

Taneichi Kitazawa's Reception of the Concept of Democracy: Interest as the Basis of *Kyotsu-shugi* (Commonism)*

Chie Enza[†]

Translated by Nadezhda Murray[‡]

This paper focuses on how Taneichi Kitazawa, a leading progressive education practitioner, received the concept of democracy, and reconsiders the meaning of democracy in Japanese progressive education, conventionally considered within the framework of early modern Japanese political ideology. Kitazawa, having gleaned the idea of “common interests” from John Dewey’s concept of democracy, focused on the social quality of interest and advocated a classroom management theory. Seeing shared interests as the basic principle of group formation, his theory of classroom management indicates the significance of the classroom as a locus of “social life” and of “cooperative group projects.”

Keywords: Taneichi Kitazawa; democracy; John Dewey; interest; classroom management; progressive education; Taisho new education; project method

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to discuss the process of how Taneichi Kitazawa (1880-1931) received the concept of democracy, and to clarify its characteristics and significance. Kitazawa, who served as director of the Elementary School Affiliated with Tokyo Women’s Higher Normal School (hereafter the Affiliated Elementary School), guided it through practical reforms and is known as one of the leading practitioners of the Progressive Education Movement in modern Japan.

*This paper was originally published in Japanese, in *Kyoikugaku Kenkyu* (*The Japanese Journal of Educational Studies*), Vol. 84 No. 1 (2017). Some amendments have been made for the English translation, in order to assist readers from outside Japan who are not familiar with the specific Japanese historical context.

[†] Tokyo Gakugei University

e-mail: kanecom@u-gakugei.ac.jp

[‡] e-mail: bekomoya@gmail.com

The Japanese progressive education movement is called the Taisho New Education Movement (also Taisho Liberal Education Movement or Taisho Free Education Movement) because it flourished around the Taisho period (1912-1926). Existing research on Taisho new education has focused on Taisho democracy as the foundation of this movement, pointing out its limitations, such as its compliance with the status quo and its bourgeois nature.¹ In response to this, Akira Nakano has actively lauded the self-motivated research orientation of the activists who worked toward progressive education. Even Nakano's research, however, views their democratic philosophy as belonging within the scope of Sakuzo Yoshino's *minpon-shugi* (democratism), the fundamental political ideology of Taisho democracy, and confirms the significance of their formative awareness of the constitutional system and the limitations of remaining within the imperialist and emperor-based frameworks.² Consequently, while positive and negative views of Taisho new education differ, both research orientations are based in resistance to the existing political system as the index of their historical evaluation.

In addition, a common problem may be pointed out in the existing research which has carried out analysis within this framework. That is to say, even while discussing the connections between Taisho new education and democracy, the researchers fail almost entirely to analyze the way in which the practitioners themselves grasped the concept of democracy. Their evaluation of the significance of democracy is founded on a perspective divided between *minpon-shugi*, which embraces the emperor system, and *minshu-shugi*, which places rule in the people's hands. They have not approached the existence and actuality of the progressive education philosophy which has its own interpretation of democracy.

This paper focuses on democracy as a core concept of Kitazawa's educational philosophy. In existing research, he has never been positioned as a supporter of democracy within the educational world. Compared to his contemporaries Takeji Kinoshita and Heiji Oikawa, well-known practitioners of Taisho new education, little research focuses on Kitazawa. The role he played in the development of the Taisho New Education Movement, as well as the significance of his philosophy and practice, remains unclear. In the work of Masako Yaguchi and Toshiyuki Yoshimura, who have discussed the practice at the Affiliated Elementary School, there is a focus on Kitazawa as an advocate of "*sagyo kyoiku*" (work education; as discussed below, this refers to education based on cooperative group projects), but no clarification of the basic principles underpinning his philosophy. For example, while Yaguchi points out that Kitazawa emphasized the "cultivation of sociality," she does not discuss on what basis he supported this,³ and therefore it remains unclear what "*sagyo kyoiku*" really was.

This paper, then, intends first to clarify how Kitazawa, having focused on the concept of democracy, understood it, and how he positioned it in the context of education. Thereupon, its task is to reveal how Kitazawa envisioned his educational reforms based on this concept. Consideration of the reception of the concept of democracy along these lines will enable discussion of how Kitazawa himself grasped the concept.

The author has heretofore clarified Kitazawa's reception of the project method prior to his study in the West and his reforms at the Affiliated Elementary School after returning to Japan.⁴ This paper will add a consideration of how Kitazawa understood the project method based on the reception of the concept of democracy, and clarify how this concept formed the basis of the classroom management theory, a pivotal tenet of *sagyo kyoiku* philosophy, which

he promoted after returning from his study in the West.

1. Characteristics of the understanding of democracy

(1) Democracy as *kyotsu-shugi* (commonism)

Kitazawa arrived at the Tokyo Women's Higher Normal School as a teacher of pedagogy, and also came to teach at the Affiliated Elementary School in March of 1910. His appointment had been requested by Toshitaka Fujii, a colleague at his previous workplace, Fukui Normal School, following Fujii's appointment as director of the Affiliated Elementary School. Kitazawa was expected to serve as his assistant. While it was in 1920 that Kitazawa himself became a full professor and the Affiliated Elementary School director, he had been making his presence felt as a leader in educational research before then. In 1918 he served as acting director while Fujii studied in the West, creating the Childhood Education Research Association as well as issuing and writing actively for the journal *Childhood Education*.⁵

During this period, Kitazawa expressed a clear interest in the concept of democracy. In his "Democracy and the Educational Ideal," published in *Childhood Education* in 1919, he argued that this concept carried the double meaning of "democracy as a political system" and "democracy as a form of social life." The former indicates "ruled by the governed, that is supported by those governed," or "self-government," yet this concept, he says, involves a contradiction in reality. This form of democracy does not actually exist anywhere in the world: "no matter in what country," he points out, "specialists in politics form governments and play the roles of rulers, even adopting a dictatorial attitude sometimes," and so "democracy as a concept is very far from the nation-state organizations of reality." Elsewhere, the latter arises from the stance in which democracy is "more than a form of government," and refers to "a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience," he says. Kitazawa argues that the latter concept of democracy expresses the significance of the "common," attempting to translate it as "*kyotsu-shugi* (commonism)."⁶

Kitazawa's focus on the latter concept of democracy derives from his consideration at the time of the works of John Dewey and of Dewey's colleague James H. Tufts, who strove to connect academia and social practice. Kitazawa had read Dewey's *Democracy and Education* (1916) by 1918 at the latest, and published a translation of Tufts' *Our Democracy* (1917) over 11 issues of *Childhood Education*, from 1919 into the following year.⁷ He comments on democracy in multiple other texts, with the understanding that what "American democracy" called for was "cooperation, common, and communication," and that its significance was misunderstood in Japan.⁸

Democracy and Education had been translated by Sukeshige Tasei as *The Education of Minpon-shugi* (1918) and by Riichiro Hoashi as *An Overview of Educational Philosophy: Minpon-shugi and Education* (1919); as with these titles, democracy was generally translated into Japanese as *minpon-shugi*. Kitazawa's translation as *kyotsu-shugi* was unusual compared to this contemporary standard, but he selected it based on Part 2 of Chapter 7 in *Democracy and Education*, "The Democratic Ideal." Here Dewey continues with his own definition of democracy, to the effect that its ideal is increasing the number of "individuals who participate in an interest," each changing while being influenced by one another.⁹ Kitazawa's point as follows seems to draw on this meaning.

“Individuals participating in and sharing an interest leads to each person comparing their own action with the others’ and considering that, finding that the action of others provides direction of some kind for their own. *When the individual joins a group and acts collectively due to this shared interest, each person comes to partake of changing and diverse stimulation, creating changing and diverse action in each individual* (emphasis added). In this way, each individual becomes able to express their own original capacities moving toward, as it were, complete development.”¹⁰

Sharing a “common interest” and working with others, being influenced by others, is what creates diverse changes in the behavior of the individual, encouraging complete development of the individual, he says. Therefore, the concept of democracy on which Kitazawa focuses includes as its essence the issue of education, indicating that the creation of the society and the individual take place simultaneously. If we distinguish the concepts of “democracy as a political system” and “democracy as a form of social life,” Kitazawa adheres to the latter by grasping it as “in a comparatively close relationship with the educational ideal.”¹¹

However, Dewey made it a precondition of democracy, in which both the individual and their society change and grow continuously, that the interests shared by a group be many and diverse, and that each group maintain free, mutually influencing relations with other groups.¹² Kitazawa also commented on this need, to the effect that “each member of society must share as many interests as possible with others,” and that the society must “have free interaction with other societies, with continually shifting customs.”¹³

In 1919, when Dewey visited Japan and Kitazawa saw the publication of “Democracy and the Educational Ideal” and translated *Our Democracy*, there were numerous papers on democracy published in educational journals, but few that focused on Dewey’s concept of democracy. The special “Studies of Democracy” issue published that year in *Kyoiku Gakujutsukai (The Pedagogical Review)* covered a debate on the political aspects of democracy, focusing on issues raised by the political scientist Yoshino with regard to universally inclusive elections, including participation by the prominent leader of the Taisho New Education Movement Masataro Sawayanagi among others.¹⁴ Kumaji Yoshida, who wrote actively about democracy among educational scholars, felt that its meaning “should be considered democracy in the political sense,”¹⁵ although he also referred elsewhere to democracy as discussed by Dewey. Yoshida mentioned that Dewey considered “mutual interests (advantages and disadvantages)” and “some degree of mutual effect” as conditions for democracy, pointed out that “if we take Dewey’s definition, not only the United States of North America (sic) but most civilized countries are in fact democratic,” and argued that this theory was “moderate” and “vague,” with “extremely obscure significance.”¹⁶ We see here the unique quality of Kitazawa’s understanding of democracy not as a political system but as the ideal of education, based on pursuing “common interest.”

(2) Focus on the classroom life as social life

Kitazawa’s understanding of the educational principles inherent in the concept of democracy was dependent on Dewey; in his *Research into New Pedagogy*, published in 1923 prior to his studies in the West, his theories on education were likewise based on *Democracy and Education*. In accordance with its Chapter 1, he argued that the three concepts of “Common, Communication, Community” were “inextricably related,” and that the establishment of life in “community” required sharing something in “common” and “communication.”¹⁷

Kitazawa argued that in order for “humans” to lead “lives in common,” they must share “purposes¹⁸, beliefs, aspirations, knowledge” and so on; among these, he focused on the importance of purposes, saying that “purposes are the most important of all.” However, he added that “shared purposes cannot be physically provided.”¹⁹ Because purposes cannot be bestowed or forcibly shared, he touched on the importance of “communication” as below.

“In order to hold something in common, communication is vital. Communication is not only required in order to have something in common and create a society; communication is, itself, life in society, and guides the student toward social life. Education thus and only thus enables the students to lead their lives and accomplish their goals.”²⁰

“Communication” is not only a method of forming society, but also “social life” in itself, he says. Therefore, Kitazawa argues, “a solid society, a living society, cannot be built simply by those living under the same roof, those of the same race, or those living in the same region.”²¹ According to Kitazawa, “communication” is “educative,” bringing “expansion” and “change” to “personal experience,” something in which “one participates in what others have thought and felt,” in which “to be a recipient of a communication changes one’s own attitude.”²² That is, as pointed out in the same book, “communication” refers to the educational functions of democracy discussed in the previous section.

In this way, Kitazawa understood that shared “purposes” became possible through “communication” with others; let us now consider how he addressed a project otherwise defined as a “purposeful activity.” In 1919, when Kitazawa was studying democracy, research on the project method, based on the principle of purposeful activity, was beginning at the Affiliated Elementary School due to a proposal from Fujii, who had returned from his study in the West. This research took as its model the experimental research proposed by William H. Kilpatrick at the Horace Mann School affiliated with Columbia University Teachers College, and proposed creating an experimental class at the Affiliated School the following year.²³ Kitazawa first translated Kilpatrick’s “The Theories Underlying the Experiment,” which indicated the educational policy at the Horace Mann School, and emphasized “interest,” already a key word for him, in the phrase “interest in being with others.”²⁴

While research into the project method was also being done by Soju Irisawa of Tokyo Imperial University and Taigan Matsunami of Nara Women’s Higher Normal School, it was in fact only Kitazawa who advanced the discussion of Kilpatrick’s experimental research and his paper “The Project Method.” As well, Kitazawa approved of the fact that, like Dewey, Kilpatrick considered being “wholehearted” a requirement for projects, and felt that of many project theorists he in particular argued for “the social or moral significance of projects.”²⁵ While these three have in common the idea of projects as purposeful activity, this interpretation represents a decisive difference between Irisawa, who felt that Kilpatrick’s theory was mere “emphasis on purpose” and Matsunami, who did not consider “wholehearted[ness]” a requirement for projects, and Kitazawa who did.²⁶ Kitazawa’s grasp of the project method was clearly premised upon his consideration of Dewey’s educational thought.

Here I want to focus on Kitazawa’s understanding that a society in the true sense is not established simply by individual behavior under a common purpose. According to Kitazawa, only when “individual behavior is suitably adjusted with awareness of a common purpose and interest in that common purpose...can a collective society, a collective lifestyle unit emerge.”²⁷ In this way, interest is made the precondition for a shared purpose. Kitazawa saw children feeling interest in a common purpose and engaging in behavior theretoward as the

ideal of education, and seems to have discovered the spirit of democracy in Kilpatrick's definition of projects as "wholehearted purposeful activity proceeding in a *social* (emphasis added) environment."²⁸

Further, Kitazawa wrote as follows in 1921 regarding the experiments at the Horace Mann School as proposed by Kilpatrick: "The Horace Mann School at Columbia University in America places great emphasis on moral education through social life, with their particular motto being cooperation and mutual helpfulness in classroom life. Their *classroom life as social life* (emphasis added) runs smoothly."²⁹

Kitazawa focused on the principles of the experiment, "cooperation" and "mutual helpfulness," and on their realization in "classroom life as social life." With this perspective, Kitazawa was to set off to study in the West in October of 1922, visiting many experimental schools working in progressive education before his return to Japan in December of 1924.

2. Experimental issues after studying abroad: advocating classroom management theory

After his return from abroad, Kitazawa, stimulated by the heartfelt research by "educational practitioners" in overseas experimental schools, objected to attitudes treating progressive education as a "fad" and began radical reforms of the research stance at the Affiliated Elementary School.³⁰ At this time, Kitazawa pointed out the limits of domestic practical reforms to the effect that "none of the progressive education schools go beyond the scope of the teaching 'method,'" and stated that practitioners must "take a radically new look at the 'school institution' at the very least."³¹ After his return, Kitazawa pointed out that even in Japan "teaching and educational methods are not that different from those of other countries," but the radical problem was that "Japanese teachers' insight into classrooms was not sufficiently established."³² He was impressed by the practitioners he had met overseas, who "did not simply work hard as teachers of each educational subject, but also possessed special awareness and ability as classroom managers."³³ Kitazawa focused on this point during his study abroad, and came to advocate classroom management theory after his return.

At a summer course provided by the Childhood Education Research Association in 1926, Kitazawa chose "classroom management" as his topic and lectured on "the concept of the classroom in progressive education," "the concept of classroom management and the stance of the classroom teacher in progressive education," and "methods of classroom management."³⁴ Based on the records of his lectures, he published *A Fundamental Theory of Classroom Management* (1927). Thereafter as well, Kitazawa published not only multiple papers on classroom management in educational journals, but also *Classroom Management in Sagyo Kyoiku* (1929) and *A Fundamental Theory of School Management* (1931), etc., focusing his interest on classroom and school management. Here, let us consider the characteristics of Kitazawa's theory of classroom management.

(1) Principles of classroom organization

It has been pointed out already that Kitazawa's theory of classroom management introduced "small groups" into the class, but this principle has not been sufficiently clarified.³⁵ In order to clarify this point, we must first discuss his view of the class group.

According to Kitazawa, one of the contributions of progressive education was the “discovery of the individual and the child” which had previously been buried in the group, while another was “school and classroom life as truly important social life.” He raised the importance of “focusing on social life” in education.³⁶ At that time in Japan, an elementary class size was permitted up to seventy children. It has been pointed out that pioneering private progressive schools, such as Seikei and Seijo Elementary Schools, set the upper limit of a class at thirty children, in favor of “smaller class sizes.”³⁷ In contrast, Kitazawa felt that larger class sizes were a better way to achieve the ideal education, arguing that the classroom should be organized so that it “embraces large numbers, while enabling interaction among differing individual personalities.”³⁸

Why did Kitazawa hold this perspective? Here I want to focus on the basic organizational principles of “the classroom in progressive education” which he advocated. Kitazawa positioned the class as “an organization of group projects,” arguing that its formation was based primarily on “common interests”, and that according to this principle it must be a group in which “age, intelligence, and academic ability are irrelevant.”³⁹ We can see Kitazawa’s view of the class as derived from the ideal of democracy as the enlargement of a group of people with common interests. In his *Classroom Management in Sagyo Kyoiku* (1929), he lists “1) Common Interests, 2) Communication, 3) Community (Gemeinschaft)⁴⁰” as the essential elements for the formation of “society” or “class groups.”⁴¹ As we have seen, these are key words for Kitazawa in Dewey’s educational theory. In the same book, Kitazawa focuses on the quotation below from *Democracy and Education*, touching on the social quality of interest to which Dewey refers: “Individuals are certainly interested, at times, in having their own way, and their own way may go contrary to the ways of others. But they are also interested, and chiefly interested upon the whole, in entering into the activities of others and taking part in conjoint and cooperative doings. Otherwise, no such thing as a community would be possible.”⁴²

Kitazawa pointed out in relation to the interpretation of Japanese educational administration that there was no active significance in composing a class of children “of different ages and abilities,” but that “all-age or multiple-age classrooms” were organized due to “inevitable economic conditions.”⁴³ At the Affiliated Elementary School in the late 1920s, progressive education research was being carried out throughout the school,⁴⁴ and based on the above-mentioned view of the classroom, the multiple-age classrooms which had already existed were apparently considered important organizations for practical research into progressive education. A teacher at this period, Shunji Yamanouchi, who was involved in progressive educational research concerning multiple-age classrooms, wrote that to consider that “the number of children in one classroom should be as small as possible for the ideal” was “a misconception of the ideal of education in the new sense,” sharing Kitazawa’s doubts about small classes,⁴⁵ while obviously finding an active significance in multiple-age classrooms. In *Multiple-Age Classroom Management in Sagyo Kyoiku* (1933), Yamanouchi entitled a section “The New Mission of Multiple-Age Education,” and argued that, given that “classroom education should involve as many individuals as possible,” “the natural blending of diverse people is the most ideal classroom,” with more educational significance in “multiple-age classrooms, that is involving children of various ages” than in a single-age group. In this book, he also espouses the organizational principle of the class as “common interests, communication, cooperative community.”⁴⁶

(2) “Communication” and “cooperation” in “group projects”

According to Kitazawa, the conventional educational view of the classroom was “a place to teach subject matter.”⁴⁷ However, he felt that the viewpoint of “classroom instruction” made it impossible to grasp “the entirety of children’s lives,” and that through “the life experience of carrying out a common life in society and working based on common interests,” it was “the essence of classroom management” to “guide... the maturing personality as a whole...toward the path leading to greater completeness.” Based on this view of education, he positioned “knowledge and skill,” conventionally “the targets of instruction,” as “tools” or “products” of growth.⁴⁸ Having pointed out the narrowness of the concept of “instruction,” Kitazawa argued that in order to make the classroom an organization of “social life,” the teacher must “guide the life of children” through “group projects”;⁴⁹ the “social life” thus established would itself create further “group projects.” These two processes would develop in mutuality.⁵⁰

During the late 1920s, Kitazawa came to focus particularly on the need for “group projects” based on “cooperative purposes.” Since the introduction of the project method, purposeful activities had been a principle of education at the Affiliated Elementary School; as we saw in section 1, Kitazawa wrote that purposes must be allowed to be “shared” through “communication,” focusing on the social significance of the project method as well. How did Kitazawa approach purposeful activities after his time abroad?

Kitazawa stated that “common interests are the essentials for cooperative purposes”⁵¹ and discussed “communication” and “cooperation” in the context of group projects. He states that “communication” is the first essential for establishing group projects. On this point he writes that “the most valuable methods of communication are the mutual expression of emotions, the exchange of opinions, debates, etc.” and that it is necessary to “express fully one’s own thoughts and feelings to achieve proper communication,” and to “express oneself suitably just as is.” However, regarding the debate-type learning method in general, he points out that it has become a formulaic method of “acquiring knowledge and skill,” and encourages his readers to take care not to lose the significance of determining purposes. Through true “communication,” he says, “common interests are discovered” and “cooperative purposes” can be determined.⁵²

He also points out that with regard to the determination of cooperative purposes, “one important condition” is whether or not you are truly able to accept them as “your own.” Even when “the decision is made by overall discussion and based on full understanding,” not made by a single teacher or child, the individual must consider “whether or not to make it truly their own.” Distinct from “parliamentary” resolutions or “political processes” of which some may feel that “I didn’t agree to it, but it’s a majority decision so what can I do, might as well go ahead,” the determination of purposes must be “educational” and “ideal.”⁵³

As well, in order to carry out group projects, Kitazawa encouraged “cooperation in small groups.” He stated that the composition of these groups should be determined not by academic ability but by a consideration of each individual’s interests, coming together as naturally as possible based on common interests.⁵⁴ When multiple groups based on “common interests” become interrelated, “with interaction and unity as a whole,” “the class has finally begun its activity,” he felt.⁵⁵ In this way, if “various small groups are created,” which become “a unified organic organization,” “the class becomes a diverse group of individuals rather than a group of overall similarity, better reflecting actual society,”⁵⁶ Kitazawa argues,

calling not simply for enlarging the size of classes but focusing on the diversity of the individual and the small group. "Cooperation" refers to "not shrinking the self, but enlarging it," thus enabling the "increase of each individual's capacity,"⁵⁷ Kitazawa felt, so that group projects would further the growth of each individual.

(3) The role of the teacher: principles of "direction"

In *Classroom Management in Sagyo Kyoiku*, Kitazawa writes of "direction as an important concept in classroom management," "as John Dewey argues in his educational philosophy."⁵⁸ Here his "direction" refers to Chapter 3 of *Democracy and Education*, "Education as Direction." In Kitazawa's writings on democracy of 1919, he published discussions of "direction and control," relying on the same book,⁵⁹ but after his study abroad, he frequently discussed "direction" theory in his writings on classroom management.

Saying that "while 'direction' is becoming something of a buzzword, it cannot be simply a replacement for 'instruction,' and is used very vaguely," he encouraged teachers to be aware of the significance of the word.⁶⁰ "Direction" ought to require the premise that "learners are those engaged in purposeful activity," but "when direction is furthered with a focus on the teacher's purposeful activity, it goes beyond the range of direction and before you know it becomes control or force."⁶¹ According to Kitazawa, as a rule "government" is the concept under which "politicians" control "citizens" or "subjects," and "is significantly different from the process of education in which we are engaged." "Political rulers look at society from the viewpoint of controlling people," he pointed out, "but educators do so from that of directing people."⁶²

Relying on Dewey, Kitazawa argues that "direction" means the function of "focusing an activity toward its goals" including both "simultaneous direction and continuing direction." The former refers to the function of avoiding situations in which "inexperienced" children lose sight of their goal and become "distracted," "wasting their energy," and to "turn their focus back to the work they are doing now." The latter refers to the function of "creating order in an activity," guiding children toward a state in which "the first stage of the activity becomes a means for the second, which becomes a means for the third, maintaining a constant cycle of means and end and unifying the activity."⁶³ In short, while keeping children's activity focused on their goal, "direction" prevents the activity from becoming a one-time thing and instead keeps it continuously developing toward the goal.

Based on a view of direction which assumes children are engaged in purposeful activities, Kitazawa discussed the role of the teacher with regard to the principles already mentioned, such as "cooperation" and "communication." The teacher is not only "the one who teaches," but also a "cooperator" in the classroom, who must both "keep children working together toward their purpose" and "cooperate with each member as another member." The teacher is also called on as a "mediator" to "maintain mutual communication and understanding between each group" within the class.⁶⁴ In the conclusion to *A Fundamental Theory of Classroom Management*, Kitazawa writes that "creating a school life as a unified group with common interests" is "the duty of the school manager,"⁶⁵ which we can see as his own task as a director at the Affiliated Elementary School. He came to believe that individual teachers must, like the children, be "engaged in their own purposeful activity," and to position "cooperation" on "common interests" as their first condition.⁶⁶

3. The philosophical foundation of *sagyo kyoiku*

As we have seen, after returning from the West in the late 1920s, Kitazawa became actively involved in the theory of classroom management. He came to advocate “*sagyo kyoiku*” around 1927, and lectured thereon at a summer course of the Childhood Education Research Association in that year. Based on the records of the lecture, *An Introduction to Sagyo Kyoiku* was published in 1929. Subsequent publications included *Modern Sagyo Kyoiku* in 1930, *Problems in Modern Sagyo Kyoiku* in 1931, and *The Essence of Sagyo Kyoiku* in 1932. This group of works from around 1930 also addresses the classroom as a place for “social life” and the significance of “group projects” there, showing that Kitazawa shaped his philosophy of *sagyo kyoiku* based on the foundation of his classroom management theory.

With regard to Kitazawa’s educational philosophy, previous research has, without touching on its formative process or his reception of information gleaned overseas, pointed out the influence and similarities of German *Arbeitspädagogik* (working pedagogy), notably Georg Kerschensteiner.⁶⁷ However, Kitazawa was aware that even in German *Arbeitspädagogik* there were competing ideas. He pointed out, for instance, that Kerschensteiner focused on the “nation-state” whereas Hugo Gaudig disagreed with Kerschensteiner and focused on the “individual”; he writes that “going too far in either direction is undesirable,” and that “one must not decide too readily which to apply and which to join in with.” He takes the position, therefore, that “at any rate, our attitude must be...[that] society is nothing without the individual, and the individual cannot exist without society.”⁶⁸

After his study abroad, Kitazawa focused on various educational trends from abroad as well as that of German *Arbeitspädagogik*; we see in the process of his progressive education research that the foundations of his educational philosophy were formed by the empathetic reception of the philosophy of American pragmatists such as Dewey, Tufts, and Kilpatrick. In particular, from the beginning of his research on, it was Dewey’s *Democracy and Education* that served as an unshifting foundation stone for Kitazawa’s educational philosophy. He had met Dewey at Columbia University Teachers College. Kiyoshi Takayama, who studied at Teachers College for some time, wrote that “[Kitazawa] debated very well in the classroom with Dewey, a leading light not only of the American academy but of pedagogical circles world-wide. I felt at the time that very few Japanese students could have discussed educational philosophy with Professor Dewey so well, in English.”⁶⁹

The memorial seminar held for Kitazawa by the Affiliated Elementary School in 1931 also suggested that after his return from study in the West Kitazawa “talked about Dewey’s educational philosophy” to the teachers at his school. They remembered that he had “talked a great deal about the issue of interests,” and “raised the issue of interests frequently.”⁷⁰ It is clear that Dewey’s theory of interest was foremost in his mind. He did indeed raise “research on children’s interests” as a primary issue to handle in the late 1920s at the Affiliated Elementary School.⁷¹

In *An Introduction to Sagyo Kyoiku*, Kitazawa positions *Democracy and Education* as his major reference work, while pointing out that in the development of the philosophy of *sagyo kyoiku*, Dewey’s philosophy had been adopted not only in America but in “France, Germany, England, etc.,” with practical reformation continuing “throughout Europe today, with [Dewey] as the authority.”⁷² Above all, Kitazawa’s own major principles of *sagyo kyoiku* were drawn from Dewey’s educational philosophy. In his article entitled “Fundamental

Principles of Sagyo Kyoiku," published before his death in 1931, Kitazawa discussed the "principle of purposeful activity," "principle of direction," and "principle of sociality," positioning "all other principles [as] secondary principles generated by the three major principles."⁷³ The final "principle of sociality" refers to "carrying out social life and group projects," while all three principles are displayed in his theory of classroom management based on Dewey's educational philosophy.

Naturally, Kitazawa did not develop his educational theory and practical reformations based solely on Dewey alone. However, in his case, because he drew his own practical issues from Dewey's educational philosophy, his perspective on his study in the West became clear, and he was able to grasp what he needed to further his own issues out of the vast quantity of educational information made available to him during that time. Regarding the significance of the reception of German educational information, a consideration of the examples and content of the *Arbeitspädagogik* and *Gemeinschaftschule* (community school) on which he focused is required, but his sympathy with Dewey's educational philosophy created different principles and views of society from those of Irisawa, who also began research on the project method and shifted his research issues thereafter to *Kulturpädagogik* (cultural pedagogy). While Tajima Elementary School, which relied on cultural pedagogy under Irisawa's guiding hand, tended to focus on the research of regional cultural assets,⁷⁴ research at Kitazawa's Affiliated Elementary School focused on the practical study of children's interests and their social quality; this difference also requires attention.

Conclusion

This paper has grasped the idea of "common interests" from Kitazawa's concept of democracy, and clarified the process through which he explored this idea within his own practical issues. While understanding the various educational principles inherent in democracy, Kitazawa also based his own educational philosophy on this concept and advocated for *sagyo kyoiku*. Based upon the discussion so far, I want to point out the following issues with regard to the significance of Kitazawa's reception of the concept of democracy.

First, the significance of the reception of the concept of democracy in Dewey's educational philosophy. Conventional Taisho new education research has been, as pointed out in the introduction, lacking in discussion of the reception of the concept of democracy; elsewhere, even research which has discussed this reception from a Deweyan perspective in the Taisho period has focused on the context of early modern Japanese political ideology and its concepts of democracy, which, as I have pointed out, is a limited perspective.⁷⁵ However, we cannot explain Kitazawa's finding of the idea of "common interests" in the concept of democracy and further pursuit of practical issues with this as a core idea simply with the contemporary typical political ideologies.

In Kitazawa's case, from the standpoint of a practitioner, because he pursued the ideal of democracy in which the individual and their group grow together, he was able to ascertain the most basic principles to further practical reformation in the shared interests which are a prerequisite for this kind of educational practice. As well, while Dewey had been working on his theory of interest from the 1890s on, because Kitazawa's reception of this theory was through *Democracy and Education*, he focused on the social nature of interests. Future dis-

cussion is required with regard to the influence of Dewey's concept of democracy and theory of interests in the sphere of pedagogy, with attention to the stance of the receivers and their interests.

Second, the significance of Kitazawa's theory of classroom management, with a basis in the concept of democracy. Conventional research, with the focus of Taisho new education on the social significance of the classroom, has addressed Takeji Kinoshita's theory of classroom management, but this has been considered a "model of the political organization of the constitutional nation-state," promoting "self-government" within the classroom with its "jurisdictional organizations" and "executive organizations."⁷⁶ However, Kitazawa did not consider the concept of democracy as a basis for classroom organization analogous to a political system of government, and distinguished "parliamentary" "majority" decisions from children's "purpose determination."

As well, the standard wisdom on the limits of Taisho progressive education indicates that its reforms did not touch the content of education, and were limited to teaching and learning methods.⁷⁷ However, by addressing classroom management, Kitazawa attempted to overcome the limitations of methodological reforms. It has been noted in recent years that the implementation of the project method was significant with regard to curriculum reforms in Taisho new education;⁷⁸ Kitazawa's classroom management theory, which related "social life" and shared purposeful activity in the form of "group projects," as well as containing curriculum reforms, can be said to have had the intent to reform the school institution itself.

We must admit that Kitazawa, who distinguished educational and political theory, did not approach reforms to the existing political system. The problems of previous research on Taisho progressive education are not the failure to point out this political limitation, but based on this evaluation, overlooking individual philosophies and original practices, failing to sufficiently clarify the diversity of Taisho new education, which includes various ranges and achievements of reform in each example. In particular, the educational significance of sociality in Taisho new education, as we see in Kitazawa's case, has not been fully considered so far.

Because Kitazawa's perspective was that true life in society is established only by shared interests, he approached "school life" from the early days of his reception of the concept of democracy as "in a sense, a firmer life in society than life in a nation-state."⁷⁹ It is clear at the very least that Kitazawa's view on society, when approaching classroom and school life as social life, was not a miniature of existing nation-states. Kitazawa wrote in 1931 that "we must advance the ideals of education toward the ideals of the social individual," pointing out that the conventional problems of education were "an attempt to educate people based on the lofty concept of a single nation-state, *separate from the individual* (emphasis added)."⁸⁰

This paper has clarified that Kitazawa's educational philosophy was formed on the basis of Dewey's concept of democracy, but there is still a need for research into how precise his understanding was. From a social perspective, because after his return from studying abroad Kitazawa focused for his practical research at the Affiliated Elementary School mainly on the Gemeinschaftschule in Hamburg and the Winnetka System, this point needs consideration along with the clarification of the actuality of his reception. In addition, in order to view rigorously the achievements and limitations of the reforms at the Affiliated Elementary School in the late 1920s, we must clarify how Kitazawa's specific practices were developed, based

on his educational philosophy, while focusing on the teachers' understanding and approaches.

Notes

- 1 Representative research includes Teruhisa Horio, "Shakai = Kyoiku kozo no henka ("Changes in Society = Educational Structure") *Nihon Kindai Kyoikushi*, Iwanami Koza Gendai Kyoikugaku vol. 5, Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1962, pp. 164-186. For English-language research on Taisho democracy and the "minpon-shugi" of the major political scientist of the time, Sakuzo Yoshino, see Bernard S. Silberman, "The Political Theory and Program of Yoshino Sakuzō" (*The Journal of Modern History*, vol. 31, no. 4, 1959, pp. 310-324) and Takayoshi Matsuo, "The Development of Democracy in Japan: Taishō Democracy: Its Flowering and Breakdown" (*The Developing Economies*, vol. 4, no. 4, 1966, pp. 612-632). Research on Taisho democracy, including the work of Nakano referred to in note 2, has been based on postwar Japanese historiographical findings.
- 2 Akira Nakano, "Taisho kyoiku to sono rekishiteki seikaku" ("Taisho new education and its historical character") *Kindai Kyoikushi*, Kyoikugaku Zenshu vol. 3, Shogakkan, 1968, pp. 125-139, *ibid.*, *Taisho Jiyu Kyoiku no Kenkyu (Research on Taisho Liberal Education)*, Nagoya: Reimei Shobo, 1968, *ibid.*, *Kaitei Zoho Taisho Democracy to Kyoiku: 1920 Nendai no Kyoiku (Expanded Version: Taisho Democracy and Education: Education in the 1920s)*, Tokyo: Shin-Hyoron, 1990, pp. 54-70.
- 3 Masako Yaguchi, "Seikatsu kyoiku no kenkyu (3)" ("Research into life education (3)"), *Fukuoka Kyoiku Daigaku Kiyō*, vol. 42, no. 2, 1993, pp. 131-148; Toshiyuki Yoshimura, "Tokyo Joshi Koto Shihan Gakko Fuzoku Shogakko ni okeru 'sagyō kyoiku'" ("Sagyō kyoiku' at the Elementary School Affiliated with Tokyo Women's Higher Normal School"), *Miyagi Kyoiku Daigaku Kiyō*, vol. 31, no. 2, 1996, pp. 17-185.
- 4 Chie Enza, *Kindai Nihon ni okeru Project Method no Juyo (The Reception of the Project Method in Modern Japan)*, Tokyo: Kazama Shobo, 2013, pp. 103-116; Enza and Miho Hashimoto, "Taisho shinkyōiku no jissen ni ataeta Decroly kyoikuho no eikyō—'Kyōmi no chushin' riron no juyo wo chushin ni" ("The influence of the Decroly Method on Taisho new education: Focusing on the reception of the 'centers of interest' theory"), *Kindai Kyoiku Forum*, vol. 23, 2014, pp. 297-309; Kenta Tsukahara and Enza, "Tokyo Joshi Koto Shihan Gakko Fuzoku Shogakko ni okeru sagyō kyoiku no kenkyu taisei—Kitazawa Taneichi ni yoru Obei ryugakugo no kaikaku wo chushin ni" ("Research orientations on *sagyō kyoiku* at the Elementary School Affiliated with Tokyo Women's Higher Normal School: Focusing on Taneichi Kitazawa's post-Western study reforms"), *Tokyo Gakugei Daigaku Kiyō*, vol. 66, 2015, pp. 79-91.
- 5 For Kitazawa's background, see page 129-131 in this author's work. He served as director of the Affiliated Elementary School in the 1920s and became director of the allied Affiliated Higher Women's School in 1930, before dying the following year.
- 6 Taneichi Kitazawa, "Democracy and the Educational Ideal," *Jido Kyoiku*, vol. 13 no. 6, 1919, pp. 44-48. In other papers, Kitazawa used the transliterated English word "democracy." He also referred to the latter democracy as "social democracy."
- 7 Kitazawa uses *Democracy and Education* in "Jido no kankyo seiri wo ronzu" ("On organizing children's environments") *Jido Kyoiku*, vol. 13, no.1, 1918, pp. 4-8. The translation of *Our Democracy* appeared in *Jido Kyoiku*, vol. 13, no. 10 and thereafter under pennames including Hosui and Hosuisei.
- 8 Kitazawa, "Saikin kyōjujo no shomondai (zoku)" ("Some problems in modern instruction (Part 2)") *Jido Kyoiku*, vol. 13, no. 11, 1919, p. 27.
- 9 John Dewey, *Democracy and Education*, New York: Macmillan, 1916, p.101. Translations referred to include Yasuo Matsuno, *Minshushugi to Kyoiku*, Tokyo: Iwanami, 1975, etc.
- 10 Kitazawa, *op. cit.* "Democracy and the Educational Ideal," p. 46.
- 11 *Ibid.*, p. 47.
- 12 Dewey, *op. cit.*, pp. 96-100.
- 13 Kitazawa, *op. cit.*, "Democracy and the Educational Ideal," p. 46.
- 14 Special edition "Democracy no ronkyū" ("Studies in Democracy"), *Kyoiku Gakujutsukai*, vol. 38

- no. 6, 1919, pp. 16-44.
- 15 Kumaji Yoshida, "Democracy ron" ("Theory of Democracy"), *Toa no Hikari*, vol. 14, no. 1, 1919, p.13.
- 16 Yoshida, "Shin democracy ron" ("New Theory of Democracy"), *Toa no Hikari*, vol. 14, no. 2, 1919, pp. 9-10.
- 17 Kitazawa, *Shin Kyoikuho no Kenkyu (Research into New Pedagogy)*, Tokyo: Ryubunkan, 1923, pp. 32-57. Parentheses are in the original. Here the theory is based on Chapter 1 section 2 "Education and Communication" of Dewey's book. Pages 64-108 also draw on Dewey (see note 9).
- 18 Dewey himself uses the word "aims" in this text within *Democracy and Education*, but I have chosen to use "purposes" throughout this paper for consistency, as the Japanese term can be translated in either way.
- 19 Kitazawa, op. cit., *Research into New Pedagogy*, p. 38.
- 20 Ibid., p. 37.
- 21 Ibid., pp. 41-42.
- 22 Ibid., p. 45.
- 23 Regarding the reception of the Project Method, see Enza, pp. 119-122, 131-136.
- 24 Kitazawa, "Horace Mann School no shogakko shoho kyoiku no kenkyu" ("Research into the Horace Mann Studies in Primary Education"), *Jido Kyoiku*, vol. 14, no.1, 1919, p.70.
- 25 Kitazawa, op. cit., *Research into New Pedagogy*, pp. 133, 357.
- 26 Enza, pp. 139-140, 173, 228-231.
- 27 Kitazawa, op cit., *Research into New Pedagogy*, p. 42.
- 28 William H. Kilpatrick, "The Project Method," *Teachers College Record*, vol. 19, no. 4, 1918, p. 320.
- 29 Kitazawa, "Dotoku kyoiku no kaizo" ("Reforms in Moral Education"), *Shogakko*, vol. 31, no. 6, 1921, p. 22.
- 30 Tsukahara/Enza, op. cit.
- 31 Hosuisei "Ikizumari" dakai no saku" ("How to get 'unstuck'"), *Jido Kyoiku*, vol. 19, no. 4, 1925, p. 1.
- 32 Kitazawa, "Gakkyu keiei ni tsuite (1)" ("On Classroom Management (Part 1)"), *Kyoiku Jissaikai*, vol. 1 no. 1, 1928, p. 152.
- 33 Kitazawa, *Gakkyu Keiei Genron (A Fundamental Theory of Classroom Management)*, Tokyo: Toyo Tosho, 1927, introduction p. 1.
- 34 "Jido kyoiku kenkyukai kaki koshukai yokoku" ("Notice of the Summer Intensive Course of the Childhood Education Research Association"), *Jido Kyoiku*, vol. 20, no. 6, 1926, advertisement.
- 35 Tetsufumi Miyasaka ed., *Bundan Shido: Han Gakushu no Tenkai (Small Group Instruction: Development of Group Study)*, Tokyo: Meiji Tosho, 1963, pp. 21-22; Kentaro Kihara ed., *Koza: Shoshudan Shido (Courses on Small Group Instruction)*, Tokyo: Meiji Tosho, 1969, pp. 113-114; Katsumi Takahashi, "Kitazawa Taneichi no shoshudan shido ron—zasshi 'Jido Kyoiku' ni shokai sareta jissen hokoku wo tegakari ni" ("Kitazawa Taneichi's theory of small group instruction: drawing on reports of practice introduced in the journal *Jido Kyoiku*"), *Nagoya Daigaku Kyoikugakubu Kiyo*, vol. 46, no. 1, 1999, pp. 29-38.
- 36 Kitazawa, op. cit., *A Fundamental Theory of Classroom Management*, p. 40.
- 37 Hiroaki Shimura, *Gakkyu Keiei no Rekishi (History of Classroom Management)*, Tokyo: Sanseido, 1994.
- 38 Kitazawa, op. cit., *A Fundamental Theory of Classroom Management*, pp. 28-31.
- 39 Ibid., pp. 65-67.
- 40 In this book (p. 41), Kitazawa writes "The concept of schools and classrooms for the sake of life in society has recently been realized most characteristically in experimental schools in Germany." He focuses in particular on the experimental schools in Hamburg; research on this is a promising avenue for the future.
- 41 Kitazawa, *Sagyo Shugi Gakkyu Keiei (Classroom Management in Sagyo Kyoiku)*, Tokyo: Toyo Tosho, 1929, p. 149.

- 42 Dewey, op. cit., p. 29. In Kitazawa's *Classroom Management in Sagyo Kyoiku* (pp. 187-188), he quotes from page 29 of Dewey's book.
- 43 Kitazawa, op. cit., *A Fundamental Theory of Classroom Management*, p. 16.
- 44 Tsukahara/Enza, op. cit., pp. 82-83.
- 45 Shunji Yamanouchi "Shodan soshiki ni yoru mokuteki katsudo" ("Purposeful activities through small group organization"), *Jido Kyoiku*, vol. 23, no. 10, 1929, p. 76.
- 46 Yamanouchi, *Sagyo Shugi Fukushiki Gakkyu Keiei (Multiple-Age Classroom Management in Sagyo Kyoiku)*, Tokyo: Toyo Toshosha, 1933, pp. 132-135, 208-211.
- 47 Kitazawa, op. cit., *A Fundamental Theory of Classroom Management*, p. 14.
- 48 Ibid., pp. 79-82.
- 49 Ibid., p. 41.
- 50 Kitazawa, "Gakkyu keiei ni tsuite (3)" ("On Classroom Management (Part 3)"), *Kyoiku Jissaikai*, vol. 1, no. 3, 1928, p. 150.
- 51 Kitazawa, op. cit., *Classroom Management in Sagyo Kyoiku*, p. 152.
- 52 Kitazawa, *Sagyo Kyoiku no Honshitsu (The Essence of Sagyo Kyoiku)*, Tokyo: Ikubun Shoin, 1932, pp. 204-208.
- 53 Kitazawa, op. cit., *Classroom Management in Sagyo Kyoiku*, pp. 215-216.
- 54 Ibid., pp. 227-228.
- 55 Kitazawa, op. cit., *A Fundamental Theory of Classroom Management*, p. 66.
- 56 Kitazawa, op. cit., *The Essence of Sagyo Kyoiku*, p. 194.
- 57 Kitazawa, "Hoho to shite no kyodo" ("Cooperation as a Method"), *Jido Kyoiku*, vol. 23, no. 11, 1929, p. 8.
- 58 Kitazawa, op. cit., *Classroom Management in Sagyo Kyoiku*, p. 184.
- 59 Kitazawa, "Shido to togyo" ("Direction and Control"), *Jido Kyoiku* vol. 13, no. 14, 1919, pp. 65-70.
- 60 Kitazawa, "Gakkyu keiei ron" ("Theory of Classroom Management"), *Aichi Kyoiku*, vol. 504, 1929, p. 7.
- 61 Kitazawa, "Seikatsu shido no jijitsu" ("The Facts of Life Direction"), *Jido Kyoiku*, vol. 23, no. 10, 1929, p. 28.
- 62 Kitazawa, "Seikatsu oyobi shigoto no kyoizontai to shite no gakko oyobi gakkyu (2)" ("The School and the Classroom as Coexistence in Life and Work (Part 2)"), *Gakko/Gakkyu Keiei no Jissai*, vol. 3, no. 2, 1928, pp. 4-5.
- 63 Kitazawa, op. cit., *Classroom Management in Sagyo Kyoiku* (pp. 184-199), which quotes Dewey op. cit. (note 9) pp. 28-31 as a basis for the theory of direction.
- 64 Kitazawa, op. cit., *A Fundamental Theory of Classroom Management*, pp. 97-98.
- 65 Ibid., p. 210.
- 66 Kitazawa, *Gakko Keiei Genron (A Fundamental Theory of School Management)*, Tokyo: Toyo Toshosha, 1931, pp. 71-80.
- 67 Seiichi Miyahara ed., *Kyoikushi (A History of Education)*, Japanese Modern Histories, Tokyo: Toyo Keizai Shimposha, 1963, p. 234, Yaguchi op. cit., p. 132, "Kitazawa Taneichi" in Tomitaro Karasawa ed. *Zusetsu Kyoiku Jinbutsu Jiten (An Illustrated Dictionary of Personages in Education)*, vol. 1, Tokyo: Gyosei, 1984, pp. 749-750, etc.
- 68 Kitazawa, op. cit., *Classroom Management in Sagyo Kyoiku*, pp. 217-223.
- 69 Kiyoshi Takayama, "Kitazawa gakkei wo omou" ("Remembering Kitazawa"), Kitazawa Masakazu ed. *Chichi Kitazawa Taneichi Tsuitoroku (Remembrances of My Father Taneichi Kitazawa)*, Tokyo: Toyo Toshosha, 1935, p. 83.
- 70 "Ko Kitazawa-sensei wo shinobu zadankai" ("Discussion in Memory of Professor Kitazawa"), *Jido Kyoiku* vol. 26, no. 2, 1932, p. 68.
- 71 Hiroshi Yoshida, "Wagako ni okeru sagyo kyoiku no enkaku" ("A History of Sagyo Kyoiku at Our School"), in Kitazawa ed. *Gendai Sagyo Kyoiku (Modern Work Education)*, Tokyo: Toyo Toshosha, 1930, pp. 40-41.
- 72 Kitazawa, *Sagyo Kyoiku Josetsu (An Introduction to Sagyo Kyoiku)*, Tokyo: Meguro Shoten,

- 1929, p. 195.
- 73 Kitazawa, “Sagyo kyoiku no genri” (“Principles of *Sagyo Kyoiku*”), *Gendai Kyoiku*, vol. 1, no. 4, 1931, pp. 62-63.
- 74 A “life education” class was established at Tajima Elementary School in 1927, selecting and displaying materials from regional cultural assets of Kawasaki City (Enza, pp. 198-210).
- 75 Ryohei Matsushita, “Nihon ni okeru Dewey no juyo—kibo to konnan no ironical na kosaku” (“Reception of Dewey in Japan: The Ironic Intersection of Hope and Struggle”), *Nihon Dewey Gakkai Kiyo*, vol. 48, 2007, pp. 227-238.
- 76 Shimura, op. cit., pp. 69-70.
- 77 Nakano, op. cit., *Research on Taisho Liberal Education*, pp. 268-273.
- 78 Miho Hashimoto, “1920 nendai Akashi Joshi Shihan Gakko Fuzoku Shogakko ni okeru seikatsu tangen curriculum no kaihatsu—Kindai Nihon ni okeru tangenron no juyo ni kansuru ichikosatsu” (“Life Unit Curriculum Development at the Elementary School Affiliated with Akashi Girls’ Normal School in the 1920s: A Consideration of the Reception of Unit Theory in Early Modern Japan”), *Curriculum Kenkyu*, vol. 18, 2009, pp. 1-18; Hashimoto, “Oikawa Heiji ni okeru seikatsu tangenron no keisei—Obei shinkyoiku joho no eikyo wo chushin ni” (“The Formation of Heiji Oikawa’s Life Unit Theory: Focusing on the Influence of Western New Education Information”), *Kyoikugaku Kenkyu*, vol. 76, no. 3, 2009, pp. 1-13; Enza, op. cit., *Kindai Nihon ni okeru Project Method no Juyo*.
- 79 Kitazawa, “Kun’iku no shakaiteki igi” (“The Social Significance of Training and Education”), *Shogakko*, vol. 25, no. 12, 1918, p. 18.
- 80 “‘Kyoiku no gorika’ kenkyu zadankai” (“Research Conference on ‘Rationalizing Education’”), *Kyoiku Shuho*, vol. 300, 1931, p. 4.