Teachers attempted to resist meritocratic thinking, which stratifies students based on their academic achievement, by teach all children to their best. Besides directly opposing the standardized testing, teachers carried out many strategies. Using self-selected materials or opposing national

guideline, which I will focus in next two sections, can be also understood as a part of this larger struggle.

Authorized Textbook and Self-selected Materials: Control of curriculum

While denying the universal secondary education for all children and pushing for standardized testing, government aligned with the **Kyokasho Mushou** (free textbook 教科書無償) movement. Article 26 of Japanese Constitution states:

All people shall have the right to receive an equal education correspondent to their ability, as provided by law. All people shall be obligated to have all boys and girls under their protection receive ordinary education as provided for by law. Such compulsory education shall be free.

The government argued against the universal secondary education, based on this article, that says people should receive education “correspondent to their ability” as mentioned above (Histology of Post War Japanese Education, vol 8). At the same time, the phrase “compulsory education shall be free” was used to provide textbooks for free. LDP, the ruling party, was very enthusiastic to bring this policy forward, Naito, the Minister of Education that time, recollected. The other side of this policy, which the government had in mind, however, was the nationalization of textbooks (Histology of Post War Japanese Education vol. 7, p.16). Any publisher may publish textbooks, however, all textbooks must be officially approved by the Ministry of Education according to the Basic Education Act of 1946. Using this opportunity, the government attempted to increase their control on textbooks.

In 1965, Ienaga, a historian, filed a law suite against the Ministry of Education for censoring textbook as violation of freedom of speech. Ienaga’s case is very prominent in the struggle against government control. While Ienaga was fighting against the

government officially, teachers in their classrooms also struggled against such censorship and control by developing the **Jishuhensei** (self-selected materials 自主編成) movements. Teachers formed study groups in their schools/areas to discuss teaching materials, innovate lesson plans, and so on. Kushida's narrative illustrates how he understood the **Jishuhensei** (sel-selected materials) movement as part of a larger struggle for peace and democracy.

***Jishuhensei**, I was already practicing it in National Language. As I've mentioned, in order to change what we teach, or what it means to educate children for democracy, or education for humanity, if we want to do that, we have to consider what we teach, which materials will teach children about democracy and humanity and chose them for ourselves. That was our movement. (Kushida, interview, July 29th, 2008)*

Jishuhensei movements were supported by various teachers and teacher-organizations, such as **Kyoken Shukai** (JTU's Meeting for Studies on Teaching 教育研究集) and **Kyokaken** (Scientific Teaching Association 教育科学研究会). Both **Kyoken Shukai** and **Kyokaken** provided opportunities for those teachers to share their ideas, and further develop their own curriculum at regional, and national level. **Jishuhensei** movements had been a practice of teachers for long time, even before the World War II. However, the advocacy for peace education became clearer with these nation-wide organizations. As union members, teachers in this study participated in **Kyoken** meetings. Kushida describes:

*Korean War and re-armament of Japan started. National Police Reserve was established which later became the Self Defense Force. Around that time, when re-armament discussion started, at the same time resistance movements also started in Japan. Historically speaking. Around that time, within JTU, there was a movement against Japan's re-armament, the movement already existed, but it became even stronger. That was when, I think it was 1954, **Kyoken** (the National Meeting for Studies on Teaching) started. I maybe wrong with the date, please check the date later. But, **Kyoken** was going on at local levels, but the National*

meeting was organized as a movement to promote peace education as well as the peace treaty, as JTU's peace movements. I think that was how it was started. (Kushida, interview, July 29th, 2008)

Miya also had experiences of participating in **Kyoken**. His narrative shows not only the variety within this movements, but also this even “peace movement” oriented, however, was very much based on their daily teaching.

I also participated in the National Meeting for Studies on Teaching. For example, at the high school teachers' union, we had local study meetings. Then our representative would go to the prefectural meeting to share our practice. Then the representative from the prefecture go to the national meetings. You can find documentation at the Union's office. Any way, we called it “Self-selected materials.” The subject matter, we organized our own teaching materials. The Ministry of Education puts out the guidelines. That is, the government guidelines. Aside from that, we created our own. I was teaching mathematics. There weren't many cram schools, unlike now, of course there were examinations, but it wasn't like now, especially at the S high school. Rather, we focused on the basic understanding of mathematics. There were many students who had difficulties, especially in mathematics, without basic understanding, it is hard. So I was focused on how to teach so that students would understand. Textbooks of that time were, not too many, but all focused on examinations, and there were students who had difficulties. So we formed classes according to their levels. So, we chose our own materials and shared it at the study meeting. We made our own textbook. It was a group of us, five of us, together, who did it together. Mathematic department. We got together once a month, it is just our case, but we gathered at our houses and discussed, wrote, brought it to a print shop and made a textbook. That was well received, maybe because not many people did it. So we were asked to be the representative to the national meeting. I didn't go but one teacher from our group went to Okinawa for the National meeting. (Miya, interview, July 1st, 2008)

Kyoken Shukai, as a movement, was strengthened by the involvement of parents as well.

This is another example of teacher-parents cooperation.

There was also a section where parents were involved. From our district, there was a representative from the PTA who participated at the National Meeting. Students weren't directly involved, but parents did. So we also worked with parents. “Cooperation with parents,” we said. Our focus was on democratization of education, we discussed how to make education which serves students. (Miya, interview, July 1st, 2008)

Kyokaken (Scientific Teaching Association), on the other hand, was a non-union group, which was a part of **Minkyoren** (People's Education Movement 民間教育運動).

Kyokaken, also revitalized by the re-armament issue, similar to union led **Kyoken**, was also an organization, which provided places for teachers to share their ideas.

*Yes, that's right, the Korean War started in 1950, and then the Anti-Subversive Activities Act was put force in 1952. That was when I was transferred to W-town. There, I met a friend who changed my life. That was Maeda. When I met him, he already knew a lot about social structures and Japan's position in the world. He was practicing **Tuzurikata** and that was his base for understanding children. He was also involved in education movements, "People's Education movements" called **Minkyoren**, maybe it was not called "People's Education" yet. Well, the movement had been in existence during the war and of course after the war. But among the organizations, Scientific Teaching Study Group (**Kyokaken**) was very active in critically analyzing pre-war education and seeking ways for post-war education. It was a very big organization, nationally, and I became a member of it, because of Maeda. Around that time, LDP was criticizing the post-war democratic education as politically biased education, and started to pressure JTU. So we felt that it was important to keep the movements and develop it, both **Minkyoren** as well as JTU. We discussed how we needed to carry out peace movements and democratic education movements. We discussed that in S area. There were only one or two teachers at one school, so we were weak, so we got together in the area. We started maybe five or six teachers, but expanded to 10, 20 and 30 teachers. But it was still very weak and not many teachers. (Kushida, interview on July 29th, 2008)*

Similar but two separate movements stimulated each other to enhance their movements.

Teachers' initiatives at local levels were strengthened by gaining opportunities to share with wider audience, at the same time, nation-wide organizations were supported by the local groups.

However, Kusida's narrative also revealed the complexity of **Jishuhensei** movements. These movements of course faced resistance from the government and the Ministry of Education, by creating yet another form of "study group." Kushida's story below shows how he tried to resist the textbook control and how authority tried to dismantle it by using the superintendents visits.

The Ministry of Education started **Kokugo Kenkyukai** (the National Language Teaching Study Group 国語研究会) as well. It was obligatory to participate. So we thought, since we have to do it, then we will change it and we suggested new materials. We brought in Matsutani Miyoko's "Girl Who Became Mute" and Niimi Nankichi's "Buying Some Gloves" and many other stories. We carefully picked one of those stories and discussed what that means, and suggested at the meetings. One time, my class was selected for peer observation for the study. I chose "Girl Who Became Mute" and it became an issue because it was not in the textbook. Principals' Association made complaints saying "Kushida is choosing his own material, not following the textbook, and his material is biased." It was a story about peasant whose daughter was taken by the officers because he couldn't pay the land tax. Well, I don't remember the details... in any case, the Board of Education complained first "he is not following the guideline, or textbook." They tried to stop me, or the peer observation. The principal told me "there are so many complaints. Why don't you change the material?" Because it was self-selected material. I had been using such materials. If it was a problem of the content, I would consider, but the content was fine, it was about importance of humanity, and I used it at my previous school. So I insisted. The board of education didn't have that much power yet, so I just did it. The superintendent even came to observe my class, never happened such things before. Well, children's response was good, so it didn't become a big issue, so the only criticism was about the material. (Kushida, interview, July 29th, 2008)

Kushida further pointed out the power struggle between Teachers' Union and **Minkyoren** group.

Union led **Kyoken** consisted many of **Minkyoren** groups. At first, the union observed and recognized us as one of moving forces for **Kyoken**. But gradually, political stance of union started to interfere our participation. The union started to exclude our groups from **Kyoken** meetings. (Kushida, interview, July 29th, 2008)

Teachers' effort to discuss and create their own curriculums, in order to meet different needs of children, was at the same time their resistance to the control of curriculum by authorities. As one of teachers' movements, however, teachers experienced coalition and division through **Jishuhensei** movement.

Teacher Evaluation, National Guideline and Teacher Resistances:

Control of pedagogy

Responding to my questions about what they remembered as the struggles they faced in the 1960s, most teachers identified the **Kinpyo** (Teacher Evaluation 勤務評定) struggle, which was one of the major struggles between JTU and the Ministry of Education.

In 1956 in Ehime Prefecture, the first attempt was made to carry out the **Kinpyo**: Board of Education, or principals under the guidance of the Board of Education, carry out annual evaluation of teachers in their schools. JTU regarded this “**Kinpyo**” policy as a part of Japan’s strategy for re-armament: to control education in order for Japan to re-establish its military power. Their understanding was clearly expressed in their slogan for the struggle; “Teacher evaluation is the first milestone towards wars.” (Histology of Post War Japanese Education, vol. 6, p8). Today, the struggle fought by the JTU may not be considered necessarily “successful.” There was a division among union members, on the issue of political parties alliance, as well as the tactics of struggle, which JTU decided to “emasculate” the rating, instead to “oppose” it. JTU assesses the **Kinpyo** struggle as: “Even though it created a division among union members in Ehime, as a whole, it transformed the JTU from just an educators group to an educational workers group and strengthened its organization (20 years History of JTU).”

Started in Ehime prefecture in 1956, however, **Kinpyo** was gradually expanded to entire Japan, and to this day the struggle continues. How teachers in this study experienced the **Kinpyo** reflects the JTU’s understanding. At the same time, teachers’

stories not merely confirm JTU's grand narrative, but also reveal fierce conflicts of interests among teachers, as well as the community.

Quality education is, off course, important. Teachers who opposed **Kinpyo** did not oppose the improvements of education. These teachers were at the same time active in **Kyoken** and **Minkyoren** movements, in order to improve their teaching. However, as Kiso narrated, teachers questioned the methods of evaluation, which as a result created the division, not collaboration, in schools.

*It was a little bit before 1960. Around that time, teachers, including myself, asked "What is education?" Education, I think, is something that children have high expectations about, but at the same time it is failing children's hope, unless we take it seriously. That means, teachers have a great responsibility. I think education is not about "teaching/transmitting knowledge," but "telling children the truth." The truth will empower children to live strongly in the society. Transmitting knowledge is just like watching a drama, but nothing more. Telling truth will make them strong. If you think of education as such, then how can a principal or a head of the Board of Education possibly assess the efficiency? It is not that simple. If there were anyone to assess, that must be a child. And children may not be able to assess it on that spot. For example, a teacher may scold a child. That child may feel upset on the spot and may hate the teacher. But in due course, he or she may come to realize the intention of the teacher and may thank the teacher for scolding. That is the evaluation of education. So evaluating our education in the manner of **Kinpyo** will distort the education. That is why we must not allow **Kinpyo**. That was our opinion among teachers in our school. So we visited the head of the local Board of Education to discuss this. He is just a country type of person. When we went there, he was very troubled. "It's pointless even if you came all the way to tell me your highly educated opinion." "But you are the one who will be assessing us, so..." "I got it. So, please just have a drink." We were merely trying to get him to discuss. But in that process, we, teachers, became more aware. That is how **Kinpyo** had effects on teachers and on community. It was really a fierce conflict. I was teaching in Y-city back then, but the head of the Board of Education was really torn between. "I understand what teachers are saying, but I must follow the instruction by the Ministry of Education. What should I do?" and he finally committed suicide. This was very big news nation wide. It was very shocking. (Kiso, interview, June 5th, 2008)*

According to Kiso, on top of putting the local board of education in the middle, at the same time, it enhanced dividing teachers in a school.

*Then I was transferred to a school in T-city. In T-city, **Kinpyo** was done by the principals. That caused conflicts between teachers and principals. By conflict, I mean not just fighting with each other, but making a division between people who assess and people who are assessed. So in school, we had to confront this. At one point, we did **Mugon Toso** (Silent Demonstration 無言闘争). It was terrible. When the principal talk to you, you don't say anything, in order to make a trouble for the principal. For example, when he said "Good morning" or "Will you do this?" we don't reply. That was a tactic that the Union decided on, but in short, it created division among us. It was the first time, I think, things like that happned. But in order to control teachers, **Kinpyo** is very effective. In another words, if you don't follow what the principal says, you get low scores. So when you disagree with the principal, you can no longer say, "I'm doing what I think is right." That was the purpose of **Kinpyo**. So until that time, both the principal and teachers were colleagues working together in a school. But **Kinpyo** divided us, on the one hand, the principal who assessed, and on the other hand, teachers who will be assessed. Some said it is good to keep order in schools and some said it will hinder the education. So **Kinpyo** created an intense debate in the field of education, as well as in the Diet. From the union point of view, it was dividing members/teachers, and that was not good in terms of struggle. So JTU fought against it. (Kiso, interview, June 5th, 2008)*

Even though it appears that Union teachers were in unification to fight against the **Kinpyo**, it also created a division amongst them.

*It was right before 1960, I think it was 1959. There was a **Kinpyo** Struggle. The Head quarter of the Teachers Union in the prefecture took it just as an anti-union policy, that it is to gain control over the teachers. I think that was their mere understanding. They said it was attack on education, but in reality, they just thought it as an attack on the Union. But there was a group of teachers, involved in **Minkyoren** (People's Education) movement, who challenged that view and really practiced the peace education, especially in Inabe and Kihoku areas were successful. Their Teachers' Union said, **Kinpyo** is not good, it is a milestone to wars, it will destroy peace education, so they instructed us to resist **Kinpyo**. But their understanding of it was at best ideological or at the level of a theme. In real practice, I doubt how much they really understood. That is because; the tactics they took were to make every teacher's rating a B, and to delay the date of submission (to the board of education). As a tactic, I understand we have to be creative, but what does it really mean to have it done one day late or a week late. It can be used as one tool to evaluate our movement, but it cannot be the goal of it. We have to keep asking why it is important to delay, why do they want to evaluate us, why does everyone get a B. But in the union struggle, getting a B or preventing the principal from submitting them for one day became the focus, as if it were a goal. They didn't go beyond to ask, why they want to evaluate us, what aspect of our education, democratic education and peace education, have been put on the table for assessment. In order to really understand what was*

happening, we needed to ask those kinds of questions. But the teachers' union in this prefecture did not question that far. Discussions on the content of textbook, whether it really reinforces the peace education or democratic education, were rarely heard in the union. While on the other hand, those teachers involved in Teachers Study Group have already have started to discuss, carry out in our daily teaching and learn from each other. (Kushida, interview, July 29th, 2008)

While Kushida brought up the clear conflict of interest between the union and **Minkyoren**, Nakamura's narrative reveals internal conflict of himself by questioning the tactics of the Union. Nakamura fought along with the Union against **Kinpyo**.

The Principal alone evaluating me is not right, I thought. What are the criteria? There are many categories, but which part of our activity does he see? I don't know how he did it, but everybody got B. But I am nor sure if it was a good idea to make it all B. There are some teachers trying hard, They may not have said it, in their mind, wanting to receive A. Making them receive B seemed like trampling them down. I am not sure, to this day, if "all B" tactic was a good thing or not. I am still stuck with that feeling. (Nakamura, interview, June 3rd, 2008)

Iwata, as a vice principal, experienced the struggle in her own way. Her belief that all children are entitled to a quality education inspired her to go around the classroom to see how each teacher was teaching. Since **Kinpyo** was done by the principal, she was not in a position to evaluate teachers and her evaluations of teachers were not sent to the Board of Education. She took memos about where she thought individual teachers could improve and distributed the memo to each teacher. It met with resistance from teachers.

***Kinpyo** is to control teachers. The principal is the one who checks, not the vice-principal, the principal would grade them ABC and submit them to the Board of Education. It is still going on nowadays, in a slightly different way. Anyway, so while **Kinpyo** was going on, I went around to observe the classrooms. So the Union decided to do the evaluation of administrators, in return. Then teachers will grade principals and vice-principal, with their experience. They can give bad marks for those who said something bad about them. Of course, teachers didn't like my going around to observe their classes, so I knew there were criticisms about it. But, I also made sure to protect teachers' work conditions, so I wondered what would be my grade. I got 70%. 70% of teachers in my school gave me A, and the rest was B. But usually, vice-principals would not interfere anything, so if the principal got A, the vice principal would get A, too. But in my school, the principal didn't to interfere, but I, the vice principal, did. So I got,*

maybe 75? So the Union asked me to stop observing classes. But then I told them, "Parents and children can not choose teachers. Then we have to make sure whomever they get, they feel their children were well educated. Don't you think so?" Then the union leaders could not say anything. I think, it is important to give quality education to all children and that is our job as teachers, and should not be swayed by the emotion. (Iwata, interview on July 8th, 2008)

Iwata's story shows that **Kinpyo**, on top of creating the division between teachers and administrators, among teachers, may have created the condition where it made it difficult for teachers to discuss and reflect on their teaching in order to improve their daily practices.

While **Kinpyo** tends to receive a lot of attention for causing heated struggles, the narratives of teachers exposed many more regulations to control pedagogy. While **Kinpyo** is, in a sense, more obvious way of controlling teachers, there were many more subtle ways that were permeating in daily school lives to control teachers in the classroom. One of such ways was **Gakushu Shido Yoryo** (National Guidelines for teaching 学習指導要領). While, the guideline stated the necessity of education meeting local needs, the Board of Education sent superintendents to schools in order to "supervise" teachers. Since the amendment of Basic Act on Education and the selection system of the local Board of Education in 1956, superintendent became government official to "instruct" teachers following the order of the Ministry of Education. Nakamura recalls the visit by the superintendent and his struggle against their enforcement of guideline.

There was a local office of Board of Education in each district. I don't remember how it was exactly called, but the office in the district oversaw elementary and junior high schools in 6 cities and towns in my area. They take care of administrative matters to manage schools, such as school lunches. Also there are one or two persons who are called superintendent. They come to our schools once every year to observe the classes. They watch our classes and tell us what we did wrong. Well, they "instruct" us. It was very strict when I first started to

teach in S junior high. They came for sure. If the school building were messy, that would look bad, so we had to have students clean the building. So in a sense it was like a "festival." "The superintendent is coming, so clean up!" we told students. Those days, students were very obedient; so they cleaned the school very well. So the superintendent would come for one day, to see how we were doing. They arrived at 10, observed classes, and I don't know what else they did, but later on, he gathered teachers to talk. He gave us feedback one by one, like "Your class was bad or good, so and so." That was their job. You know "teaching plan"? We had to submit our teaching plan for that day. When you teach a class you make a lesson plan, right? So we had to give it to him to let him know what we were teaching that day. For example, science in this class of this grade, topic is this and explanation of what I would do in the class, like, explanation time, question time so and so. We had to submit it to him when he came in the morning, so when he comes to see the class, he would have it in his hand. He looked like he was writing something on it while observing. I don't really know what he was doing. Anyway, I didn't think it was a good thing. I was very annoyed that one person comes only one day a year and criticizes my teaching. I take full responsibility in what I teach. It is my class. The Ministry of Education may have the authority, but they come to check what we were teaching, if we were teaching outside of the guidelines, for example in social studies, what is the teacher saying, they are watching out. So they say they come for guidance, but in reality, it is control, for that day at least, to see if we are teaching based on the curriculum guidelines, in short. They went to see all classrooms and in the afternoon, the superintendent gave us comments.

I was teaching math and there was no superintendent who knew about math or math education, at least among those who came to see my classes. They frequently specialize in National Language or Social Studies. So they couldn't comment on the content. But they still came. I don't know how much they understood about math education. So for me, I always thought, what are they doing, just following orders from the top, stupid fellows, it's such a nonsense. There were also lectures we had to attend whenever the guidelines were modified. Every time it was modified, the prefectural superintendent came to give us lectures. It was focused on math. All the math teachers in the district were gathered in a conference room nearby and superintendent gave us a lecture. There were such events, but the main thing was the school visit. They came to the school to "instruct" us. It's only one day so it was not a big deal, but they gave us a hard time. So that's what they did. I didn't care much about it. Even when they criticized me, I just thought, what a hell are they saying? It didn't scare me, but the principal was really worried about if we were doing what we were supposed to do. I thought it was garbage. Anyway that was what happening at the school. So in other wards, it was really censorship. I thought that's wrong, because they said that the superintendents came to observe for a day in order to understand how classes were managed, but that was impossible. The principal said, "They will see your class management and give you advice..." but I don't think they can do this by observing only one day. It's just a quibble, especially, if they don't know about the subject that we are teaching.

So I just ignored it. (laugh) What is he saying, a stupid guy, I thought. I even said it to the superintendent once. "I am teaching eight different subjects." In a small school like S junior high, I had to teach eight different subjects. "You tell me to read every corner of the guidelines, but is that really necessary? I teach students so that they understand what is in the textbook. Isn't it enough?" I told him. Then he told me "you have to read all the guidelines and follow it." So I told him, "then you come and do it yourself." He couldn't reply. I said, "You may be the superintendent, you may have authority. But for us teaching everyday, reading guidelines is not our first concern." Everyday, I taught six different subjects, sometimes there were classes where I'd teach same content to different group of students, but usually all different classes. I had to study the material and prepare for the classes. "There is no way I would have time to read guidelines for six subjects." I got in an argument with the superintendent. Poor thing, the superintendent missed the train because of that. There is only one train every two hours. But it wasn't only me arguing. Other teachers also agreed with me, so it was good. (Nakamura, interview, June 3rd, 2008)

It is clear that such school visits were intended to control teachers. However, as Nakamura's narrative further suggests, that it had affects on students as well.

In the morning, I would say, "They might come today. When they come, you need to behave." Then students were fine, studying hard. I also made sure that I would call on those students who can answer, when they were in the classroom. If students make mistake, that looks too bad on them. No need to give such pressure. (Nakamura, interview on June 3rd, 2008)

This narrative indicates that, even it might have been only one day a year, the school became for students a place not to learn by trial and error, but a place requiring obedience, to give answers that authorities want them to answer.

School visits were one way to confirm that teachers were following the national guidelines, and Nakamura's story shows how he navigated through such censorship. Teachers' resistance against the national guidelines was carried out in their daily practice. The reason for the resistance may have differed depending on the teacher. For Maeda, it was out of necessity so that all students could understand the material as well as resist stratification of students by test scores. Maeda's narrative reveals how he used

alternative methods, not following the national guideline, in order to maintain the classroom as a place to learn.

There were more and more teachers using “Water-pipe method” but it was different from the National Guideline. For example, the decimal system. In Japan, we use the decimal system, but I applied “water-pipe” methods, which divides 10 into 5 and 5. For example, $7+8$, according to the guideline, is to bring 3 out of 8 and make $7+3=10$. Then $8-3$ is 5, so it becomes 15. But this is very complex structure. Some kids have trouble there. There will be a gap between kids who can do it and who can't. There, already, is stratifying. But if you do it with “water-pipe” methods, $7+8$, 7 is 5 and 2, 8 is 5 and 3, $5+5$ is 10, $2+3$ is 5. So back to the card practice. There was no child who couldn't do this. They could use their hand, too. (There were some teachers who told children not to use hands). So according to guidelines, you need addition and subtraction, but “water-pipe” methods, you only need to know 7 is 5 and 2. Once you understand that, children can understand the rest. There was a study about this method nation wide and I learned it in study group. There are guidelines, and teachers tend to follow them. That is also one way, but if you look at children who have trouble, for me, the water-pipe methods was one of my ways to help children. (Maeda, interview, July 31st, 2008)

Maeda learned and discussed the “water-pipe” method at **Kyokaken** meetings where he found coalitions of teachers. He tried an alternative way, so that everyone in his 1st grade classroom understood the basics, so that students could grow without feeling competition or inferiority.

Summary

The resistance to the control of assessment, curriculum and pedagogy needs to be understood holistically. All issues are connected; e.g. **Kyokaken** group discussed and developed own curriculum as well as methods, in order to oppose stratification by the standardized testing. However, I must wonder, why these teachers were able to recognize various ways of oppression. Perhaps, it was because of years of discussions on education they had with their colleagues in previous decades, which prepared teachers to act. Maybe it was social movements that teachers were involved that made them become aware of the

hidden agenda of capitalist education policy. Or, it was people in the community who influenced them to understand the condition students were facing. In any case, teachers' movements were also built up based on numerous efforts by teachers and people during the previous decades.

Meeting Needs of Diverse Students: Multiculturalism in Practice

I would like, now, to shift my focus a little and present narratives of how teachers responded to the needs of diverse students as a part of teachers' experience in 1960s. Even though in 1960s, multiculturalism was not yet an issue, teachers' narratives reveal the multicultural nature of their classrooms. *"Teachers tried different and creative methods to respond to each student's need"* (Kiso, interview, June 5th, 2008).

Zainichi (Korean) Students

Kiso taught in a heavily industrialized area. There was a Zainichi community in the school district and some students in his class were Zainichi. He especially recalls the episode with a student who was transferring into the classroom.

There was a transfer student in my class. She was Korean. When introducing her to the class, I said "Her family is Korean." I made it open. This child came from another prefecture, but she was going to live in the Korean neighborhood, so everybody in the class knew that she was Korean. But nobody mentioned anything about it. That is the wall between us, "Don't say it." Behind her back, people say "she is Korean" but not openly. There was a period of time when many Korean people went home. During that time, she also went home. Before leaving Japan, the family hosted a farewell party to which I was invited. They prepared a lot of meat dishes. Then she came to me and told me quietly. "Teacher, when you introduced me to the class you said I was Korean. I hated it. I didn't want you to say it. I was angry with you, teacher. I didn't want to go to school. But now that I am going home, I think you did the right thing. I am Korean and I shouldn't be ashamed of it." I was very moved. It was the power of ethnic education. We need to teach children history of the people so that they do not need to hide their background. People's history, language, culture and so on, so that one can be proud of self. Koreans have Chima jeogori, like Japanese have

Kimono. We need to recognize it each other. Why do we hide? That's because Korea was colonized by Japan. If you think that way, one may want to hide it, it doesn't matter whether it is a small or big country. "You said, the Korean language is a beautiful language, and Koreans have their own culture. Because you said that, I realized that hiding my background was wrong," she said. I didn't think that deep. I just thought if I didn't say it, everybody was going to talk behind her back. I didn't want that to happen. That was the reason I said it. And students in the class didn't say much about it. But she was the one who hated it.

A girl without a word

Kushida was transferred to an elementary school in a small village. There he met a girl, who had trouble, for three years in her elementary school, interacting with her classmates, therefore never spoke at school.

It was when I had a fourth grade class. I was, in a sense, notorious as a strange teacher. But, there, a mother came up to me and said "please take care of my child." It was a girl. Mother said, "For three years since the first grade, she had never had a friend at school, never talked, she never read any books." So I talked to the girl. Then she replied to me and she talked to me. I thought maybe I can do something, so I told the mother, "I'll take care of her." The mother came with the child to school; I think that was how it happened. I decided that I would try to have her read a book in front of everyone. So I told the mother, "I may not succeed, but I will try to have her read books." So I made sure I talked to her, and then I talked to her in the way so that she had to reply. So we started with just "yes," her name was Keiko, so I called her "Keiko-chan," and talked to her. Then eventually, I asked her "Would you like to read a book?" Not in front of everyone, yet, but I asked her to read it to me. She did it. Then she took the book home and practiced. She would read it to me and I said "very good." The mother was very supportive, too. I am sure she had been reading books; she knew how to read. So I made a promise to the mother: "We'll have parents day soon. I'll ask her to read the book in front of everyone." Then I asked Keiko-chan, "Will you read it for us?" Then she nodded. On the parents' day, I couldn't expect too much, so I did regular class with other children and then later on, said, "Today I want everyone to hear this. Keiko-chan is going to read a book for everyone." And then I turned to Keiko-chan and asked, "Will you do it?" I still remember how intense I felt. Mothers were standing at the back of the room. I think everyone was nervous. I was, too, worried if she can really read for us. It was poetry. I picked a poem, because I thought it would be easier to read. Then she read it with a loud voice. I cried, even now just retelling the story, I am teary eyed. It was unexpected, not just "good" but really a touching moment. All the mothers were really shocked, too. First time, never heard her voice before, after three years in elementary school, she proudly read a book. The mother was in tears. I cried, too. I am such a simple emotional person, so I cry often. It made

me really happy. Then I thought, this moment was too precious to keep it to myself, so I asked the whole class to write something about it. Anything, using their own words, there was only 12 to 13 students in the class, but I handed out blank sheets of paper and had everyone write something. Simply how they felt. Then children wrote various comments, but there was this student, according to his mother "he is not the brightest" but he wrote something like a poem, something like "Keiko-chan read a book. This was the first time ever, I heard her voice." He made it into a poem. I was really happy about him too. So I read it to everyone, too.

Buraku Boy

Tado taught in a junior high, where he says he met many students who taught him what "education" really is. He described his critical moments as a teacher, with a boy who was from a **Buraku** (outcast) district.

When I first went to D junior high, the 1st or 2nd semester. I was in charge of the 8th grades, but I also taught social studies in the 9th grade. During my class, there was a student who just kept making such an annoying noise with his pencil. I was so annoyed that I scolded that student once. He got really upset and almost grabbed my shirt, saying "What". I pretended to be strong and said, "what do you mean 'what'?" Then he just left the class. After that incident, he didn't come back to my class, at all. So I thought he was absent, but he was in the hallway. I could see him there. So I talked to the teacher in charge of that class. "I scolded him once and he cut my class for a week even though he was at school. He is on strike. What should I do?" "Would you please teach the class in the way that he can understand?" "That is easy to say, but difficult to do." "But it is important to show him that you are trying." I agreed with him. So I said I will try to be creative. When I reflected back about my class, it is 50 minutes long, but nobody stays focused for that entire period. That student, made noise for almost the entire class time, there were one-two minutes when he didn't make noise. That meant there was a time that even he focused on my class. He must have been interested and was listening. So I decided that he would be my indicator in this class. I thought, I needed to make my class interesting enough so that the time he concentrates increases from five to ten minutes, ten to twenty minutes. I needed to be very creative and I tried hard. Then he gradually stopped making the noise. I also talked to him. "I was very annoyed by the noise you were making, so I scolded at you. But if you think of that, it was my fault. If my class were understandable to you, you would not have done such thing. It was neglecting my responsibility as a teacher. But I will try hard so that you may understand, so please work together with me." I confronted with him and told him. In the beginning, he would flee from the class when he saw me. I told him, "Don't hate me that much. I am not poison or anything." As we talked casually now and then, he started to come to class. Then, it was the mid-term exam; he got 60 points on

his exam. That was also interesting. We were studying the judicial system, about different courts. It was 9th grade social studies. In the class, I told students "we will now study about different courts." Then he said, "I know about the courts." First time raising his hand. I said, "You do? Tell me more." "There is family court." "That's right." He then said, "I'll research it." So I said, "Ok, so please share what you know when we study about the family court." Later on, I went back to the teachers' room and asked his classroom teacher. "He told me such, what was it all about?" Then the teacher told me "Of course, he does. He's gotten in trouble a few times and went to the family court. He should know it very well." So we laughed. So, now I know that, in the next class I said, "Ok, we are now going to study about the family court. Family court, you seem to know very well. I have never been there, but I heard you have. So share what you know with us." "Yes, I will," he replied. Then what was astonishing was that he was sitting in the very back, but he moved around his classmates and came to sit in front of me, in the very first row. I thought this was his will to study. Then he got 60 points in the mid-term exam. When I returned the exam to him, he said "Wow, 60 points. This is my first time, the best score I ever got in the school." Then he changed. It was so amazing. I experienced so many episodes such as this where I was taught by the students, I was made to realize the necessity to change how I taught and how I acted as a teacher.

Senryu Kyoshitsu

Maeda was teaching first grades. He tried creative methods that he learned through curriculum study group. One of his most memorable moment was when he tried to bring in children's knowledge into classroom by using Senryu (humorous poem).

It was in late 1960s at my last school. We practiced Senryu in classroom. I think I was teaching first and second graders during the time. I taught children the rule of Senryu; three lines with 17 or fewer "on" (rhyme). Children were very excited, using their hands counting "on" (5-7-5) and made very interesting Senryu. I still remember, it was the time of reconstruction of school building, so we were in prefab classroom. So there were some children who made poems complaining about it. Then I made them into a poetry book, so that I could distribute to children. There are some poems I still am amazed. There was a boy, only child he was, he made a poem: "In front of a beautiful woman, my father call himself BOKU (polite way of referring self for male)." First grader, or maybe he was in second grade. But what an excellent observation!

Among the poems made by children, another one Maeda still knows by heart. "Milk is Hippo Sensei (Maeda)'s favorite lunch menu." He recalls, "*Hippo Sensei - I was chubby*

so children nicknamed me". He recognizes the unpredictable and unlimited ability of children and hoped to help children to attain the best of their ability.

These narratives exemplify how teachers dealt with multiculturalism in the 1960s. At the foundation of their activity are their resistance movements against social oppression. They wished to work against meritocracy, curriculum and pedagogical control by the government that is pushed by the global capitalist forces. Embracing multiculturalism is in a sense, one of their ways of resisting to oppression.

Summary

In this chapter, I reconstructed teachers' narratives of 1960s in order to understand their experiences in society, at schools, and with individual students. The voices in this chapter, which represented educational issues and teacher resistances, are summarized in the Table (see Appendix D). Narratives of three teachers, Miya (a high school math teacher), Kiso (a junior high history teacher), and Kushida (a elementary school teacher), were most frequently used in the reconstruction of teacher experiences in 1960s. These teachers perhaps most clearly represented their experiences as "teachers' movements," which I took up when retelling the stories of teacher resistances.

Through contextualizing narratives in social context of 1960s, I gained deeper understanding of their experiences as education and social movements. These teachers attempted to oppose social oppression, by fighting the Teachers' Union, People's Education Movements, along with parents and community. They fought against administrations, local Boards of Education, the Ministry of Education, Industrial Corporations, or mass agricultural business.

The institution of schools was quickly changing pushed by government and capitalist forces, which advocate meritocracy and efficiency in schools. Standardized tests were used to track students to certain social strata and justify social inequalities. In this changing school system, students faced feelings of inferiority, pressure of competition, and control by authorities. Teachers, working in the classrooms everyday, tried to address those issues with students, to challenge governmental policies as well as social practices of prejudice and discrimination.

The teachers in this study built their movement on their predecessors in 1950s or even before. Their movement expanded; expanded beyond their classrooms and involved communities. Yet, they also faced division and opposition in their school and in the local unions. The institution of schools was quickly changing pushed by government and capitalist forces, which advocate meritocracy and efficiency in schools. In this changing school system, students faced feelings of inferiority, pressure of competition, and control by authorities. Yet, teachers, with their own ways, attempted to confirm humanity of each student by teaching them **Ikiru Chikara** (power to live 生きる力). These are stories of individual teachers that teach us in their attempt to practice education for people, that there were actions taken by teachers as agents of transformation, who struggled throughout everyday conflicting interests.

CHAPTER VI

STORIES OF TEACHERS FROM THE 1960S: POSITIONING

In this chapter, teachers' narratives are analyzed from the perspective of representational and interactional theories of narrative self-construction: how a teacher, as a narrator, constructed self-identities in relationship with me who was the researcher and a listener, and how we together engaged in interactional positioning at the time of the narrating.

Wortham argues that autobiographical narratives represent self at the same time the self is enacted interactionally with the interviewer: That is, the narrator together with interviewer constructs self-identity while telling the narrative. In order to analyze co-construction of self-identities, I focused on interview segments which had the greatest verbal interactions between narrators and myself as the interviewer. (See Chapter IV for representational and interactional theories.)

After coding and content analysis were completed, I went back to the raw interview data in order to find out how the narrators and I interacted during the interview. By paying attention to interaction, I realized that I had different interactions with each participant at different times; sometimes, I asked questions more actively, and sometimes I quietly nodded to their stories. I focused on the parts where I was asking questions, therefore helping narrator to discursively construct self-identity. In transcriptions of the interviews with six teachers, out of ten, I was able to identify segments of discursive self-construction: four examples of co-construction of activist teacher identity and three cases of avoiding social stigma of activism.

Interviewer Contribution

Before I proceed to the section of analysis of the narrators' interactional positioning, however, it is necessary for me to discuss my contribution to narrative self-construction. In interactional positioning, the narrator's understanding of whom the listener is has a great influence on the narrator's interactional positioning. Therefore, I will first describe here how I introduced myself prior to the interviews.

I met with each participant prior to the interview in order to explain my research. Participants were curious about the reason why I was studying the 1960s. I explained briefly about my background and interest: I had been involved in Anti-Military and Anti-Iraq War movements in the US as well as in Japan at the time of the research. I had met many people through several movements, who have been active since Anti-Vietnam War movements in the 1960s. While I was learning about Anti-Vietnam War movements, I began realizing certain similarities to the present situation. That was how I became interested in the 1960s, in general, but as a teacher, I was most interested in what teachers did during that time. The narrators had, therefore, some understanding of my participation in movements and interest in activism, as well as my focus on teaching and teachers.

My curiosity about social movements was also clearly expressed during the interviews, which influenced our interactional positioning. My pro activist statements opened up possibilities for teachers to take up "teacher activist" identity. I would like to illustrate how teachers discursively constructed their position as activists; our interaction produced narratives focused on their identity as activists, how they represented themselves and how others viewed them. On the other hand, despite my pro activist

statements and political beliefs, unspoken social stigmas, such as one's affiliation with the Japan Communist Party, were reflected throughout the interviews.

Teacher as Activist

In opposition to the dominant discourse of neutrality of education and teachers, many prominent scholars and educators, such as Howard Zinn and Paulo Freire, argue that education is a political act and teachers cannot be “neutral”: Teachers either reinforce or oppose the dominant value and system. Freire writes:

To say that as a teacher “the grade in which I teach does not matter; what I may or may not do will have little importance in view of the fact that the powerful act to benefit themselves and against the national interest” is not a worthy statement. It is not an ethical affirmation. It is simply self-indulgent and accommodating. Worse, if accommodated, my immobility becomes a motor to drive more shamelessness. My immobility, whether or not it is produced by fatalistic motives, acts effectively in favor of the injustice that are perpetuated or the catastrophes that afflict us, in favor of delaying urgent solutions. (Freire, 1998, p. 88)

Teachers I interviewed expressed directly and indirectly their belief of being against the injustice and domination. While narrating, four teachers, Kiso, Miya, Ano, and Maeda, created interactionally their self-identity as activist teachers, however in different ways: proactively teaching against destruction/pollution by the capitalist corporations in a local industrial district, organizing a teachers' strike for peace, resisting the control of authority, and contesting dominant “common sense” discourse.

Integrating Social Issues into Curriculum

In all of my interviews, I asked narrators to talk about memorable moments in the 1960s. Kiso, a junior high history teacher, remembered the 1960s as a “*very lively*” time for teachers, a time when “*teachers were able be creative in their teaching.*” In the following segments of the interview on June 5, 2008, I just previously had asked a question “Did you and/or other teachers try out innovations in teaching that addressed

social issues?” In response to my question, Kiso shared a great deal about the study group activities he was involved in. He introduced different teaching practices by his colleagues, such as a bar exercise in PE class and a lesson using regional folk music in music class. Kiso also shared using hands-on activities in his history class. While he was sharing different teaching practices of various teachers, my interaction with him remained minimum just nodding and confirming “yes” (lines 4&7). The shift in interaction occurred when he mentioned for the first time about Japanese-Korean Circle (lines 27-28). My nodding and confirming “yes” (line 29) became enthusiastic in tone, repeating three times, and even interrupting Kiso. I asked questions for details (lines 38 & 40). He then started to challenge the dominant narratives of Japanese history (lines 58-73), and he continued to bring up eventually the issues of pollution. In this segment, he developed an identity as an activist.

- 1 K: that was about the middle of 1960s. it was very interesting, that we were so creative in teaching, like history, music or PE. it was very eye-opening. like the horizontal bar story I just mentioned.
R: yes
- 5 K: there were some children who were scared to jump up to the bar. teachers had to yell at them “Jump up, jump up” to make them do it.
R: yes
K: but, if you think of it, you don’t have to yell at them. you just need to hold them up on to the bar and tell them “jump off when you like.” then they
10 were able to just do it.
R: haha(laugh)
K: then “let’s do it again, jump off again” then they just jumped of. “well done” then “next time, you hang on to the bar and swing” like that, children were able to do different things. they are not afraid of the bar anymore.
15 when they thought they had to jump up, they were afraid, but being held and put up, you only have to release your hand to jump off. then you move your hip to swing. then some of children started to swing around the bar. then that teacher was encouraged and made a presentation at the circle to share their experience. I was impressed. there were many such cases. another
20 case was music. there weren’t enough instruments for everyone, like piano. but if you beat the bucket, it makes sounds. then you understand the idea of

percussion instrument. and they were able to make music. there were many such cases in the 1960s. in history classes, for example, we made ancient cloth out of old news paper and tried them on, like how people

25 wore those cloth and tied the belt. while doing such things, we learned history. like that we actually made different things and tried to learn by doing such things. Also there was a unique circle, very rare, Japanese-Korean

R: yes yes yes

30 K: we formed a group with Japanese and Korean school teachers

R: yes

K: went to observe the classes at local Korean school. then we did fund raising activities to support building their school.

R: whmmm

35 K: we became really good friends

R: whm

K: there were 30 people came to observe the class.

R: teachers?

K: yes 30 teachers,

40 R: and interacted?

K: yes. we learned from them, about ethnic education.

R: yes

K: how it is important. there were some naughty students who were Korean.

R: haha(laugh)

45 K: trouble makers. but when I talked about Korea in the class, how their culture was advanced, like Japan imported Kudara-kannon from Korea, how their skill was advanced, those naughty students changed

R: whmmm

K: then they went home and told their parent about it. now their parents told

50 them to invite me to their house. they prepared meat with chili for me.

R: um

K: then I got to know them well.

R: yes

K: while doing all that, I realized how ethnicity is important, different culture,

55 language, religion, cloth, etc. we need to recognize all those, that means nation and nation to get along well

R: um

K: and understand each other. that also meant to understand Japanese ethnicity as well, not to take it as normal but one of cultures. then I came to realize

60 very important thing, about Ainu. until then, I just thought Ainu as different but they were native of Japan, they lived here even before Shamo or Wajin(Japanese people). they were pushed north by Wajin. so Japanese means both Ainu and Wajin. Japan is really a multi-ethnic country. I never thought like that until that time.

65 R: yes

K: really. we say “Japanese” but who is “Japanese”? Shamo, Ainu, Korean are our forbearers as well as Wajin.

R: yes
 K: then Ryukyu, these people also became part of Japan. then Japan is indeed a
 70 multi-ethnic country.
 R: yes
 K: I came to realize that by rethinking ethnicity. then I incorporated that in my
 teaching. now visiting Okinawa has a different meaning
 R: yah
 75 K: that was an eye-opening experience for me. Korean and Ainu issues
 R: yes
 K: another issue was on pollution
 R: pollution...
 K: around that time, we had pollution cases in Y-city. Children's asthma cases
 80 became a big issue at school. So we had a study group on pollution.
 R: study group on pollution? what did you do?
 K: one was to improve their health. throat. Asthma was the problem, so we
 had children gargle at school
 R: yes
 85 K: but that is in defense. we need to think about the cause of the problem, what
 is causing this pollution. that is not in PE but in social studies. so we
 tackled that problem. what is causing the problem, that is the big
 corporation, filling up the sea and burning oil throughout the nights. we
 have to bring those issues up. Ishihara Corporation is still causing a lot of
 90 problems today... though
 R: really
 K: so we studied about pollution and practiced in our teaching and reported at
 the study group meeting. it was in Y-city.
 R: then you taught about it in class?
 95 K: yes, we did it in class and reported at the meeting
 R: is that so. what did you do?
 K: in social studies, we discussed development. more factories have been built,
 and the town has been developed. but they did not think about people who
 lived there. the smoke from the factory is causing problem. is it really a
 100 development? so we said "it is a destruction in disguise of development"
 R: yes
 K: that is what we often heard. so it was really a destruction. we invited
 parents from the area to share their stories "we hung our laundry outside,
 then we saw black dots on our cloth. that is coming from the factory
 105 chimney. so we went to complain to the factory. then they made the
 chimney taller."
 R: yes
 K: but what happened when they made the chimney taller was that black smoke
 reached to more distance places.
 110 R: haha
 K: nothing was improved. my child died because of asthma. the elderly died,
 too. who is targeted by this pollution. that is children and elderly" like that
 R: yes

- K: those things we did
115 R: it was when you were in K-junior high
K: yes

His construction of activist identity is also observed in his shifting use of language: before line 75, he talked in a reactionary manner using words such as “came to realize”, however, when he started to use more proactive vocabulary, such as “tackled,” after line 77, he presented himself as taking proactive action to the issue. Here, he successfully positioned himself interactionally as an activist who created education as part of a social struggle.

Organizing Teachers’ Strike

Miya was a high school math teacher. One of his memorable moments of the 1960s was his involvement with the Teachers’ Union. Miya was a very active member of the High School Teachers’ Union and he served as a chairperson of the executive committee of the local chapter in 1966, when the General Council of Labor Unions of Japan (**Sohyo**; 総評) organized a massive nation-wide strike on October 21st, appealing against the Vietnam War, in which Japan Teachers’ Union took part as a member of **Sohyo**.

In narrating his daily activities, however, he presented his union activities as additional, as something that was done “*outside working hours*,” just among fellow union teachers and not in relationship with students or parents. In other words, his identity as a teacher and as a union activist maintained distance in time and space. Drawing a clear line between activism and teaching is, of course, due to the attack on the Union by the government as well as the administration. While I understood his intention, on the other hand, I became more curious about how his union work and teaching influenced each

other. The following segment is an excerpt of the interview on June 13, 2008, where he is responding to my question: “how did his union activities influence his daily life in the school?” In order to illustrate the union activities at school, he used the issues of chair/administration allowance as an example (lines 1 to 54). While he explained that the Union stood against the Board of Education, he created “we/union” and “they/the Board of Education” dichotomy (line 7 to line 24). He spoke about the Union’s arguments as if they were his own (line 15 to 16). His strong identification, almost loyalty, with the Union was also shown in the following section, when even after he officially left the Union and became a vice-principal, he kept paying the Union membership fee (line 37 to 49). However, he presented Union activity as an institution, and his agency was not clearly expressed. Moreover, he maintained the position to separate his Union work from his teaching. While he was explaining about his Union work, my interaction was very limited to confirming “yes” and nodding, however, in line 55 to 56, I changed my position and asked him more a direct question about the relationship. At first, my question seemed not to change his position, as can be seen in his response “*never*” in line 57. However, this interaction triggered his story about a teachers’ strike, which he led as a chairperson, hence the shift occurred in his positioning: from an institution to activism. His shift can be observed in his narrative. When he was merely explaining Union activity as institution, he presented a “unified” voice of the Union and/or teachers (lines 22, 23, 26 and 48); while narrating about his involvement in the strike, he started to reveal divided voices of Union members (line 72 to 80). Some teachers were against the teachers’ strike, while “we,” he and some colleagues, organized the strike. After my question “so did you go on a strike?” in line 81, Miya increased his use of “I” as well. By

using “I”, he constructed an activist identity, very strongly committed to peace and justice, despite penalty, police and all the difficulties.

- 1 M: chairperson system was introduced in the school,
R: yes
M: and an allowance for the chairs started.
R: yes
- 5 M: allowance for the chairs.
R: yes
M: that meant... before that, we had already chairs. mathematic department in high school, even in S high, there were 5 to 6 teachers. so we already had a chair among us. there were meetings where representatives from each
- 10 department got together, so we were taking turns every year to be the chair. we just were doing it on our own, in our department. that was like that, but the Board of Education took advantage of our custom. as I mentioned before, for example, if there were five teachers in charge of one grade, we would have a chairperson among us. they say they will pay an allowance
- 15 for the chair. the Union opposed it fiercely. what do you mean “allowance.” we are all same teachers.
R: aha
M: chair is just a role. could be a veteran teacher who would take that role but that is up to us to decide. stipend will differentiate us. that is not acceptable.
- 20 that is one of the rightist policy, as you asked.
R: yes
M: so they say they will pay and the Union says we will refuse to receive. there was money floating in between. so we decided to save that money and the money was used to build the assembly hall for teachers,
- 25 R: yes
M: didn’t cover the entire cost, but part of it. that is one thing that we refused to take the allowance.
R: whmmm
M: oh that’s right well... vice principals also had an allowance. that was not
- 30 the chair, but an administrative allowance. about ten percent. so I was being paid a little bit more than other teachers. (laugh)
R: (laugh)
M: but that was, Union people came to me and said “vice-principal, sorry to say this to you, but...” when you become a vice-principal, you will no longer be
- 35 a member of the Union.
R: aha
M: Union membership fee was not cheap. I don’t exactly remember how much but it was not like 2-3000 yen. It was more like 5-6000 yen. so some teachers left the Union because of the fee, but once you become a vice
- 40 principal, it is the rule that you are no longer a member. so somebody from the Union came and said, “vice principal, sorry to say this to you, you are no

longer a member of the Union, but will you contribute to the Union from your administrative allowance?"

R: whmmm.

45 M: I don't remember how much but I kept contributing to the Union. that shows how strong the Union was back then. collecting money from a non-Union member, a vice principal. anyway, there was an issue of chair allowance. up until I retired, we received allowance, but we never took it in to our pocket. that was quite public. talking to you, I remember more
50 things.

R: (laugh)

M: chair allowance. in the beginning, it was for rational reason, in April, we decided a chair. it was reported to the Board of Education and they started to pay allowance.

55 R: how did the Union work influenced your classroom, like did you ever cancel your class because of it?

M: never. that is not good if you do that. but talking about strike, we actually went on a strike

R: teachers?

60 M: yes. strike. this was a historical moment. that year, for good or bad, I was serving as a chairperson of the Union. so it was such a struggle. "What's up with you, teachers!" canceling classes and going to rally with banners. so it was most important to talk to parents. parents. in case of strike. even with Kimpyo struggle, we didn't go on to a strike. what I was involved in
65 was 10.21 strike. anyway, when teachers go on a strike, it is crucial to get understanding from parents.

R: does that mean you talk to parents beforehand?

M: yes, beforehand, we asked PTA committee to get together and said "because
70 of this and that, we want to go on a strike. it means we will have to cancel two-three hours of class, but we will make up for the missed classes." and tried to get understanding from them. that discussion, of course is difficult. there were schools where they could not come to agreement. high schools were relatively easier. but especially countryside, elementary and junior high schools, tried until the last moment, but they couldn't take part in the
75 strike. dropped out, well from the Union point of view, dropped out. "if you do such things, we'll strangle you and drown you in the ocean." like that. it was really something. so when you do a strike, teachers were divided, too. unless it was a really organized community. but I don't think ever 100%. that time, S high school was also divided into two, almost 50-50.
80 it was a historical moment

R: so did you go on a strike?

M: yes

R: but you were divided into two. so half of you ? or entire school?

M: yes entire school. so of course, I was penalized, received warning. well that
85 will remain in your record for the rest of your time.

R: so what happened to those teachers who were divided

M: divided?

R: who were opposed to the strike

M: ah, well, those, when you go on a strike, you'll have a rally. so we go to
 90 take part in the rally, but those teachers said "I wont take a part." that's that.
 nothing can be done. "We will go" we said and left. so before hand, half a
 year before the day, we started our preparation. so I was also tailed by the
 police.

R: police? tailing?

95 M: police, but not in uniform.

R: ah, like the public safety commission?

M: yes yes yes. so I, at the time of the strike, my children were kindergarten
 aged. so police could come to arrest me, because the Ministry of the
 Education considers it to be illegal, for a public servant, teachers are semi-
 100 public servant of the prefecture. there is a controversy over public servants'
 rights to go on a strike. different understanding of law. do you know ILO?
 ILO recognizes, like in France, even policemen have the right to strike. So
 prohibiting teachers to go on a strike in Japan, ILO does not recognize it.
 anyway, it is a controversy. I think it is a different understanding of law. so
 105 we thought it was legal, but administration wouldn't think so. so the public
 safety commission came. there was an office of the Union, not anymore,
 but in the building across from the station. one or two months before the
 strike, somebody was watching us. I was very active and devoted to carry
 out the strike, so even if I got arrested and they took away my teacher
 110 license, I never thought how I was going to earn a living. I was determined
 that I would do my utmost. but I didn't want to be arrested in front of my
 children, I was living in K town in S and commuting to S high school, but I
 didn't go home during that time. the Union got a room in an inn for me.
 then it was really moving, but my friends came to protect me. "we can't
 115 leave the chairman alone. we will stay overnight with you." it was great
 friendship. it was like that. so I hid all the flyers. I told my wife to dig a
 hole and bury everything, and in order to avoid getting arrested in front of
 the children, I stayed at an inn for 2-3 nights. those who did it together,
 even now, we talk about it when we get together for a drink. "those days,
 120 you were young." like that. indeed. it was like that. we never knew what
 would happen. JTU said they would support us, but it was an individual
 responsibility. so I was prepared for the worst. but fortunately, my wife
 was understanding. she didn't make it a big deal. both of us were young, I
 think.

125 R: so in your case, PTA also showed understanding?

M: yes, gave us tacit consent

R: how did the students react?

M: I don't really remember about the students' reaction. (silence) Of course,
 we talked to the students beforehand, as well. each teachers did. it can't be
 130 like all of sudden no classes and teachers are gone. that is not acceptable.
 so we did talk to them

R: how did you talk to them?

M: I don't remember, but I think the Union gave us direction on how to talk to our students. for PTA, the Union wrote a letter and we distributed it to them.
135 now thinking back, it was the most enthusiastic moment of my life.

He was an activist. His commitment to the Union is very clear throughout his narrative. In a part of his narrative, however, there was a sense of inevitability: “problems exist and are resolved, more or less, but there is little or no hint of human suffering, agency, conflict, or struggle (Cornbleth, 1998).” Interaction between Miya and me created an opportunity for Miya to construct an activist identity with human suffering, agency, conflict and struggle.

Freedom Attained Through Struggle

Ano was a high school national language teacher. He characterized the 1960s as being “*free*”: there was a certain freedom/flexibility in schools. In response to my question “what do you remember about the 1960s,” he recalled different activities in which he was engaged with his students as well as fellow teachers, such as going to **Anpo** demonstrations or camping with students. He used the word “*free*” repeatedly when describing his activities. He asserted “*school has to be an enjoyable/fun place for students*” and a teachers’ role is providing opportunities to students to “*be connected with each other.*” His action, even though he seemed to represent himself as just having fun, was a conscious decision he made in order to oppose a dehumanizing school system. The following excerpt of the interview on June 3, 2008 is one of the examples of his active and conscious challenge to the dominant discourse.

In this segment of the interview, he talked about using popular folk dance and songs with his students at school, responding to my question “what kind of interactions do you recall with students.” Despite his assertion of being “*free*,” he revealed there were

opposing voices to his action at school (line 6). My utterance in line 9 questioning the opposing voice showed that I don't share the assumption of the authority. My questioning of the dominant authority discourse then shifted his position to express more clearly his action as a form of resistance (lines 10 and 12). Indeed, he was creating a counter discourse against exam focused and meritocratic culture of school. His utterance in line 31 shows that he was aware of the risk he took, possibly losing his employment as the consequence of his action. This interaction reveals that the freedom was in fact not something granted automatically, but rather negotiated. His resistance enabled him to feel the freedom. Furthermore, my question in line 18 came out because he challenged my notion of "a national language teacher"; that a national language teacher is not supposed to be teaching dance. In responding to my question, Ano gave another example of counteracting such a notion, singing songs in his lessons of the national language (line 19).

- 1 A: it was really free
 R: is that so?
 A: at School, I felt really free. Folkdance was very popular around that time, and I suggested doing it with students.
- 5 R: really
 A: then other teachers didn't like it. I was scolded.
 R: what?
 A: it was like that. there were such aspects as well.
 R: why is folkdance not good?
- 10 A: it seems funny isn't it? they say it will distract students from studying
 R: oh
 A: it will create an atmosphere of relaxing and not studying. students will spend their time on dancing, instead of studying, or something like that
 R: haha
- 15 A: it was the very beginning, not yet really started, so who knows what happens. Oklahoma Mixer, Korobeiniki, and so on, we danced together. I even did that after being transferred to Y High School, using track field...
 R: weren't you a national language teacher?
 A: a national language teacher, during my class, we sang songs, too.
- 20 R: really?

- A: my students still say, “you taught us songs”
 R: which songs?
 A: I don't remember... popular songs, songs from Utageo movements, also
 North Korea was different, then
 25 R: ha
 A: so we also sang the Song of Pyongyang
 R: really
 A: also we sang traditional children's songs. we sang a song before starting a
 lesson.
 30 R: really?
 A: if you do such things now, in three days, you'll get fired
 R: is that so?

He interactionally constructed his identity as a teacher opposing the authoritarian voice. By challenging my view of “a national language teacher, Ano was also able to position himself as actively challenging the national curriculum and revealed one of the ways to gain control over what he taught.

Resisting Common Sense

Challenging dominant discourse is a daily practice of teachers. However, that is hidden some times in the guise of strangeness as a tactic. Maeda was an elementary school teacher. Following is a segment of the interview on July 31, 2008. I have asked Maeda to share memorable moments in his life/teaching in the 1960s. Responding to my question, he shared several teaching practices with 1st graders, which were perceived as “*different*” from his colleagues such as math instruction not following the national curriculum guidelines, using **Senryu**(川柳), or humorous a Japanese style poem, in the classroom, or eliminating homework. These examples just raised, he said, were “*carefully thought through*,” while walking on the wall, in the below segment of the interview, was his “*spontaneous*” idea, almost “*mischievous*.” However, this narrative interactionally revealed his agency of challenging the dominant discourse of “commonsense.” In lines 13, 18, and 26-27, I repeatedly asked question about students’

responses using the words “surprised, confused, and strange.” These word choices reveal that I was shocked by his activity and at the same time assumed some resistance from children who would take up commonsense or dominant discourse. His response to each of my questions did not, however, allow us to recognize the influence of dominant discourse in children. I then changed my position from a listener to a teacher (lines 33 to 39) and shared my experience and struggle as a teacher to challenge the dominant discourse. Responding to my shift in positioning of self, recognizing me as a fellow teacher, Maeda then shared his belief in education as challenging the “common sense” (lines 40 to 45) and positioned himself as a teacher actively opposing the dominant discourse, rather than a strange teacher.

1 M: if you wanted, you could do really interesting things. I was just full of ideas.
Of course sometimes I thought it through, but sometimes, I just had an idea
and did it on the spot. let’s try and do this today... like that. it was in PE
class, I think. there was block wall around the elementary school, about 1.2
5 meters high, just like you see in every other school. I had all my students
get up on the wall from the entrance and we went around the school, on the
wall. if you do such a thing now, it will create a huge problem, what a
dangerous thing. and there was a storehouse beside the gym and it was
accessible to the roof from the wall. so we all got up on the roof of the
10 storehouse and did hurrah! everyone in the school, all teachers and students
were watching us. I was there with children but still, some might have
thought “that’s unacceptable!” but to this day, students remember that.

R: when you told children such things, were they surprised?

15 M: I think it was because there was someone who did it, mischievously. so I
thought I would have everyone do it not as mischief, but as a class.
everyone could do it! we went not all the way, but about a half way and
then went up onto the roof.

R: how did children respond? were they confused?

20 M: no they were fine. it doesn't require a special skill. for example, bar
exercise, there is always someone who has trouble. vaulting a horse, too,
there are some children who cannot do it. but there was no body who
cannot walk around the wall. nobody fell from the wall, we went around, of
course they were very careful. if somebody fell and got injured, it would be
a serious problem for the teacher. it would become nationwide news and I
25 would have been criticized for doing such a dangerous thing.

- R: when you suggested such a strange activity, did children say anything?
would they just follow you?
- M: they did. it's no problem. and I told children "don't do this when I am not
with you." but once was enough for children and there were no problems
30 afterwards. if it was the bar exercise or vaulting horse exercise, there would
be students who had a difficult time. but walking on the block, even though
students had to be very careful, everyone was able to accomplish the task.
- R: is that so..., well, I sometimes have an opportunity to work with junior high
students. when I do a drawing activity having them sit on the floor, some
35 students say "is it ok to sit on the floor?"
- M: aha
- R: they ask me. so students are more conservative... not conservative, but
probably they have been told not to behave badly. did anyone say such
things to you?
- 40 M: well... in a way, education is to break the fixed ideas that children have.
instead of putting them into a certain box by saying it must be done in this
way, education is to break such conceptions. we don't know what these
children might become in the future, that's unpredictable. imposing
"commonsense" onto children will end up limiting the growth of children.
45 that's what I think.

Through interaction with me, his intention was clearly voiced which allowed me to understand his practice as part of his activism. He successfully constructed an activist identity in his narrative.

Summary

Teachers are indeed activists even though how their activism is manifested in individual practices differs. In Kiso and Miya's cases, it may be easier to recognize teacher activism as it is more directly connected to social movements. Ano and Maeda appear to be taking a more liberal discourse of being a "good teacher", however, actually opposing the dominant discourse in their own ways. All of the four examples I examined above show the process of crystallizing teacher activism interactionally. All four teachers were politically and socially aware of domination and exploitation by education and capitalism and all of them were actively involved in social movements. However, their activist identity was co-constructed interactionally which strengthened their position.

Social Stigma of Activists: Self-censorship Enacted

When I designed the study, I did not realize how deeply the stigma of being activist is embedded in my mind. Having been involved in anti-war/peace movements, I believed that my political stance was clearly expressed. However, while analyzing the interview data, I noticed the lack of clarity of my, as well as the teachers, affiliation with JCP.

As mentioned in Chapter III, GHQ carried out the “Red Purge” in 1949. Under this circumstance, teachers chose whether to clearly identify or not their political affiliation. Even though it happened almost 60 years ago, the influence of the “Red Purge” is persistently present in 2008. One’s connection to JCP was rarely voiced during the interview. Even though teachers had some understanding that I shared with them a sympathetic attitude to JCP, it was not mentioned directly. At the same time, I, as the interviewer, kept avoiding the opportunity to clearly ask or talk about the connection to JCP. There are three cases of those moments that I became aware of while analyzing the data.

Stranger

The following is an excerpt from the interview on June 6, 2008, where Iwata was sharing about her interaction with her students and parents. In this segment, Iwata mentioned about “being labeled as Red” or “communist.” She reflected back and said she had always been labeled as Red since the beginning of her career as a teacher, but never herself clearly indicated that she was a member/sympathizer during the interview. She rather represented herself as being a “stranger” or “outlaw.”

1 I: when I was in K-junior high, I started to educate both parents and children. that was my beginning of Equity Education. to practice such education, you see, you have to work over-time, or outside of schools.

R: yes

5 I: I did that over-time, or outside school activities all the time until I retired.

R: whmmm

I: yes. so everybody thought I was Red, a member of the Communist Party. so, administration, too thought I do all these because I was a Communist. the label of Communist never left me.

10 R: really

I: yes. it goes all the way back to when I first became a teacher in 1946. During that time, there wasn't enough food, so we brought sweet potato.

R: whmmm

I: no school lunch, either. I was the only one who brought a sweet potato and

15 ate with children, in entire city. also, I put food color in it so that it would look different every day, red, green and so on, just for some change, for fun. I showed it to the children "Today, my lunch is this color." then they would do the same. there were no teachers who would do such things.

R: teachers who would eat lunch with children?

20 I: yes.

R: is that so?

I: well, half of the children went home to eat lunch.

R: ah

I: that is how bad the situation was. then I started to think it would be good if

25 we could make miso soup or something at school...

R: it may sound stupid, but may I ask you a question?

I: yes?

R: what does it have to do with being a Communist and eating lunch with students?

30 I: that is because nobody else did it.

R: what? Is that the only...?

I: yes, that's it.

R: that is the only connection?

I: yes. and you try to be creative. you see, teachers only need to perform tasks

35 that were assigned to them. so why does this person do extra, even paying from her own pocket? that raises questions. then other teachers also had to protect themselves, so they would report to the principal saying "she is doing her own stuff." then the principal reported to the Board of Education. then you become someone who does a strange thing, who is different. that

40 was the first stigma for me.

R: yes

I: then I went out, beyond the school to talk to parents. I visited their homes. also, I told students that they didn't need to bow to the picture of the Emperor, which we had to do before the war ended.

45 R: yes

I: adding all that, people said “She is strange” then “She may be a Communist.”
that’s how it is connected.

R: I see

I: that stigma was gradually but swiftly spread. that is how people thought,
50 “Red is scary.” it was very difficult to speak against the government, and to
do different things from others. so people just didn’t act.

I, in lines 28-29, asked a question for clarification; how being a Communist and eating lunch with students are related. However, I never clearly asked if Iwata was a member of the Communist party or it was just a rumor. During another interview, she mentioned not having been promoted to a principal position “*because she was a woman and a Communist*” (Iwata, July 8, 2008). This opportunity for me to ask a question to clarify the relationship was again missed. I helped Iwata’s self-representation by not asking direct questions. Even though there was almost 40 years difference in age between us, both Iwata and I collaborated in not saying the word “Communist” clearly.

Progressive Thoughts

In Miya’s case, my lost opportunity to ask direct questions about ones affiliation with the Communist Party was observed during the discussion about his appointment at one school during the interview on June 24, 2008. Normally, the personnel system for public high schools is to transfer teachers to different schools every 10 years or so. However, Miya was assigned to one school. I, wondering about his assignment, asked him to share his understanding of the reason for this unusual assignment. In explaining, he used word “*progressive thought*.” The transcript below is a part where I followed up on his comment and asked a clarification question about what is “progressive thought.”

1: R: you said “a progressive thought”, but what does it actually mean?

M: well, I mean Union activities. well, this is a long story, but when I was a student, it was during the war so all the progressive movements were suppressed. because of my sister, who went to “Jiyu Gakuen” founded by

5 Motoko Hani, one of the leaders of progressive education, a historically well
known person, and it is a Christian School. well, there are many different
Christians but they were progressive. so because of her, I started to go to
Church and I was baptized, too. but I was questioning, only praying in the
10 church would be enough to change the society? then I talked to my friends
and I met some very active members of a party which was considered to be
progressive. this was after I became a teacher. I was a very faithful
Christian and went to Church every Sunday. from a little town where I lived,
I had to ride my bike to the closest station and then take a train all the way
to T-city. but still, I went there every week. I was also on the Church
15 committee. but I met a very progressive priest in church and he was very
much influenced by Priest Akaiwa in Tokyo. Akaiwa said “if you want to
practice what the Bible says in this world, it is really the same as what JCP
is trying to do.” Because our priest admired Akaiwa, he often distributed
pamphlets by him at the church. so I was more inclined to progressive
20 thinking. then I started to question about going to the church on Sundays.
rather, I wanted to work in the community to bring about social change. so I
stopped going to church. it was a life-time change for me.
R: whmmmm
M: so, then I started to dedicate more to union work. social change... sounds
25 too big, but through Union activities, I wished to contribute to social
development. the atmosphere of Union activity was like that then.

Miya talked about Christianity and the influence of Priest Akaiwa. In Akaiwa’s words, Miya mentioned “JCP” (line 17), however, he was inclined to “Progressive thinking” (lines 19-20). He then talked about “Union work” however, never clearly talked about his affiliation with JCP. I, as the interviewer, could ask for clarification with a direct question, which I never did, however. Again, Miya and I, successfully or not, positioned each other to avoid to identifying one as a Communist interactionally.

Summary

Besides the two examples I examined above, there were more cases of such avoidance and lack of clarity. For example, Kushida avoided overall talking about his involvement in political campaigns at one point of his career. His connection to JCP is only shown in the words of opposition when he filed his candidacy to the Union Leader. However, again I never asked a direct question and he identified himself as being an

active member of “Kyoukaken.” He openly criticized the Teachers’ Union for being totalitarian and at one point he filed his candidacy to be the Union Leader, in order to enhance their movement. However, he talked about his opposition from the Board of Education to his candidacy: “If he took this position, the Union becomes red and it will carry out strikes. He will ruin the education.”

This lack of clarity may suggest that there is a social stigma that was embedded in the teachers as well as in me. Without clear mention of political analysis, class struggle was obscured and rather liberal, equity, democratic discourse was carried out instead throughout the narratives. Even though I intended to understand globalization from the class point of view, when understanding the teachers’ daily practices, the class point of view was somehow silenced by my self-censorship.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

The work of the political activist inevitably involves a certain tension between the requirement that positions be taken on current issues as they arise and the desire that one's contributions will somehow survive the ravages of time. In this sense the most difficult challenge facing the activist is to respond fully to the needs of the moment and to do so in such a way that the light one attempts to shine on the present will simultaneously illuminate the future. Of course, one can never really know whether one's positions and analyses will retain their value beyond the immediacy of the moment. (Davis, 1990, p. xiii)

Summary and Discussion

Teachers in this dissertation, as political activists, responded fully to the needs of the moment in the 1960s and in doing so, they hoped to illuminate the future. The stories told in this dissertation show how they, individually as well as collectively, took on issues as they arose, and, in a sense, for me in 2010 to retell their stories of struggles in the 1960s is one of the ways for their contributions to survive the ravages of time. I wrote this dissertation, in collaboration with the teacher activists, in a hope that it becomes my contribution to the work of the political activists, which expands beyond time and space.

In this dissertation, I have reviewed narratives of ten Japanese teachers and their experiences as teachers in the 1960s. I reflected their experience in relation with society. By contextualizing teachers' narratives within the society of their times, narratives of individual teacher's resistance became a part of the larger people's movement: how dominant forces, such as the Economic Council, the Government, the Ministry of Education and the local Boards of Education, attempted to control their daily lives and how individual teachers, with the collaboration of colleagues, parents, and community, counter-acted such controls. It also revealed how teachers' movements strengthened

other social movements while, at the same time, their involvement in social movements strengthened the teachers' movements and influenced/expanded the teachers' practices in everyday life. Teachers' resistances, even though their struggles were particular to their situation, were tied to social issues and their individual action was a part of the larger struggle.

The narratives also revealed the complexity of power relations within the struggle; many layers of power relations that individual teachers needed to navigate in order to resist different forms of oppression. Faced with students who were struggling in the school and a rapidly changing society that was rapidly changing because of shifting economic structure, teachers tried to understand their social conditions and resist the dominant forces in order to raise children with **Ikiru Chikara** (power to live 生きる力). Each story told here brings up conflicts of interests at local levels challenging a grand narrative of oppressors, which are often depicted as monolithic. With further analysis of power relations in teachers' stories, we can see even challenges to the narrative of the Teachers' Union as a unified force taking the sides of the people by opposing the government.

Through analysis using interactional positioning theory, I deepened my understanding of how some of teachers, with my contribution to their positioning, were able to construct activist identities and actively challenged dominant discourses of the neutrality of education and teachers. Through interaction, the agency of the teachers became clearer which successfully constructed individual teachers as activists. Teachers were inclined to resist the policies, not only because JTU told them to do so, but as a result of their own analysis of social conditions. Interaction between teachers (the

narrators) and me (the interviewer) revealed the human suffering, agency, conflict, or struggle each teacher experienced either against the authorities, among colleagues, and/or within themselves. At the same time, I also became aware of the social stigma of being an activist, which I unconsciously carried, and was therefore reflected in the narrative self-construction of some teachers. These findings show that teacher activism, in narratives, is actively constructed with the collaboration of the narrator and the interviewer.

In narratives, the activism faces a possibility of being silenced, as is revealed by the fact that some of the teachers and I avoided clearly mentioning our political beliefs, in the process of narrating. For a researcher, I recognize there are tensions between maintaining rapport with the participants and asking more direct questions, which may put social stigma on the participants. In this dissertation research, both teachers and I had understanding of our involvement in social activism, however, it did not automatically guarantee the narratives created between us brings up our activism. The possible reasons may be the complexity of the power struggle among activists.

While teachers often times are depicted as showing “compliance with bureaucratic controls, disaffection and lack of critical reflection” (Tickle, 2001) and often are accused of helping to replicate inequity in society, this research shows there are still spaces for individual teachers to make courageous choices that shape new possibilities for their schools. This research adds one more example of teachers being “organic intellectuals, who are constantly interacting with society, struggling to change minds, engaged in the evolution of knowledge, raising issues in the public domain and defending decent standards of social well-being, freedoms and justice” (Becker, 1996 quoted in

Tickle, 2001). Teachers in this study were aware of the grand narrative that education will help, automatically, build a society of equity, democracy, freedom and human development. They recognized sufferings of their students as they faced students in the classrooms everyday. The suffering they witnessed pushed them to take a stance of opposing practices within the schooling systems which created stratification and justified inequality. The narratives offer counter-stories to the obedient Japanese teacher and the obedient student.

Their narratives also revealed the multicultural nature of Japan, challenging the dominant discourse of Japan as mono-cultural country. Race, ethnicity, gender, economic backgrounds, etc., of individuals are socially constructed by the dominant forces in order to exploit, at the same time, has possibility of becoming a fuel to the social struggles of people against oppressions. Such social construct of identity for exploitation in the 1960s included ethnicity (Zainichi), class (Buraku), gender, geographical location, as well as physical and mental conditions of individual students. Teachers, interacting with students of diverse background, recognized the multicultural nature of their classrooms, even before multiculturalism became part of a national discourse in the 1980s-1990s in Japan. Furthermore they opposed mono-cultural curriculum set by the Ministry of Education, which excluded certain types of students from their classroom community as well as larger society. They also resisted dehumanizing practices in school by embracing students' diversity and challenging state sanctioned textbooks, standardized testing, and so on. Even though they did not use the term "multiculturalism," their teaching practices provide ample evidence to be counted as multicultural education. Moreover these narratives underscore how teachers participated

in collective resistance movements against oppressive schooling practices and Union practices.

Implication

Teachers, in making their decision to act, were influenced by their involvement with the larger society. Teacher narratives presented in this dissertation are narratives of the resistances of the people in Japan who tried “not to be on the side of the executioners” (Zinn, 1980). My attempt in this dissertation was to learn from their experiences in order for me to seek a way to fully respond to the needs of current issues, to keep the light of hope for future. So what can I/we learn from their experiences? First is certainly the confirmation that teachers indeed can be activists, resisting forces against domination. Teachers indeed “make choices whether to proceed along one path or another, and fight out these choices in great social conflicts” (Harman, 2008, p. iv). There were, and are, teachers who chose the side of students, farmers, and working people despite the difficulty and stigma they faced in society. Teachers in this study analyzed, on their own, social conditions and acted to serve the interest of the masses. Their analysis and actions were influenced by the people’s movements; at the same time, they fueled social movements at large. In other words, their actions were grounded in social conditions. Even though they lived in small towns and villages, far away from the economic and political center of Japan and the world, they were a part of the global movements of people. They were a part of historical social development. They were indeed a part of globalization from below in resisting capitalist globalization forces.

The teachers, who told their stories in this dissertation, are highly respected, no doubt, but not special teachers. They faced many challenges, as well as interferences by

authorities and colleagues. They felt a sense of uplift as well as failure. They had to deal with their emotions, uncertainty, and contingencies, just as anyone else. Yet, they opposed oppressive practices, which enabled them to feel and live what freedom and democracy mean. Their stories teach us that there are risks and consequences for any one of us to take a stance to act against oppressions. Many of the battles that these teachers fought in the 1960s still continue; teachers today face meritocracy, censorship of curriculum, mandated methods, etc. Exploitation continues through the spread of capitalism. We all have the possibility of learning from our predecessors to act in order to respond fully to the needs of the moment. Even though individual actions may seem small and powerless, these individual acts are the base of a global uprising of the people. It is possible, thus, for me/us to be a part of the global people's movements in my/our own place, wherever that might be, as long as I/we, too, ground my/our analysis of issues in the social conditions.

Throughout the process of data gathering, data analysis and writing this dissertation, I learned the potential of being teacher activists, however, most importantly, I learned how those activism needs to be recognized/analyzed through individual's interactions in local settings. Even though a teacher activist may tell his/her story, in the process of narrating, his/her activism can be silenced in telling the stories. It is only possible to recount sorties of activism, with collaboration of the narrator and the listener, and the researcher share the responsibility to bring forth his/her activism. Narrative inquiry is a very useful tool to bring up people's voices. However, I am even more aware of the impacts of the interviewer in creating narratives with participants. It is not just a

narrative, but is a constant negotiation of relationships between the narrator and the interviewer, and all the negotiations happen in relation to the greater society.

The narratives told in this dissertation were recollections of ten teachers, however, there are many more of such narratives of teacher activism, which remain untapped and many are silenced in a dominant oppressive system. As a researcher, I would like to contribute in future to continue gathering and examining the stories of teacher activism, present and past, in order to contribute to reinforce and strengthen the discourses of teacher resistance and activism. Even though I became interested in the 1960s-1970s because I saw similarities in the activism today, I was not able to examine the similarities and differences between the past and the present in this dissertation. I was able to bring forth particularities of each teacher's struggles in their geographic space during the specific time period. I see possibilities, as future researches, in expanding time frames as well as geographic spaces: What are similarities/differences of teachers' resistance in the 1960s and now? What are teachers' experiences in other parts of Japan and beyond? I also see the necessity of researching experiences of minority teachers, i.e. Ainu or Okinawan teachers: How do they perceive social movements and their daily teaching practices? It is also a very important to find out how an individual teacher shift his/her thinking and practice responding to different needs occurring over time.

Frankly, I was astonished by the imagination of teachers that I interviewed; how they were able to imagine classrooms that will not stratify children by meritocracy, that will teach against domination, and that will teach for human connections. Moreover, they were able to imagine the community that they wished to live in. Angela Davis, delivering a commencement speech for high school students, asked young people to

imagine the future: “imagine the world without nuclear weapons, imagine the world of shorter work weeks with no cut in pay, and more employment opportunities.” The power of imagination is crucial because people can attain what they can imagine.

And we must say – as Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., said twenty years ago, “I have a dream.” Your generation was not yet born when Dr. King led the earthshaking march on Washington in 1963, but you hold in your hands the power to lead this country in a direction that will reflect what you are able to imagine now in your hearts and mind (Davis, 1990, pp. 177-178)

The narratives told in this dissertation will help us, I hope, to imagine and act upon the dreams to attain a world of peace and justice: imagine practicing education for all children without stratifying them on meritocracy, imagine using self-selected materials and building one’s own curriculum, imagine teaching social issues as a part of the curriculum, imagine developing methods to teach students basic skills and the power to live, imagine teaching students to connect to each other rather than competing against each other, imagine collaborating with parents and community, imagine a school that is a part of social development, and imagine schooling that opposes capitalist dominant forces. Then teachers can truly be a part of the people’s movement and take the side of people of the world who struggle for a more just society.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR AN UNSTRUCTURED INTERVIEW

Research Question 1:

How did social movements in 1960s-1970s influence their teaching practices?

1. During 1960s-1970s, in what school/ grades were you teaching?
Alternative more direct question: Please tell me grades, subjects and schools you were teaching in 1960s and 70s.
2. Were there any memorable moments in your life/teaching during those two decades (20 years)? Could you tell me about them? (if no) Are you aware of others' memorable moments?
Alternative more direct question: What kind of interactions do you recall, with students/parents/other teachers in regards to what was happening in the society?
3. Were there any particular social issues you were preparing students to understand or take action on? (if no) Are you aware of others' experience preparing students to understand or take action on?
Alternative more direct: What were the significant social issues affecting your teaching and students' preparation? Could you tell me how they these issues influenced your teaching experience?
4. Were you engaged in any activities with students/parents/other teachers outside of classroom? (if yes) Please tell me stories of your experience with students/parents/other outside of classroom. (if no) Are you aware of others' experience with students/parents/other outside of classroom? Could you tell me about those?
5. Were there any accomplishments on these issues you feel you were particularly proud of? (if yes) Please tell me about these. (if no) Were you aware of others' accomplishments on these issues you feel that were particularly noteworthy?
6. Were there any hardships for you or other teachers or students when you taught in these ways? Were there any hardships with colleagues/students? How did you understand difficulties that students in 1960s-1970s were facing?

Research Question 2: (This is for more specific information)

What was their intention and how did they carry out their daily teaching practice?

1. Tell me about a typical day back in the 60's, 70's. How did you carry out your daily teaching practices? Please share some of the stories of interactions with students, parents, other teachers, and etc.
2. What did you want to convey to the students the most?
3. How did the day's activities change between the two decades?
4. Please tell me why you become interested in this particular issue. Please share the experiences of difficult moments and how you dealt with them.
5. Did you and/or other teachers try out innovations in teaching that addressed social issues? Please tell me about these. (if no) How do you see students' school lives, making connections to home and school, constitute and influence social movements?
6. Please tell me about your professional relationships with colleagues back in the 60's. Who agreed/disagreed with your teaching practices? How did you know?
7. Did you see any differences in influence on students between your practices and others' practices? Could you tell me about these? (If no) What did impact students?

*The order of questions may be changed in each interview depending on participants' responses.

APPENDIX B

SAMPLE OF CODING CHART (KISO)

Kiso (Interview on June 5, 2008) tape 1

TOPIC	CONTENT	CODING	
勤評闘争の始め 1956年	現場におりてきたのは少し後 初めは良くわからない	勤務評定	Kinpyo
勤評とは何？ 評価の基準は？	勤務評定は学校現場で働いている教師の点数 子供たちに点数をつけるのと同じ、つけるのは校長 付け方は？欠席？遅刻？服装？格好が悪い？声が悪い？	勤務評定	Kinpyo
教師の気付き、 地域闘争へ	1960年頃 ただ教室の中だけでなく社会へ 親から見たとき、ええ先生がねられる 親たちが立ち上がる		
教室と地域	教師は教室の中だけでなく地域の意識 地域は自分の周囲の人たち 学校では教室 クラスよりは広い一人の子供の周囲を（親兄弟祖父母など）捉える 何十人かの教室は何百人かの地域になる 善し悪しを判断するのは校長ではなく親たち 地域ぐるみ PTAぐるみになり 勤評闘争大きくなる	勤務評定 地域活動	Kinpyo and Community
教科書問題	教科書問題 中身と有料-憲法には義務教育は無償とする おかしい 教師が親にいい、親が同意、教科書無償をもとめる	教科書 地域活動	textbook issue
勤評闘争	横へ広がる運動 1960年に近い頃	勤務評定	Kinpyo
年表カード			
勤評闘争の側面	校長先生、家庭科女教師暴力事件 校長追放追放	勤務評定	Kinpyo
全国闘争へ	日教組の取り組み	日教組	Union
教育とは何か	教師たちが教育とは何かを問う 子供たちから期待も失望もされる 教育は知識を伝えるのではない 真実を子供に伝える 伝えられた子供たちは生き生きする そういう教育を評価するのは校長ではなく子供、子供は今わからない 何年か後にわかるこれが教育の評価 勤務評定は教育をゆがめる 教育を守るために勤評を許さない 村の教育委員会へ交渉に 教師の目覚め	勤務評定	Kinpyo
勤評闘争の影響	四日市の教育長 追い込まれ 教師と文部省板挟み 自殺 教師と校長の対立 される方とする方 無言闘争	勤務評定	Kinpyo
論争	教師を管理下の中に縛り付けるのに便利なのが勤評 校長の言うことを聞かせる 学校の秩序としては良い、教育の流れには良くないと論争	勤務評定	Kinpyo
労働運動と勤評	労働運動としては 労働者としての教師を分裂させるものとして日教組が取り組む	日教組	Union

形骸化	勤務評定 ABCで教師を評価 目的は教師が反省するため 公開を求める 一番いい先生は誰か、悪い先生は誰か、と校長に詰め寄る 「みんな良い先生である」 みんなBの評価 結果 勤務評定の骨抜き化	勤務評定	Kinpyo
現在の勤評	現在はみせない 闘いが弱まった 管理統制が進んだ		
教頭公選制	60年後半(67~8年ごろ) 教頭を職場選挙で推薦する 推薦された人を校長が		
勤評の時期	勤評は年1回9月10日に提出 9月1日からの10日間が激闘	勤務評定	Kinpyo
勤評闘争の影響	自殺した教師、勤評で追いやられて自殺した校長、教育長 教育問題と同時に人間関係もゆがめた 影響は学校運営にも教育実践にも広がる 教師と親との関係にも影響 学校が混乱状態に	勤務評定	Kinpyo
サークル活動	勤評闘争の苦しい中で明るいことも サークル活動が元気づく 綴り方運動 公害問題 民謡-地域の人々と共に 運動会に(音楽教育) 教室を飛び出した教育(美術) 体育 ドルフィン泳法 民教連へ 教師が生き生きと実践	サークル	study group
ガリ版印刷			
勤評闘争とサークル活動	校長と対立あるいは巻き込む 親と結集		
当時の社会	社会的にはベトナム戦争反対闘争 沖縄から飛んでいく飛行機はアジアの民衆に爆弾を落としにいく 沖縄返還運動に結びつく 沖縄の基地返還闘争 砂川、立川の基地闘争に	社会運動	social movements
員弁の農業講演会	四本足の鶏を書く子供		
創意工夫の教育実践	教師が自由にする創意が 体育 鉄棒に飛びつけない子供 「飛びつかなくてもいい 降りればいい」 飛びつくのは難しいけど降りるのは易い 易い方から教える 民教連で教育実践報告 絵も歌も 1960年代後半に 生き生きと	サークル	study group
歴史教育	歴史教育の実践は エジプトギリシアから始まる世界史 ミロのビーナス 八頭身 百済観音 縄文土器を作る 金印の実物大を紙に書く 実感を持たせる 当時の大学の先生「歴史は感動を求める 印象を深める 活躍した英雄を教える 人物中心の歴史を」 人物は歴史観をゆがめる 感動は大切だけでも人物ではなく事象、民衆はどう闘ったかを伝える 歴教協から学んだ 「先生 教科書あんまり使わんだな」 教科書は使う 写真を 文章はあまり使わない ガリ版で副教材を作る	教育実践	teaching practice
おもしろかった	創意があった 今はそれがしにくくなった 官制の研究会 民間の研究会は日曜日しかできなかった でも夏休みにやった	サークル	study group
歴教協設立	三重県 68年12月10日	サークル	study group

当時の社会事情	ミニスカート おどろきやった テレビの普及率 96% この年ベトナム戦争頂点に 三重県でもベトナム反戦デモ 安保闘争 バスで東京に 東大紛争 4月に東大で会議 安田講堂のバリケード「やっとなるな」	社会運動	social movements
60年代 戦国時代	60年代は 教育の中での激動であると共に活気があった 戦国時代 波乱 民衆は力を持つ 小さなサークルでも実力があれば 子供たちを抱えてやろう	1960年代	1960s
クラブ活動	クラブ活動 バasketボール部 合宿（3日間） 男子も女子も 裁縫室（畳の部屋）に蚊帳をつり布団は家から持ってくる 女子の合宿も問題意識なし 親がスイカの差し入れも やろうと思えばなんでもできた	課外活動	after school activity
いろいろな教育実践	サークルも創意がある 叱りつけてやっていたのがしからなくてもいい 降りることから始める鉄棒 鉄棒が怖くない 実践→感動→サークルへ参加 音楽 バケツの打楽器 打楽器とは何か 音楽とは 歴史 古代の服装を 新聞紙で作る 学習が深まる 実物を作る中ででてくる学習	サークル	study group
日朝サークル	日朝サークル 日朝教師の会 朝鮮人学校と交流 民族教育を学ぶ やんちゃな子、崩れた子、授業の中で、朝鮮の進んだ文化 百済観音 子供たちの姿勢が変わる 家で親に言う 肉に唐辛子 交流が深まる 民族の尊さ 文化 言語 宗教 服装 認める 民族教育 アイヌの問題 日本 シャモ 倭人の前に住んでいた 日本人はアイヌも倭人もひっくり返して日本人 多民族国家 琉球王国 いろいろな民族でできている日本 実践 沖縄に見学 新しい発見がいっぱいあった	サークル	study group
公害教育	公害問題 四日市の公害 四日市喘息 塩浜で公害 教研開催 公害に強くなる身体作り（防衛的） 公害を起こした問題-社会科で取り上げる 実践を持ち寄った 工場ができる 町の発展 同時に住民のことを考えずにしたら 町の発展にはならない 地域の開発 地域開発というなの破壊 親たちもきて話をする 「家では選択に黒い点々がつく 工場に文句、煙突を高くした、黒い煙が遠くに飛ぶようになった 改善ではない」 ぜんそくで子供、年寄りが死んだ 公害で子供年寄りが被害に 守らなければならない	公害問題	pollution issue

transcribed section

APPENDIX C

TRANSCRIPTION SAMPLE (KISO)

[勤務評定：勤評闘争の始め、勤評とは、評価の基準]

K: 教育現場、学校現場を激動させたのが勤評闘争ですね、それで勤評闘争の始まりは1956年というのが年表なんかにも出てくるんですけども、もうちょっと後ですかね、あの現場に降りて来たのはね、そして、初めは良くわからなくて、勤務評定ってどういうことやとか、それからそのことが私たちの教育現場にどんな影響を与えるのやというようなことも、頭に聞くだけで、だんだん、なるほどっていうふうになってくるのは、もうちょっと後のことである

R: 当時は、先生の理解では、どうしてこういうことをするんやという説明を受けたの覚えて…

K: うん、一番初めね、一番初めは勤務評定というのは教育現場、学校現場で働いている教師の勤務の状況はどうなのか、それを点数を付けるんやと、学校の教師が教室の中で子供たちに点数を付けるように、教師もまたその役割を点数に付けられるんやと、つけるのは校長やと、というようなことなんやね、だけど、どうやって点数を付けるんやろあというので、例えば出勤簿で欠席が多いとか遅刻が多いとかっていうことやろか、ちがうぞ、服装が悪いからっていうんやろ、とかな、それから格好が悪い、声が悪いとか、そうすると、ハンサムな男はええのか、とかやな、(inaudible) 服着とったらあかんのかとか、まあというようなちんぷんかんぱん質問も含めるうちに、教師がだんだんと的になってくる状況は、1960年に近い頃やったと思うんです、けどもそれを、ただ教室の中だけでなく、それがもっと広がってね、例えば、教室の中だけでなく、親たちがそれを聞いて、そしてそういうふうにして、される中で、やっぱり、ねられるのは、親から見てええ先生がねられていく、いうことから親たちが立ち上がってくる、それが今度は、親たちと同時に、今度は地域の闘争に結びついていく、というのはやっぱり、教師はやっぱり教室の中で授業しただけやなくて、地域という意識があるでしょ、地域という言葉はどういう言葉かと言うたら、自分一人ではなく、周囲の人たちを地域という、で、周囲の人たちというたら、学校でいうたら教室や、だから教室は地域や、そうすると、教室が地域だという時には、クラスというよりはもっと広がってくる、教室の中に一人の子供が椅子に座っておいたら、それは一人の子供だけでなくして、その子供にはお父さんとお母さんがおる、それからもしかしたら兄弟がおる、あるいはおじいちゃんおばあちゃんがおる、そういうなんを教室の中で一人の生徒が座っているときに、そういうなんも捉えて考えていく、こうなってくると、もう教室というのは40人なら40人のクラスではなくして、何百人かの地域になる、そういうような取り組みが一方である中で、この勤務評定というので、教師の評定をすると、それは教師をきちっと見るか、あの教室をええか悪いかを見るのは、校長ではないやないか、それよりは私たちや、ということから、それやったら校長も(みていこうと?)、親たちが、そういうことの中で地域ぐるみ、それからPTAぐるみ、そういう風なことで出てきたもんで、勤評闘争が大きく広がった、

[教科書：教科書問題]

K: 一方その頃にあったのはね、教科書問題があった、教科書問題の一つは教科書の中身の問題、もう一つはその頃はまだ教科書が有料やったん、そうすると教科書が有料、ところが憲法には「義務教育は無償とする」、とせやのに教科書が有料はおかしいやないか、ということを経験が親にいい、親がそうやといい、それから親と教師が一緒になって教科書無償の闘いがでてる、ということの中で現在は教科書が無償になった、だからそういうようなことの広がりも含めてくると、勤評闘争というのは横へ広がる運動、まあそれが1960年に近い頃であったんですね、

[勤務評定：教育とは]

K: 60年のちょっと手前ですね、その頃に、私も含めてやけど、教師たちが、教育とは一体何かと、で教育というのはやっぱり、子供たちから期待されると同時に、失望もされている、きちっとせん限りはね、だからそういう意味で教師がもっとしっかりしなくちゃいけない、で教育というのはものを教えるのではない、ものを、知識を伝えるのではない、やっぱり真実を子供に伝える、真実をね、そうすると、真実を伝えるということは、真実を伝えられた子供たちは強くなるはずや、生き生きとするはずや、知識を受けたやつは、ああそうかというて、ドラマを見ただけのような感じやけども、そうではないはずや、そういう風にせなあかんのやと、そういう様なことは校長から評価されるはずはない、そんなんは簡単にわかるはずはない、それは評価するのは子供や、そしてその子供は今わかるはずはない、例えば子供に、先生が子供を叱った、叱って、叱られたことは子供にとってわかるはずはないので、子供は先生を恨んだりするやろう、だけど何年かたって、子供たちが「ああ、よく叱ってくれた、」という風になるのや、これが教育の評価や、せやで勤務評定というように形でされることは教育をゆがめることや、せやで私たちは教育を守るためにも勤評を許してはならない、という考え方が出て来て、そして村のね教育委員会へ行って、話したことがある、で田舎の教育委員会というのは田舎のおっさんやさ、なあ、で、いったら、「んな先生、来てもろて、難しい話聞かせてもろて、どもならんわ、」っていうのやさ、「いや、そやなくして、勤評というのはこういうことやで、あんた教育委員やで、教育委員が評定するのやで、せやで()」というたら「先生の言うことようわかったわ、」とかいうてな、「それよりも一杯飲んでって、」とかいう、「そうじゃなくして、ちゃんと話して来て」というような中で、教師が目覚めて来た、だから勤評闘争は、地域を目覚めさせたと共に、教師も目覚めさせた、だけど、その激しい闘争の中で、私はY市におったんやけど、Y市の教育長は追い込まれて、そして先生の言うことはようわかるけれども、文部省から言われた通りにせんならんし、俺どうしたらええのやと言う中で、自殺をした、これ全国でも大変なことやった、Y市の教育長が自殺をする、そんなこともあった、で、そのうちに私は、Tへ来たんかな、その頃にTでは、要するに勤務評定というのは校長がするもんで、だから教師と校長とが対立することになるわけや、な、ま、対立というのは仲悪いとかいう意味じゃなくして、させられる人とする方とでちがいますでね、それで校長とのにらみ合いがでてきてね、ひどい、一時ですけどもね、無言闘争ということをやった、無言というのはものをいわない、校長がものをいうて来て、もの言わない、ま、いわば校長を困らせてやるということやな、それで校長が「おはよう」というても何ももの言わんわけや、それから、校長が「こうしてくれんか」というてももの言わんわけや、そういうようなことが起こったりね、そういうようなのが組合の闘争やけども、要するに対立、初めてのことで、けども基本的には教師を統制の中に、管理下の中に縛り付けていくためには、勤評というのは効果的やわな、要するに、校長の言うことを聞かぬ限りは点数がよならんわけやから、な、だから教育のいろんなことでも、校長のいうたことで、「俺はこういうことを勝手にやるのや」という風にはいかななくなってくる、というのが狙いやったんやな、ですからそこで、今まで校長と教員とが学校の中で一緒になっとったのが、校長は評定をする上、教員は評定される方、とがっ(差ができるジェスチャー)となっ、それは学校の秩序としてはええことや、という見方と、それから、それは教育を本当に進めていくことにはならんのと違うか、という見方と二つに分かれますね、で、ですから教育学会でも大論争になったし、それから国会でも取り上げられた、それから今度は労働運動としては労働組合、労働の教師たちを分裂させていく意味でも、許せない、ということで、ですから日教組が取り上げて、全国的な闘いになった、各学校でもやった、で、その頃は、私はまだどちらかと言えば、新進気鋭でしょ、なあ、若い、30近いぐらいの、の、だから職員会議に(inaudible)いうても、私が発言したら、みんな「ああ、そやな」とかいう、無視できない様な状況であったわけやし、そんなところだったわけですね、勤評はね、それでしまいには勤評はどうなったかというたら、教師はね、ABCの評定するんです、あんたはA、B、C、それもね一項目じゃないの、たとえば生徒のつかみかたがどうかとか、それから教育の教材研究はどうしているかとかね、というようにいくつかの項目が、10ぐらい

あるのかな、で、それを A、B、C とか言うて付けるんです、それで、それを具体的にそれをどう書かれたか、というたら、「勤務評定でするんやったら、目的は一体なんや」というたら「教師を反省してもらって、教育を良くするためにするんや」と校長が言う、そうするとみんなが「反省するというのやったら、その評定したものは通信簿と一緒にやで、子供に見せるように、俺にも見せなはれ、見せるか、」でもうしまいには「見せなあかんやろう、なら見せます、」今度はみたらやな、片一方は A、こちらは B、ということにはならんでしょ、そうするとしまいにはそん中で校長は「こん中で、ええ先生はどれや、それから一番あかん先生はどれや、言いなさい」というと、校長が「そんなことは言えませんし、ありませんわ、この先生はみんなええ先生です」とこういうわけや、「ええ先生やったら、そのようにちゃんとせなあかんわけや、それを見せなさい、」で結局、勤務評定を見せることになって、見たら誰もかもみんな B、みんな B、どの項目もみんな B、こういうことになった、そういうような闘争、それは勤務評定を骨抜きにする、ね、骨抜きにする、効果をつけない、という様なことを一時やったの、今はそうじゃなくして、またちゃんとつけられているようだけれどもね、もう見せないから、

R: もう見せなくてもいいんですか？

K: もう見せないようになってしもた、それだけ、まあ闘いが弱まったというのか管理統制が進んだというのかな、だけどその時はそうだった、

R: いつぐらいからそれは変わったんですか？

K: 60 年後半になりますとね、校長や教頭をするのに、教師が意見を言うという風になってきたんです、例えば教頭をするのに職場で選挙する、推薦する、それで教頭につく、それは管理的にはあかんわけでしょ、せやで、どうなったかという職場から選んだのを、推薦されたのを校長が決める、こういうような、結局は職場の力があつた、もの言う、そういうような状況の中で、これも勤評闘争の中で出てきたことですが、けど、自分たちで選んでいくというようなことも、1967-8 年頃にはあつたようです、

R: そうすると、毎年、こうやって勤評するぞという闘いは続いていた？

K: そうそう

R: あるときに、こちら側が勝ってしまった、というか、他にせんでもええようにしてしまった

K: そやな、あの、勤評は毎年一回ある、年一回 9 月にある、9 月の 10 日に提出というのかな、ですから、9 月の 1 日からの 9 月の 10 日ぐらいまでの間が、非常に、激闘、闘いになるわけやな、それにしても、勤評はいろいろな格好で、そのことで教師が、教師の中でもね、勤評でこんなおもしろくないのというて自殺した教師もでてきた、教師も、それから勤評で追いやられて自殺したとかいう校長もでてきた、そんなことで、四日市の教育長もやけど、そんなことまでおこって、なんというか教育問題と同時に人間関係もゆがめてしまったのかな、そんな激しい闘いがあつたんです、ただ、それだけでなくして、そういうことは、人間関係をゆがめていったりすると、そのことはいろいろなところに影響するもんな、学校運営にもでてくるし、教育実践にもでてくるし、そうすると今度、親と教師の間にも、ぴったり上手くいくところもあれば、今度は逆にゆがめるということもあるしね、それはやっぱり各学校の中で、だから学校そのものがそれで苦しいというのか、混乱状態がいくつかでてきてますね、

[サークル：サークル活動]

K: そういうことで、しかしその頃、勤評闘争だけでなくして、

R: うん

K: 人間というのはまたおもしろいもんでな、そんな苦しいような中でも、時々忘れるというのかな、そういうような闘争からぬけて、けらっとした他のタイプが出てくる、これは人間のええところかもわからん、いつまでもじめじめして、けんかばかりしとるかというたらそうではなくて

R: うん

K: それは何かというと、サークル活動、この間も良かったですけども、

R: うんうんうん

K: サークル活動っていうのが非常に元気づいてくるわけ、いわば国語なら国語の教師が集まって綴り方運動をやる、
R: はい
K: 社会科の教師が一緒になって公害問題をとらえるとか、それから音楽の教師が集まって、教科書のような歌やなくして、
R: うん
K: もっと子供に明るい歌がええやろ、それは一体何やというたら、民謡や、そやで、例えば大原節やとかソーラン節やとか、というような歌を、そうすると歌を教えてくれる先生は誰かというたら、音楽の大学の先生ではなく、
R: うん
K: 地域のおばちゃんを連れて来て、
R: ははは
K: そして講堂でこやって踊って、
R: ほー
K: 子供に、そうするとそれを運動会でやる、
R: うん
K: そしてその実践を報告する、ていう音楽の教育、それをやったのも何人かいますけどね、だから美術なら美術の教師が、教室の中で絵を描く、そんなんじゃなくして、絵というのは楽しかったら寝転んだってええやないか、
R: ははは
K: というので、運動場なら運動場へ、「寝転んでもかまへんで、やれ」ていうようなんで、
R: へー
K: 体育でも、Kさんと一緒に取り組んだのはありますけども、みんな水泳がいややというときに、泳ぐというのはこんなんやというてドル平とかいう泳法をね、
R: はい
K: 教えてね、それで、みんなやったら楽しくなって、泳げる様になったという実践もあるの、
R: ふうん
K: そんなんでもやりましたね、そうすると、そういう様なサークルがいくつか出て来て、サークルの代表者が出て来て、やるのが民教連、」その中心を加藤さんにやっと思ってもうたんやけども、
R: ははは
K: だけども、教師が生き生きとして
R: うーん
K: 実践をして、ただその頃は、ヤスリで、ガリ版印刷で、
R: うん
K: だから非常に苦労をしたわけ、今の様なきれいな印刷がさっとできるんやなくして、
R: うん
K: ていうのは余計に教師を元気づけた、な、そうすると、教師が元気づけてくると、勤評闘争の闘いももっと朗らかになってくる、明るくなってくる、「校長をやっつけたる」っていつてみたり、
R: ははは
K: あるいは今度は逆に「校長を巻き込んでいく」ということだな、
R: ふうん
K: 勤評なんて、そんなことよりもっと大事なことがあるんやというようなこと、そうすると親がそれで結集して、
R: うん
K: というようなのが 1960 年代の後半ぐらいになってくるとね、できました、あの社会的にはベトナム戦争が
R: はい

K: 一番激しいころ、北ベトナムのね、
R: はい
K: そうすると、ベトナム戦争の時に、一番日本の中では、激動したのが沖縄やな、
R: はい
K: で、沖縄では飛行機がどんどん飛んでいく、
R: うん
K: どこへ飛んでいくんやというたら、ベトナムに爆弾を落としにいくのや、そしたら、沖縄から飛んでいく飛行機は、アジアの民衆である、ベトナムの人たちに爆弾を落としにいくのやというたら黙ってみとるわけにはいかない、ていうので沖縄では激動の、「沖縄を返せ」の運動に結びつくわけやな、
R: ふーん
K: アメリカの土地やないんやと、ていう風にして、出て来たのがベトナム闘争、ベトナム戦争 反対闘争、それから沖縄の基地返還闘争、あの、沖縄だけではなくて、砂川とか
R: あ、はい
K: 立川だとか、ていうようなね、各地にある基地闘争にも広がっていく、
R: はい

[サークル：創意工夫の教育十実践]

K: ですから、その頃の教育実践というのは激動のところやったけど、同時に創意があったわけ、一人一人の教師にね、
R: うん
K: 自由にやる創意があった、
R: うん
K: だから自分でやろうとする創意を発揮ようせん場合には、それはそれほどじゃないけど、やるという教師には、「俺は体育でこうやってやるわ」と、
R: ええ
K: そうすると、こんな、私も聞いて、せやなと思ったけど、例えば鉄棒をようせん子供がおるわけ、
R: はい
K: 鉄棒にぶら下がるのはいややというて、そうすると、学校の先生は一生懸命になつてな、「怖いことないで、先生持とったるで、鉄棒に飛びつけ」ってやる、けども「怖い」という、鉄棒の端へいっても「怖い」、
R: はい
K: しまいにもう泣き出す様な子供も、その時に、体育の教師が「そうやな、何もな鉄棒に飛びつかんでもええやないか」という、
R: はあ
K: じゃあどうすんのや、「鉄棒から降りたらええ」という発想、
R: はあ
K: どうすることや、みんなでだっこしてな鉄棒にまたがらせる、
R: はい
K: そうすると「そっから降りてごらん」というとピョンとおりる、みんな降りるわけ、みんなできたやん、鉄棒に飛びつくのは難しいけど降りるのは易い、だから易い方から教えるのに、みんな難しい方から教えようとするで、あかんのや、な、だから、そうすると、みんな「なるほどな」という、
R: ははは
K: それで新しい体育のことはみんなそうする、私は体育の専門やないから、「なるほどな」と、民教連なんかで話聞いて、
R: はあ

K: それだけやけども、そんな生き生きとしたやり方が出てくるわけ、絵を書く場合にでも、絵をよう描かかんたらやな、手に色をぬってきなバン、

R: はは

K: それでも絵ができてくるやないか、おんなじように描くんやったら、もっと元気ようバンってやったらもっとええやないか、というような中で、絵を描く、歌を歌う歌でも、

R: うん

K: は一っっていうて張り上げてやった方が、っていうので歌のやり方、そういうような実践が持ち寄ってくる、ていうようなのも、1960年後半ぐらいになってくるともっと生き生きとしてくる、ですから、勤評そのものの闘争では、だけですと、そこだけを矮小化すると、

R: うん

K: 運動としてのええ悪いが出てくるけども、その中で、いろいろな創意工夫、それぞれの小さなサークルが、大きくなって全国大会を作り上げ、

R: うん

K: というようなふうにな、なっっていったわけですね、

R: ふーん

K: そんなことが確かに大きかったと思いますね、

[教育実践：歴史教育]

R: はい、その先生は歴史を教えられていたんですよ、

K: そうですね、

R: その、ごめんなさい、先生の創意工夫はどんな？

K: 私の創意工夫はね、例えば歴史でやる時には、例えばあの、世界史なら世界史でやる時にはエジプトギリシアから始まるわけではね、

R: はい

K: その頃、その像なんかでもですね、例えば八頭身の美人の

R: はは

K: ミロのビーナスなんてやるとさ、

R: はい

K: これは美人やな、美人というのはどういうことやというたら八頭身なんや」そして今度は、「八頭身というのはギリシアだけと違うんや、法隆寺の百済観音も

R: はい

K: 八頭身なんや」というと、「ああ、おもしろいな、そんなんギリシアだけやない、」

R: ええ、

K: それから縄文の土器なら縄文の土器をやっても実際に縄文の土器を作らせてみたり、それから、金印であるでしょ、

R: はい

K: あの、「漢の倭の奴国の」、

R: ええ、

K: それをその実物の大きさのものを紙に書いて、

R: はい

K: このくらいの大きさなんや、という実感が出てくる、だから、実感を持たせてやる、

R: ふーん

K: というような取り組みをした、

R: ふーん

K: そしたら、その当時の大学の先生が、もう亡くなったけど、それはちょっと右よりの先生やったんやけども、「歴史は感動を求めないといかん、感動を求めるといことは印象を深める、感動を求めるといことは何かというと、その歴史に活躍した英雄を伝えることや、せやで、人物中心の歴史を」ということを言う、で私はそれに対して反対で、人物って言うことになってくると、歴史観がゆがめられていく、感動というのは大事やけど、その感動は人物の感動ではなくして、やっぱりいろいろな事象、その当時の民衆はどう闘ったかっていう

ことを伝える感動でなければあかんのや、っていうことで、歴史の言い合いをしたことがあります、そのことは私も歴教協から学んできたこともあったりして、ですから、そうやってやっていくと教科書だけではおもしろくないわけ、

R: はい

K: だからガリ版で副読本こしらえてやる、だから今でも同窓会なんかで子供らくると、「先生、あまり教科書使わんだな」とかいうて言うてる、ですけども、他の方からはにらんどったヤツもおったかしらんけど、わからへんわけ、なんでかというて、一応教科書は開いて、教科書にある写真も使いますから、

R: はは

K: 「何ページの百済観音みなさい、」だけど、詳しく書いてある文章は、

R: はい

K: それを読まんでも続けていく、っていうような中での、実践の取り組み、そのころに歴教協も作った、

R: はい

K: 三重県でね、歴教協を作った、他の人はそれぞれ体育だとか理科だとか、いろいろなサークルができて来た、それが今でも続くのもあるし、ま、あの、おもしろかったのはおもしろかった、創意があつてね、

R: ふーん

K: 今見てみると、今はそれがしにくくなった、

R: ふーん

K: 官制の研究会があつて、

R: はい

K: それが出てくる、例えば出張が、集会をやろうと思つてもできないわけ、

R: はい

K: だから、やろうと思つたら土曜、日曜しかできないわけ、昔は土曜日も休みやなかったもんな、

R: はい

K: そうすると日曜だけしか、祭日、祝日だけしかなかつたりとか、だけど、そんな中でも、やろうと思つてやったわけ、夏休みとかね、

R: はい

K: そんなんで、の取り組みはいろいろやりましたね、

[社会運動:当時の社会事情]

R: 三重県でもベトナム反戦とかは？

K: うん、やりました、

R: はあ

K: それでデモ行進もやったし、だけど、ベトナム反戦よりももっと激突したのは

R: ええ、

K: 安保闘争、安保闘争では、これ、だいぶん、ここからもバスを仕立てて東京にいきましたね、東大紛争、こうやってかいてあるよ、東大紛争、60年、この時の4月に東大のところで歴教協の会議があつて、私泊まり込みで行きましたけどね、安田講堂のところに、ずっとバリケードがはつてあつて、「やつとるな」っていうて、言ったことがありましたね、

[1960年代]

K: 60年代は、そういう意味では、非常に激動、教育の中での激動であると共に非常に活気のあったことやな、人間の社会状勢、戦国時代というのは波乱やけども、同時に民衆は力を持つてくる、上から抑えられとるんじゃないで、力の強いものがやれるんやで、とかいうような中で、小さなサークルでも実力を持つとるものであれば、そうやってやろうと言つて、子供たちを抱えてやろうというような風になつていったわけですね、この間お話したかな、私は若い頃やからその時に、クラブ活動、体育の、私はその時にバスケットボール部で、バスケ

ットをやったん、それでね、バスケットもね合宿してね、夏休みに、合宿してやったん、その合宿、バスケット部の、男子も女子もやった、男の子と女の子と、同じように合宿はできやんからと、何月何日から、三日間ぐらいやけどな、男の子の合宿、学校で裁縫室という、まあ畳の部屋やな、今は家庭科室という、そこで蚊帳つってね、布団敷いて、「布団、家から持ってこい」言うてね、そうしてやった、そしてすんだら今度は女の子、私女の子と一緒にとまった、今やったらな、女子の中学生と男の教師と一緒に寝るとはなんやと問題になるけど、そのころやったら、学校も職員室でみんなに伝えてあるし、別に何とも、問題意識も思わなかった、それで親たちは、「ありがとう」いうて家からスイカ持ってきてくれたりとかね、夏休みにそんなこともやった、非常に、やろうと思えばなんでもできたんやな、

[サークル：いろいろな教育実践]

K: そんなのがだいたい60年代の中でね、そして、サークルの中でおもしろいには、そのようにして、それぞれ歴史だとか音楽だとか、それぞれ、体育でも、みんなおもしろい創意があるわけやな、どきんとするような、今いきました鉄棒なんかでもそうでしょ、

R: ええ

K: みんな鉄棒飛びつくのは怖がって、飛びつけと、先生声からして、「とびつかんか」というて叱りつけてやっちゃったわけ、

R: ええ

K: ところが、何も叱らいでもええやないか、みんなだっこしてこうやってあげといて、それで「好きなように降りてごらん」というたらピョンと降りるわけ、それでできたや、

R: はは

K: そうすると「もう一遍あげたげるでもう一遍おりてごらん」というとピョンと降りる、「そうやな、」そしたら次は「ぶら下がって身体ふってごらん」って言ったら知らず知らずのうちに鉄棒ができてくるわけや、そうすると鉄棒ができる、怖いことなくなって、下から飛びつくときには怖かったのに、こやってあげてもらってぶら下がって、降りるんやったら、手離したらおりれる、そんな次はこうお尻振ったらゆれる、そのうちに、今度はやれる子は今度は上へあがってぐるんとまわる、そういう実践を、そしてそれを感動をもらえると、みとった教師が、そんなら私もサークルへ出て、という様なものがいくつかあった、そういうのが出て来た、ほすと今度は、音楽のときに、ピアノやそんなんは、楽器はあらへん、バケツもって叩いたら音が出るわけやな、ということで、打楽器というのは一体何かというのがわかっていく、そしてその中から、サークル活動のね、音楽というものは作られていく、というようなものも、いくつか出て来たわけ、そんなんもこの60年代にようけあったと思います、歴史の方では、例えば古代の服装をしようというので、模造紙か、模造紙がもったいないからといって新聞紙でしてさな、それで昔のふりしてね、それで縄でこうやってしばって、帯を締めてやっていく、そういうような中で歴史の学習なんかもようけ出て来た、ですから、あの、今でもその当時に取り組んだやつがありますけど、実物をね、ものを作っていく、そういうような中ででてくる学習がね、やってきました、それからサークルで一風変わったのは、日朝、

R: ええ、ええ、ええ

K: 日本と朝鮮学校のとのサークルを作ろうというので、ここにも出てくるけど、日朝教師の会というので、

R: はい

K: 四日市朝鮮人学校で授業を参観をすとかね、それで朝鮮人学校で落成式にカンパ活動をするとか、こんなことをしてね、

R: ふーん

K: それで朝鮮人とも仲良くなりましたしね、

R: ふんふん

K: 授業参観して30人集まったとかね、

R: 参加者は先生方ですか？

K: ああ、これは教師がな30人
R: へー、交流を？
K: 交流をしてね、こんなことやりました、という風にして、日朝、朝鮮人の中で学んだのは民族教育
R: はい
K: というのがいかに大事か、そうすると、朝鮮人の中でも非常にやんちゃな子や
R: はは
K: 崩れた子がおるわけ、だけども、それをやっぱり授業の中で、朝鮮というのはそんな国ではないやと、朝鮮というのは日本よりもっと進んだ文化をもっとって、朝鮮からいろいろな仏像、今でも百済観音なんて、朝鮮の仏像はすごいや、とかっていうと、今まで教室の中であれとった子が、僕たちの国の朝鮮のことをあんなに先生いうてくれる、とかいうとると、子供の姿勢が変わってくる、
R: ふーん
K: そうすると、その子供は家に帰っておとつあんやおっかさんに言うと、ほんなら先生呼んでこい、といて、そやでいくと、肉に唐辛子かけて、食べなはれとかいって
R: はは
K: 「ああそうか」とかいうような中で、交流が深まってくる、
R: はい
K: その中で、今まで気がつかなかったのは、民族というものがいかに尊いものか、そして民族にはそれぞれの文化やら言語やら宗教やら服装やらいろんなものがあるんや、それを認めるということが、国と国が仲良くすることやし
R: ふん
K: 理解すること、そうすると、今まで日本人が日本の服装を着とったけれども、これはやっぱり外国へ行ってきて、やっぱり伝えられるものじゃないといかん、まあ民族教育というので、それで、それをやっているうちに、大変なことに気がついて来たのが、今まで気がつかなかったのが、アイヌの問題、アイヌというのは今まで、ただ変わった文化やという風にいうとったけど、実は日本のもっと、シャモていう、倭人が住む、もっと前にアイヌがおった、そしてアイヌがここに住んどった、それがアイヌがだんだん追いやられて、倭人が日本にやってきた、だから日本人ていうのはアイヌも、それから倭人もひっくるめて日本人、そういう意味では、いろいろな民族で日本ができて、今まで気がつかんだことや、
R: はあ
K: なあ、そうすると、日本というけども、日本人というけども、それはシャモも入っとるし、アイヌも入っとるし、とかやな、そうすると、そのうちに今度は朝鮮から入って来たのもやっぱり日本人になって来たし、
R: はい
K: それから琉球もな、琉球語とか琉球王国とか、これも日本になって来た、そしたら、そういう意味では、いろいろな民族で日本もできてきているんや、
R: はい
K: ということに気がついてくる、民族というものを見直していく、ていうような、そしてそれを実践をしたり、そういったあれしたり、そんなつもりで、今度は沖縄に見学にいったり、
R: はあ
K: こういうことになってくると、実にその、その点での新しい発見というのはいっぱいあったわけやね、それが朝鮮問題、アイヌの問題、
R: はい
K: それからもう一つは公害問題、
R: 公害
K: その頃にY市で公害がでてきたんやね、それで、Y市で、子供らが、Y市喘息でゴホゴホして、そうするとそれを教室の中で取り上げられて、塩浜で公害教研というようなのをやったりしました、

R: それは公害教研とは、どういうことを？
K: 一つには公害に強くなるために、やっぱり喉をね、Y市喘息になるわけでしょ、ですから、水でうがいをするとか、
R: うん
K: だけどそれは防衛的である、公害を起こした問題点は何か、それはやっぱり体育ではなくして、社会科や、ということで、それは一体なんでかといったら、あんな大企業はあそこで、埋め立て地にして、石油をどんどん炊いて、毎晩火で燃やして、このことを問題にせなあかん、石原産業は今でももめてるけど、そんなん、
R: へー
K: それでそんな公害問題やとかね、それで公害教研というので、いろいろな実践を持ち寄って、Y市でやった、
R: それはじゃあ教室でもそういうことを
K: 教室の中でやったのを持ってきた、
R: そうなんですか、どんなことをされたんですか、
K: 教室の中では、社会科の所でいうたら、こういう風にして工場ができてくるということは町の発展になるんやけれども、同時に住民のことを考えずにしたら、どんどん煙を出して、それは町の発展にはならない、それはどんなんかっていうたら、地域の開発というけれども、それは本当の開発やろうか、それでよく言葉なんかで出て来たのは、地域開発という名の破壊、
R: はい
K: っていうことがよくいわれた、だから開発ではなくして破壊やと、ということでね、それでSのところで、いろんな所でいうと、親たちもきて話をすると、親たちが「家では洗濯物をして外に干しておくよ、黒いものが点々がつくのや」と、「あれはみんな煙突からの煙から降ってくるや、」それで私たちは工場に文句をいいに言ったら、そしたら今度は煙突をもっと高くしますというて、煙突を高くする工事をしてくれた、
R: はい
K: しかし、煙突を高くしたらどうなったかというたら、黒い煙が今度はもっと遠くへ飛ぶようになった、
R: はは
K: ちっとも良くなってはおらない、」で、子供が喘息で死んだ、それから年寄りが死んだ、ということで、公害で一番いじめられるのはこの町の子供と年寄りや、それを防ぐのは地域の住民の暮らしを守らなあかん、とかいう様なことでね、
R: はあ
K: そういう公害教育が出てきました、
R: 地域、当時はK中学
K: そや、
R: Y市の方
K: Y市の川隔てたところで
R: 子供たちもそこに住んでいる子供
K: はい

APPENDIX D

TABLE: CONTROL ISSUES & TEACHERS' RESISTANCE VOICES

Controlling Forces	Control Issues	Counter Movements	Voices of Teachers' Resistance
Economic Council Ministry of Education	<u>Assessment</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meritocracy • Entrance Exam • Standardized Testing 	universal education own assessment tools tutoring sessions	creating feelings of inferiority (Miya) education which value everyone (Miya) education for basic skills (Miya) creating competition (Ano) creating gap b/w areas (Nakamura)
Government (LDP) Ministry of Education	<u>Curriculum</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Textbook Censorship • Government study group 	self-selected materials own curriculum own textbook own materials	Kyoken as peace movements (Kushida) creating a textbook with colleagues (Miya) collaboration with PTA (Miya) Minkyoren challenging Union and Board of Education (Kushida)
Ministry of Education Board of Education Superintendents Principals	<u>Methods</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher Evaluation • National Guidelines • School Visit 	Kinpyo discussion with Board of Education Superintendent alternative method	creating division between Board of Education & teachers (Kiso) principals & teachers (Kiso) Union & Minkyoren (Kushida) disregarding teachers effort (Nakamura) influence on relationships among teachers (Iwata) censoring lives at school (Nakamura) water-pipe method (Maeda)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahmed, A. (1997). Postcolonial theory and the "post" condition. *Socialist Register*, 33, 353-381..
- Aizawa, S. (2005). Japanese educational structure from the perspective of student's ability to learn, 1957 to 1969: The analysis of educational movement discourse through the case study of english teaching. *The Journal of Educational Sociology*, 76, 187-205.
- Amano, I. (1998). Postwar Japanese Education: A history of reform and counterreform. In E. R. Beauchamp (Ed.), *Education and schooling in Japan since 1945* (pp. 152-167). New York: Garland Pub.
- Amin, S. (1989). *Eurocentrism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- _____. (1997). *Capitalism in the age of globalization: The management of contemporary society*. London ; Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Zed Books.
- Amino, Y. (1999). Japan in the world: Foreigners in japanese history. In Y. Ishii, & M. Yamauchi (Eds.), *Nihonjin to tabunka shugi* [日本人と多文化主義] (pp. 4-22). Tokyo: Kokusai Bunka Koryu Suishin Kyokai (Esu Japan).
- Apple, M. W. (2004). *Ideology and curriculum*. New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Banks, J. A. (1995). Multicultural education and curriculum transformation. *Journal of Negro Education*, 64(4), 390-400.
- Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (2001). *Handbook of research on multicultural education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bauman, Z. (1998). *Globalization: The human consequences*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Beauchamp, E. R. (1998). Education. In E. R. Beauchamp (Ed.), *Education and schooling in Japan since 1945* (pp. 312). New York: Garland Pub.
- _____. (Ed.). (1998). *Education and schooling in Japan since 1945*. New York: Garland Pub.
- _____. (1995). Reforming education in postwar Japan: American planning for a democratic Japan, 1943-1946. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* [H.W.Wilson - EDUC], 11, 67.
- Beck, U. (2000). *What is globalization?.* Cambridge, UK ; Malden, MA: Polity Press.

- Bell, J. S. (2002). Narrative inquiry: More than just telling stories. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36, 207-213.
- Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Brady, J., & Ohmann, R. (2008). Introduction: Radical teaching now. *Radical Teacher [H.W.Wilson - EDUC]*, (83), 2-4.
- Brecher, J., Costello, T., & Smith, B. (2000). *Globalization from below: The power of solidarity*. Cambridge, Mass.: South End Press.
- Carnoy, M., & Rhoten, D. (2002). What does globalization mean for educational change? A comparative approach. *Comparative Education Review*, 46(1), 1-9.
- Castro, F. (2000). In Deutschmann D. (Ed.), *Capitalism in crisis: Globalization and world politics today*. New York: Ocean Press.
- Clandinin, D., Pushor, D., & Orr, A. (2007). Navigating sites for narrative inquiry. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(1), 21-35.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry : Experience and story in qualitative research* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Clandinin, J. D., & Huber, J. (2002). Narrative inquiry: Toward understanding life's artistry. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 32(2), 161-169.
- Clayton, T. (1998). Beyond mystification: Reconnecting world-system theory for comparative education. *Comparative Education Review*, 42(4), 479-496.
- Coffey, A., & Atkinson, P. (1996). *Making sense of qualitative data: Complimentary research strategies*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publication.
- Connelly, M. F., & Clandinin, J. D. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, 19, 2-14.
- Connelly, M. F., Phillion, J., & He, M. (2003). An exploration of narrative inquiry into multiculturalism in education: Reflecting on two decades of research in an inner-city canadian community school. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 33(4), 363-384.
- Cornbleth, C. (1998). An america curriculum? *Teachers College Record*, 99(4), 622-646.
- Cortazzi, M. (1993). *Narrative analysis*. London ; Washington, D.C.: Falmer Press.

- Coulmas, F. (2002). Language policy in modern Japanese education. In J. W. Tollefson (Ed.), *Language policies in education* (pp. 203-224). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Dale, R. (2000). Globalization and education: Demonstrating a 'common world educational culture' or locating a 'globally structured educational agenda'? *Educational Theory*, 50(4), 427-448.
- Davis, A. Y. (1981). *Women, race, & class*. New York: Random House.
- _____. (1990). *Women, culture & politics*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. [New York]: Herder and Herder.
- Gimenez, M. E. (2001). Marxism, and class, gender, and race: Rethinking the trilogy. *Race, Gender & Class*, 8(2), 23.
- Gorski, P. *EdChange*. Retrieved September 3, 2009, from <http://www.edchange.org/>
- Gottlieb, N. (1994). Language and politics: The reversal of postwar script reform policy in Japan. *Journal of Asian Studies*, 53(4), 1175-1198.
- Graham, N. (2009, August 6). Limbaugh: "Adolf Hitler, like Barack Obama, ruled by dictate". *Huffington Post*,
- Gudmundsdottir, S. (1997). Introduction to the theme issue of "Narrative perspectives on research on teaching and teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13(1), 1-3.
- Harman, C. (2008). *A people's history of the world*. London ; New York: Verso.
- Held, D., & McGrew, A. G. (2003). *The global transformations reader : An introduction to the globalization debate*. Cambridge, UK Malden, MA USA: Polity Press ; Distributed in the USA by Blackwell Pub.
- Horio, T. (1997). *Gendai shakai to kyoiku* [現代社会と教育]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Ishii, Y., & Yamauchi, M. (Eds.). (1999). *Nihonjin to tabunka shugi* [日本人と多文化主義]. Tokyo: Kokusai Bunka Koryu Suishin Kyokai (Esu Japan).
- Kikkawa, T., & Todoroki, M. (1996). School education and democratization of social consciousness in post-war Japan. *The Journal of Educational Sociology*, 58, 87-101.

- Kitagawa, M. M., & Kitagawa, C. (1987). *Making connections with writing : An expressive writing model in Japanese schools*. Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.
- Labaree, D. (1997). *How to succeed in school without really learning: The credentials race in American education*. New Heaven: Yale University Press.
- Leistyna, P. (1999). In Kincheloe J. L., McLaren P. and Steinberg S. (Eds.), *Presence of mind: Education and the politics of deception*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Leo, A. (2009, February 25). Is Obama Hitler or the antichrist? Those are the only two options. *Huffington Post*,
- Maehira, F. (1999). Incident of ethnic exhibition: Ethnicity and okinawa in modern japan. In Y. Ishii, & M. Yamauchi (Eds.), *Nihonjin to tabunka shugi* [日本人と多文化主義] (pp. 23-35). Tokyo: Kokusai Bunka Koryu Suishin Kyokai (Esu Japan).
- McLaren, P. (1998). Revolutionary pedagogy in post-revolutionary times: Rethinking the political economy of critical education. *Educational Theory*, 48(4), 431-462.
- Modelski, G. (2000). Globalization. In D. Held, & A. McGrew (Eds.), *The global transformations reader: An introduction to the globalization debate* (2nd ed., pp. 55-59). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Mogadime, D. (2008). Racial differential experiences of employment equity for women teachers: One teacher's narrative of resistance and struggle. *Journal of Black Studies*, 39(1), 85-108.
- Montano, T., Lopez-Torres, L., & DeLissovoy, N. (2002). Teachers as activists: Teacher development and alternate sites of learning. *Equity & Excellence in Education [H.W.Wilson - EDUC]*, 35(3), 265-275.
- Motani, Y. (2002). Towards a more just educational policy for minorities in Japan: The case of Korean ethnic schools. *Comparative Education*, 38(2), 225-237.
- Moulder, F. V. (1997). Teaching about race and ethnicity: A message of despair or A message of hope? *Teaching Sociology*, 25(2), 120-127.
- Nagai, H. (2002). Multicultural education in the united states and Japan. *Comparative International Education Society*,
- Ngugi wa, T. (1992). *Moving the centre : The struggle for cultural freedoms*. London Portsmouth, N.H.: J. Currey; Heinemann.

- Noguchi, M. G. (2001). Introduction: The crumbling of a myth. In M. G. Noguchi, & S. Fotos (Eds.), *Studies in Japanese bilingualism* (pp. 1-23). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Parkipuny, M. (1989). *The human rights situation of indigenous peoples in Africa*. Retrieved March 3, 2005, from <http://cwis.org/fwj/22/hra.htm>
- Passin, H. (1965). *Society and education in Japan*. [New York]: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College.
- Polkinghorne, D. E. (1995). Narrative configuration in qualitative analysis. In J. A. Hach, & R. Wisniewski (Eds.), *Life history and narrative* (pp. 6-23). London: The Falmer Press.
- _____. (2005). Language and meaning: Data collection in qualitative research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52(2), 137-145.
- Reardon, B. A., & School of Education, Malmo (Sweden) Dept of Educational and Psychological Research. (1999). *Peace education: A review and projection. peace education reports no. 17*
- Reischauer, E. O., & Craig, A. M. (1989). *Japan, tradition & transformation*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Reischauer, E. O. (1977). *The Japanese*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press.
- Rincon, H., Sala, M., Sala, F., Tarnapol Whitacre, P., Lee, T., & Academy for, E. D. (2005). *Basic education in El Salvador: Consolidating the foundations for quality and equal opportunities*. Academy for Educational Development.
- Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2000). Globalization and education: Complexities and contingencies. *Educational Theory*, 50(4), 419-426.
- Rodney, W. (1981). *How europe underdeveloped africa*. Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press.
- Ryang, S. (1997). *North Koreans in Japan: Language, ideology, and identity*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Sakai, T. (1999). *Kodomo to kyōiku no rekishi* [子供と教育の歴史]. Tōkyō: Popurasha.
- Sassen, S. (1998). *Globalization and its discontents*. New York: New Press.
- Sato, N. E. (2004). *Inside Japanese classrooms: The heart of education*. New York; London: Routledge Falmer.

- Sewell, W. C. (2005). Affecting social change: The struggle for educators to transform society. *Educational Foundations*, 19(3/4), 5-14.
- Shimbori, M. (1968). Toward a sociology of industrialization and education. *The Journal of Educational Sociology*, 23, 5-18.
- Siddle Walker, V. (2005). Organized resistance and black educators' quest for school equality, 1878-1938. *Teachers College Record*, 107(3), 355-388.
- Sleeter, C. E. (1989). Multicultural education as a form of resistance to oppression. *Journal of Education*, 171(3), 51-71.
- _____. (2000). Creating an empowering multicultural curriculum. *Race, Gender and Class*, 7(3), 178-196.
- _____. (2008). Teaching for democracy in an age of corporatocracy. *Teachers College Record*, 110(1), 139-159.
- Sōjinsha. (1982; 1983). *Sengo nihon kyōiku shiryō shūsei* [戦後日本教育史料集成]. Tōkyō: San'ichi Shobō.
- St. Denis, V. (2000). Indigenous peoples, globalization, and education: Making connections. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, XLVI(1), 36-48.
- Tabb, W. K. (2001). *The amoral elephant: Globalization and the struggle for social justice in the twenty-first century*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Tai, E. (2003). Rethinking culture, national culture, and Japanese culture. *Japanese Language and Literature*, 37(1, Special Issue: Sociocultural Issues in Teaching Japanese: Critical Approaches), 1-26.
- Takahashi, T., & Saito, T. (Eds.). (2006). *Kenpo ga kawattemo sensou ni naranai to omotteiru hito no tame no hon* [憲法が変わっても戦争にならないと思っている人のための本]. Tokyo: Nihon Hyoron Sha.
- Tatum, B. D. (1997). *"Why are all the black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?" and other conversations about race. A psychologist explains the development of racial identity*. New York: Basic Books.
- Tickle, L., Bancroft, P., Roberts, J., & Bright, K. (2001). The organic intellectual educator. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 31(2), 159-178.
- Torres, C. A. (2002). Globalization, education, and citizenship: Solidarity versus market? *American Educational Research Journal*, 39(2), 363-378.

- Wallerstein, I. M. (2004). *World-systems analysis: An introduction*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Winant, H. (2001). *The world is a ghetto: Race and democracy since world war II*. New York: Basic Books.
- Wolf, N. (2007). *The end of America: Letter of warning to a young patriot*. White River Junction, Vt.: Chelsea Green Pub.
- Wortham, S. (2000). Interactional positioning and narrative self-construction. *Narrative Inquiry*, 10(1), 157-184.
- Wray, H. (1991). Change and continuity in modern japanese educational history: Allied occupational reforms forty years later. *Comparative Education Review*, 35(3), 447-475.
- Zhao, H., & Poulson, L. (2006). A biographical narrative inquiry into teachers' knowledge: An intergenerational approach. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 7(2), 123-132.
- Zinn, H. (1980). *A people's history of the United States*. [London ; New York]: Longman.