

**Education for Peace and Democracy  
in the Literature and Language Class:  
Action Researches in the Japanese  
Saturday School in London**

**Miwa Mizushima-Macmaster**

**UCL Institute of Education**

**Degree: PhD Submission**

## **Declaration**

I, Miwa Mizushima-Macmaster, confirm that the work presented in this thesis is my own. Where information has been derived from other sources, I confirm that this has been indicated in the thesis.

## Abstract

This thesis is built around *three pedagogical action researches* relating to *education for peace and democratic citizenship*. These researches were conducted in three successive school years in the department of literature in the Japanese Saturday School in London (JSSL), with the collaboration of my departmental teaching colleagues and of the students in the senior division (15-18 years old), who we were teaching. They involved significant episodes of cross-age-group teaching and learning.

The *research questions* are:

- 1) How could we, Language and Literature teachers of senior students, use Literature to develop effective curriculum and pedagogy units around the theme of war and peace?
- 2) How, more generally, could we develop and teach Language units that would nurture democratically-minded citizens who would become voluntarily and independently involved in society?

The research draws throughout on the JSSL students' (atypical) experience of *both* Japanese and British life and education, and the thesis begins with points of comparison between Japanese and British society and education, bringing out Japan's 'seniority' system and culture, its difficulty with its growing multi-culturalism, and its traditionally centralized education system.

The first, and most prolonged, action research involved a sustained engagement with literature texts, approved for senior school use in Japan, to raise serious questions about war and peace, and more specifically about invasions of other countries. The second engaged the students in investigating Media reporting of wars and other matters to raise questions about the citizen's news-consumer responsibilities. The third reflected on cultural differences between Britain and Japan and how we can 'understand' each other. It was helped by an extended session with a Japanese WWII veteran, who was famous for his reconciliation work with Japanese and British soldiers.

The study uses a range of methods including a planning, teaching and research diary, semi-structured interviews with teacher colleagues and students, student questionnaires and evaluations, and video records to track and evaluate:

- (a) the impact of the action researches on students (including the cumulative impact on students who experienced all three researches), and
- (b) the impact on teachers' pedagogical development of working collaboratively and with cross-age-groups of students.

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to express my deepest appreciation to my supervisor, Dr. Paddy Walsh. I am grateful for his incredibly deep knowledge, intelligence, analysis and insight. It is difficult to imagine completing this thesis without his intellectual support. I am also grateful to his wife Pat for allowing him to give so much of his time.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to president, Mr. Shuichi Sugano; to my former colleagues and collaborators, especially with their permission, the three who were able to contribute most to the fieldwork phases - Ms. Sei Hamaguchi, Ms. Tamako Matsukuma, Ms. Kazue Morino; and to the many students who willingly lent their young talents and their learning to the research in Japanese Saturday School in London. Their collaboration in my research is at the heart of this thesis. I hope that they will not find too many disagreements with my conclusions.

I would like to express my appreciation to headmaster, Ms. Mariko Hayashi, colleagues and students of Kobe College, where I work at this moment and where I am now also trying to put some ideas from the thesis into practice.

I would like to express my deep respect for Mr. Susumu Tsuboi, an A-bomb survivor, who passed away on 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016. He inspired me a lot about peace education from 1998 when we went together to Ukraine for his lecture and for peace activities.

I would like to express my profound gratitude to my dear husband Rob for his love, support and patience that enables me to complete this thesis.

# Analytic Table of Contents

<b>Chapter 1</b>	<b>Introduction and Contexts</b>	<b>11</b>
1-1.	Finding the Area of Research	11
1-2.	Research Focus and Questions	15
1-3.	Three elements of Japanese political and educational culture	17
	(1) <i>Japan's Seniority System</i>	18
	(2) <i>'Living together' – Mono-Culturalism under Challenge</i>	26
	(3) <i>MEXT, England and School-based Curriculum Development</i>	30
1-4.	The Structure of the Thesis	35
<b>Chapter 2</b>	<b>Research Site and Theory-Methodology</b>	<b>38</b>
2-1.	Introducing JSSL Senior High Division	38
2-2.	Action Research	44
	<i>John Elliott's philosophy of action research</i>	46
	<i>Some Research Dilemmas and Practicalities</i>	52
2-3.	Research Instruments	55
	(1) <i>My Research Diary</i>	55
	(2) <i>Tape-Recorded Interviews of Students and Teachers</i>	56
	(3) <i>'Before and After' Student Questionnaires</i>	58
	(4) <i>PM Evaluation Forms</i>	60
	(5) <i>Constructed Learning Materials</i>	60
	(6) <i>Use of Video / DVD</i>	60
2-4.	Analyzing Data	61
2-5.	Ethical Issues	63
2-6.	Summary	66
<b>Chapter 3</b>	<b>The First Project: Literature Education for Peace</b>	<b>67</b>
3-1.	Rationale and Conceptual Framework	68
	<i>Peace education, more than emotional manipulation</i>	68

<i>Three particular objectives in using war and peace literature</i>	71	
3-2. The Key Texts		72
3-3. Planning		77
<i>Getting Going</i>	77	
<i>'Before and After' Questionnaire</i>	79	
<i>Planning the Class Programmes</i>	80	
<i>Planning the Plenary Meeting</i>	80	
3-4. The Class Periods		82
<i>Understanding the historical background in S1</i>	82	
<i>Reading and Using the Main Text in the S1 Class</i>	83	
<i>Using the S1 Supplementary Texts</i>	85	
<i>S2 and S3 Colleagues' class periods</i>	90	

## **Chapter 4 The First Project (cont.): Plenary Meeting and Final Evaluations** **95**

4-1. The Plenary Meeting		95
<i>Watching and Responding to the A-bomb video</i>	96	
<i>The Discussion Groups – Evidence for 'RICE'</i>	97	
<i>The PM Evaluation Questionnaire</i>	101	
4-2. The 'Before and After' Questionnaires		103
<i>Rationale of the Questions</i>	103	
<i>Analysis of the Students' Responses to the Four Categories of Questions</i>	105	
4-3. Evidence from Interviews and a Reflective Meeting		109
<i>Ten Recurring Themes</i>	109	
<i>The Student Interviews</i>	110	
<i>The Teacher Interviews</i>	113	
<i>Reflection and Looking Forward: Final Meeting</i>	116	
4-4. Final Comments on AR1		119
<i>(1) Literature, video, discussion and peace</i>	119	
<i>(2) Discussion, Japan and Deep Questions</i>	120	

## **Chapter 5 The Second Project: About Newspapers** **122**

5-1. Rationale and Conceptual Frameworks		122
<i>Newspapers in Education (NIE)</i>	123	
<i>Three Priorities in NIE</i>	125	

5-2. Preparations and Assignments	127
<i>First and Second Terms</i>	127
<i>The Teacher Study - Group</i>	129
<i>Official and Unofficial Reasons - the Winter Assignments</i>	130
5-3. Two Preparation Classes for the PM (4 <sup>th</sup> and 11 <sup>th</sup> Feb)	133
5-4. The Plenary Meeting (18 <sup>th</sup> Feb 2006)	138
<i>Final Preparations and New Materials</i>	138
<i>Using the New Materials</i>	139
<i>Reflection</i>	144
5-5. Evaluations	145
<i>Student Views of the PM</i>	145
<i>The 'Before and After' Questionnaire (4th / 25th Feb 2006)</i>	147
<i>How AR2 differed from AR1</i>	149
<i>Successes and lessons learnt</i>	150

## **Chapter 6 AR3: Pedagogy as Sharing Personal Experience 153**

6-1. Imphal, Mr. Hirakubo and Other Resources	154
6-2. Teaching, Learning and Evaluation	161
<i>A class preparing for the first PM (8th July 2006)</i>	161
<i>The First Plenary Meeting (15th July 2006)</i>	164
<i>The Summer Holiday Assignment (Summer 2006)</i>	166
6-3. Being Japanese in Britain	166
<i>The preparatory class for the second PM (9th Sep 2006)</i>	168
<i>Further Preparations for the 2nd PM</i>	171
<i>The 2nd Plenary Meeting (16th Sept. 2006)</i>	172
6-4. Student and Teacher Evaluations	177
<i>The Student Evaluation of the second PM</i>	177
<i>The Teacher Evaluations</i>	179
6-5. Conclusion: Progression in the ARs	182

## **Chapter 7 Comparable Research Studies 183**

7-1. Action Researches in Japanese Classes from 2003-2006	183
(1) <i>Japanese History in a Senior 2 Social Studies Class</i>	184
(2) <i>World Peace in Junior 2 Integrated Study and Social Studies Classes</i>	185
(3) <i>'Structural Violence', action-study in a first year University (U1) English Conversation class</i>	186

(4) <i>'Japanese and American views of peace compared' in a Junior 1 Social Studies Class</i>	188
(5) <i>'Understanding the Singaporean View of the Pacific War' in S1 English Literature classes</i>	190
7-2. Japanese study after 2006	192
(1) <i>'Conflicts and conflict resolution in the Modern World', an action study in High School Social Studies</i>	193
(2) <i>Michel Apple</i>	194
7-3. Some Non-Japanese Studies	196
(1) <i>'The Situation Made Us Special', a year-long action study in an American Middle School 7th grade</i>	196
(2) <i>Workshops exploring Community and Identity for 10-18 year olds in four schools in Leicester, UK</i>	200
(3) <i>Citizenship education and student identities: school-wide action research with 11-16 pupils</i>	202
7-4. Conclusion	208
<b>Chapter 8 Final Evaluation of ARs 1-3</b>	<b>210</b>
8-1. Summary of ARs	210
8-2. An Evaluation Methodology	215
8-3. Comparing the Themes	218
8-4. Student Learning	225
<i>Independent-Mindedness</i>	226
<i>Equality, Justice and Law</i>	228
<i>Peace and Communication</i>	230
8-5. Values of the Pedagogy	232
<i>The Three Variants</i>	232
<i>The Three Constants</i>	235
<i>Japan Now</i>	237
<i>A Positive Appeal</i>	240
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>241</b>

## APPENDICES

### Chapter 2 Appendices

App. 2-1	A Note on Entrance Examinations to Japanese Universities	253
App. 2-2	Foundations for Elliott's view of 'Action Research'	254

### Chapter 3 Appendices

App. 3-2	Digests of the Main AR1 Texts (S1, S2 and S3)	257
App. 3-3	The Programme for Considering Wars	261
App. 3-4(a)	Sample Class/Research Diary Extracts for AR1	262
App.3.4(b)	S1 Supplementary Texts in AR1	265
App.3.4(c)	Sample Extracts from S2 and S3 Teachers' AR1 Diaries	269

### Chapter 4 Appendices

App. 4-1(a)	The Programme for the AR1 Plenary Meeting	271
App. 4-1(b)	The Content of the A-bomb Video	274
App. 4-2(a)	'Before and After' Questionnaires for AR 1	275
App. 4-2(b)	Four Categories of AR1 'Before and After' Questions	276
App. 4-3(a)	Student Interview Transcripts (two group interviews)	277
App. 4-3(b)	Teacher Interview Transcripts	281

### Chapter 5 Appendices

App. 5-2	Teachers' Study-Group on the Iraq Invasion/Occupation	284
App. 5-3	Research Diary Notes on a Double-Class	288

### Chapter 6 Appendices

App. 6.1(a)	Headmaster's Invitation to Parents	290
App. 6.1(b)	Mr Hirakubo's Address to the Teachers	292
App. 6-2	Assignment: a News-Article on the Imphal Campaign	294
App. 6-3(a)	Worksheet Responses from a Preparatory Class	295
App. 6-3(b)	Plenary Meeting Group Record Sheet	296

## **Abbreviations and an Acronym**

AR=Action Research

BCS=Burma Campaign Society

JSL= The Japanese School in London

JSSL= The Japanese Saturday School in London

MEXT=Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science &  
Technology in Japan

NIE=Newspaper In Education

PM=Plenary Meeting

RICE = R-eflectiveness;  
I-nteraction between teaching and learning;  
C-ollaboration of students and of teachers;  
E-thically worthwhile

# Chapter 1

## Introduction and Contexts

### 1-1. Finding the Area of Research

This thesis is built around *three pedagogical action researches*, each understood as relating to *education for democratic citizenship*. These were conducted in three successive school years, 2004-2007, in the department of Japanese Language and Literature in the Japanese Saturday School in London (JSSL).<sup>1</sup> I was a part-time teacher in this department from April 2003 to March 2013. Several of my departmental colleagues collaborated with me in these action researches (ARs), in which we taught students in the senior division (高等部 Kōtōbu 15-18 years old), who were following the standard pre-university Japanese curriculum for this subject area.

JSSL students have more or less experience of two societies and cultures and, in most cases, of two educational systems. They go to their English schools on weekdays and to the JSSL on Saturdays to maintain their Japanese ability. This school was originally established in 1965 for students preparing for the entrance examinations to Japanese universities, while attending English schools in the meantime. However, the students' purposes have recently become more various. In the time of my research, there were more students of mixed Japanese and non-Japanese parentage than previously, and even some whose parents were both non-Japanese though they understood and valued Japanese language and literature. These families usually did not plan to go back to Japan and their children intended to enter English universities. So the students we were teaching had various future destinations in mind.

My previous professional experience certainly influenced my choices of research topic and approach. I had completed six years as a full-time teacher of Social Studies in Kobe College<sup>2</sup> in Japan (where I have now returned to teach again from April 2013). This college was

---

<sup>1</sup> Our shared experiences of those ARs and my early analyses of them also fed into our practice with student cohorts in many later years.

<sup>2</sup> 神戸女学院 Kobe Jogakuin

established in 1873 by an American missionary group with the twin aims of developing the ‘best education’ for girls and promoting freedom and independence in Japanese society. That it maintained these policies even during WWII contributes to its reputation of being one of the best girls’ schools in Japan. It comprises a high school, a secondary school and a university and, prior to doing this research, I had taught in both the high school and the secondary division.

The college’s commitment to teachers’ freedom and independence meant I could choose what I would like to teach in Social Studies, within reason. For example, as a teacher and, also, an active citizen in the field of peace studies, I had gone to Pakistan in 1997 through the JICA (Japanese International Cooperation Agency) high school programme and in 1998 to the Ukraine with Mr. S. Tsuboi, an Hiroshima A-bomb survivor, to share experiences with the victim families of the Chernobyl atomic power accidents. On my return from these visits, I had morning assemblies with 900 high school and secondary students to present my accounts.<sup>3</sup> However, I always felt that my teaching method in Japan was not truly educational and I also recognised some invisible barriers to projecting Japan in a critical light. In Social Studies, I taught the literal meaning of ‘democracy’, but I did not let students experience what democracy really is. I also became quite concerned at that time about aspects of political life and political culture in Japan and about the very low profile of political education (in the broadest sense) in Japanese education. However, I had little idea how my way of understanding and teaching could improve.

Before going to Pakistan, I received a few days training at the JICA office in Tokyo. Their programme is aimed at improving teachers’ understanding of ‘developing countries’ and we were taught new methods of getting our students (and teacher colleagues) interested in the issues. These methods shocked me because I never had such an education before. Therefore, I was reinforced in my uneasiness about teaching methods in Social Studies – as well as in my interest in education for developing countries. When I then came to London, it was first to undertake and complete an MSc in Development Studies at SOAS and, then, as a teacher I

---

<sup>3</sup>In 2005, after my first action research, I attended the Nishinomiya Peace symposium, organised by Mr. Tsuboi, to present the new British initiative in Citizenship Education.

wanted to focus on what I could do through education. Researching in the IOE under Dr. Paddy Walsh, I soon became interested in the new Citizenship Education curriculum being introduced in English schools. This was partly because of the discussions of methods and approaches that accompanied it. Researching further, however, I gradually came to realise that Citizenship Education's ultimate keyword is 'democracy' and, later still, I would realise that democracy is the 'trunk' for the matters that interested me, such as peace studies, education for developing countries, and international understanding. These could be regarded as, 'branches' of democracy.

My first plan was to persuade JSSL to let me pilot some parts of Citizenship Education with JSSL students, while at the same time doing an observation study of those same parts being taught, and teaching them myself, in an English secondary school – and then comparing the two experiences. Partly for practical reasons, but also in the interests of greater depth, my final plan, for which the relevant permissions were available, was the one indicated at the start of this chapter. I could thus make more sustained use of my position in the JSSL Language and Literature department teaching older students.<sup>4</sup>

There was also, however, a more personal background factor which inspired the more specific features of the research.

Prior to my research, having had a good relationship with students and colleagues in my first year at JSSL, I then experienced some months of difficulty early in my second year. Students seemed not to be listening when I was 'explaining'. I consulted the 'President' (局長) about this, who then observed my class and gave me three inter-related points of advice:

- 1) My JSSL students had been studying in their English Schools from Monday to Friday, where they would have experienced a more varied kind of teaching. It was natural that they would lose interest if I carried on with a monologue lecturing style.
- 2) I should develop more activities to let students work together and help each other.

---

<sup>4</sup> However, England's Citizenship curriculum remained part of the inspiration for this study. A short comparison with an initiative in the Japanese curriculum will feature later in this chapter.

- 3) I should engage more with other teachers to discuss my problem and how we could improve each other's practice.

I had indeed met these ideas in theory of education classes and readings, but it seemed I had not previously been required to implement them seriously. Having already had six 'successful' years of teaching experience in a prestigious Japanese school, my pride and confidence were shaken very hard and, at first, it was difficult for me to accept the President's advice. However, I soon recognised its logic and wisdom and started to have discussions about teaching styles and teaching practices with my colleagues and to reflect more on how students could improve their thinking through their own practice. What also made these changes easier to accept was that they would help to connect my teaching to my research by doing action research.

And not only my own teaching but now also, perhaps, my colleagues' teaching! Each year my departmental colleagues agreed to participate in the ARs and this meant becoming engaged in an unprecedented amount of *collective work*. At innumerable meetings, ranging from quite formal to semi-formal to informal, we planned, shared, monitored and evaluated the themes, structures and processes of each AR. We still did our individual lesson-planning for our own individual classes, but now our collective work was a key influence on that planning where those classes related to the AR theme of the year.

There was also intensive collective work relating to shared '*plenary meetings*' [*PMs*] of *all our classes together across the three age-groups*. These were indeed crucial features and main foci of the ARs. A proportion of the AR-related work in our separate classrooms was more or less consciously preparing the students for these quite elaborate 'get-togethers'. The expectation was that teachers and students gathered together would all want to show their best 'sides' in the PM. If some students or classes were not learning enough, then the results would appear in the PM! So, it was considered that PMs would be motivating, not only for us teachers to show the progress of our classes, but, more importantly, for the students to show their older and younger peers what they had learnt and what they could make of the AR theme. Therefore, as well as the advantages for teachers in sharing and developing opinions

while constructing a PM, we expected large advantages – and pressures – for the students in preparing to engage, and then actually engaging, with the other age-groups in developing and pursuing the AR theme. How far these expectations were met will appear in later chapters.

The ARs were of different lengths. AR1 was much the largest: 10 classes in their separate classrooms for each of the S1, S2 and S3 groups, leading up to a single whole-Saturday PM. This large volume of work on a single theme (peace), approximately 25% of a full year's work, was legitimated by the fact that the AR was built around literature, which was our department's main business. By comparison, AR2 on media education for democracy was allocated just 3 separate classes, spread over 8 months, but interspersed with vacation assignments and all leading up to another final Saturday PM. AR3 on international understanding was allocated preparatory separate classes and assignments leading up to each of *two* PMs, one in the middle and the other at the end of the AR, but all contained within a more intensive 4 month period. (These different sizes explain why AR1 is given two chapters in this thesis, in comparison with the single chapters for ARs 2 and 3.)

## **1-2. Research Focus and Questions**

As described above, my starting point was the President's advice to me on how to get students in my class involved. This *pedagogical concern*, and *the teaching and learning strategies* that it led me to develop and trial in collaboration with my colleagues in our three projects, have remained the *principal focus* of this research and thesis.

However, the thesis focus is in one way broader and in another way more specific than just 'pedagogy'. It is broader because it also includes peace education and the wider area of democratic education. It is more specific because its concern is not pedagogy in general but pedagogy in relation to those curriculum areas. More fully and formally:

*The study is of projects in language and literature teaching that were designed to promote certain themes that I came to see and to gather under the general heading of 'democratic education' (namely, peace, media critique, and international understanding) **BY** using particular inter-related pedagogic strategies that are themselves more democratic than the*

*norm (namely, intensive team planning and teaching, enhanced student activity and participation, and cross-age student interaction<sup>5</sup>).*

*Therefore, the thesis, including my main literature search, will not relate to pedagogy generally, nor to peace and democratic education generally, but to **a specific pedagogical approach to peace and democratic education.***

Because the pedagogical approach itself would involve quite deliberate forms of planning (among colleagues) and of evaluation (by colleagues and students), it was already quite ‘research-friendly’, as well as ‘democracy-friendly’. But turning the project into actual action research – and then giving it some publicity in the school’s life – further enhanced this emphasis on shared discussion, planning, deliberation and evaluation – thus also increasing its potential democratic impact. The ‘action’ and the ‘research’ would support and reinforce each other.

The fieldwork extended over three years and the later projects had to *distinguish* themselves from earlier projects as much as build on them, especially because two thirds of the students in each later project had already experienced at least one earlier project. In such circumstances, it is natural that the researcher’s sense of his or her research questions should evolve. AR1 was designed to reflect my particular interest and passion for peace education. How could we teachers use literature that was appropriate to the different ages of our classes – and that preferably was officially approved – to get our mainly Japanese students to think deeply about war and peace? But literature cannot be all about war and peace and, in addition, Language and Literature includes more than literature. Moving into the second year of the research, then, we teachers chose ‘responsible media use’ (considered as an aspect of democratic life) as our theme for AR2. I then retrospectively realized clearly that nurturing democratic-mindedness *could* also be seen as having been in the background of AR1’s peace theme, as indeed the ‘trunk’ from which the two themes were branching. When

---

<sup>5</sup> These three ‘democratic’ strategies are clearly interdependent. Also, we found they had a wider value than just in relation to themes in democratic education. Indeed, we retained this annual cross-age project in later years for more traditional language and literature themes. It remains, however, that it is especially appropriate for democratic themes.

in the third years we chose the theme of ‘international understanding’ for AR3, I was fully conscious that it also *could* be seen as fitting under the more general notion of democratic-mindedness.

However, it will emerge that ‘peace’ and ‘peace education’ remained an explicit and more or less prominent part of how we were conceiving both ‘responsible media use’ and ‘international understanding’. Therefore, it seems to me that two research questions of broadly equal weight better reflects the *balance* of the aims and the work across the three ARs than would a single question that prioritised democratic education.

The two main **research questions** of this thesis then are:

- 1) **How could we, Language and Literature teachers of senior students, use literature to develop effective curriculum and pedagogy units around the theme of war and peace?** (*This question underpins AR1 fully and explicitly, while also – in its relationship to war and peace – helping to shape ARs 2 and 3.*)
  
- 2) **How, more generally, could we develop and teach Language units that would nurture democratically-minded citizens who would become voluntarily and independently involved in society?** (*This question explicitly underpinned ARs 2 and 3, while also being in the background of AR1.*)

These questions are designed to focus most directly on pedagogy (including the preparation of curriculum themes and materials). Their wording also reflects the close relationship between my research and my own teaching, while also suggesting the involvement of my Senior Language and Literature colleagues.

### **1-3. Three Elements of Japanese Political and Educational Culture**

E. Said explains in his book *Orientalism* (1993) that societies should not be defined or generalised. European empires justified rule over their colonies by creating a sense of indigenous inferiority and, indeed, ‘orientalism’ was used to define the east as savage,

ambiguous, and not logical, by comparison with the ‘superior’ occidental world. On this basis, I as an ‘oriental’ person would not be able to step outside my own Japanese culture and look down on it from a transcendental God-given position – though an ‘occidental’ person might somehow overcome this difficulty! It seems more reasonable, however, to suppose that the difficulty applies equally to orientals and occidentals, and that the possibilities of overcoming the difficulty are also equal – in regard to which multicultural experience seems quite central. As a Japanese living, studying and working in the UK, I had developed a hybrid sense of identity and perspective. I was ‘at home’ in both Japan and the UK and to some extent ‘a foreigner’ in each. When I travelled to and reflected on Japan I was aware of my displacement from the norms and mores I grew up with. This hybrid perspective gave me – and continues to give me – a critical purchase on both countries.<sup>6</sup>

This section will outline the three elements of the political and educational culture of Japan that most shaped the background from which my fieldwork project emerged: *the hierarchy or ‘seniority system’*; *living together – mono-culturalism under challenge*; and *centralized education*.<sup>7</sup> I will discuss them in occasional comparison with their English counterparts. This is appropriate to the two-culture experience of JSSL and of the teacher-researchers and pupil-participants. However, the main focus on Japan in what follows reflects, among other things, my desire at the time to bring the results of these researches to my anticipated future work in Japan.

### **(1) Japan’s Seniority System**

The first element is the informal structure of Japanese society, the unreflective norms that are generally invisible and subconscious in its peoples’ relationships. In particular, it is Japan’s famous ‘seniority system’, the way the hierarchy of the society works. My action research projects *challenged* this seniority culture strongly. The challenge was essentially indirect, but it was sustained across the ARs

---

<sup>6</sup> Though now teaching back in Japan, I continue to regard London as my principal residence and I generally return to London in school holiday periods.

<sup>7</sup> The first of these three will require the longest discussion.

To describe this system, I will draw mainly on Chie Nakane's classic analysis of this culture in her *Japanese Society* (1970), since it still seems quite applicable some forty years later.

In Japanese history, the ruling people have always used the seniority system to achieve their goals, especially in critical periods such as WWII and the post-war 1950s-1960s. For Nakane, this informal structure creates the unique character of Japanese society and is the main source of its energy. It creates a 'collective society' where 'territories' – including Japan as a whole – are protected and developed against rivals by a hierarchical co-dependency between superiors and subordinates. He sees Japanese 'collectivism' as rooted in the conception of 'territory (場)', not in qualifications (資格) or skills. A key example is that labour unions have traditionally been constituted by companies; all X company employees join the X company labour union and all Y company employees join the Y company labour union. Workers do not relate to each other as trade unionists across companies. In this structure, employers can easily manage subordinates. In power relations terms, Nakane sees the seniority system as 'authoritarianism (權威主義)', in which people cannot really speak to 'authority', and not as a proper 'democracy (民主主義)' in which the people can make demands on the top, and argue and negotiate with it.

However, as Nakane acknowledges, this system has been very successful in establishing modern Japan by its impact on both workers' motivation and an educational system that has promoted obedient, patient, diligent and healthy students in preparation for long, hard employment. Japan is not very large and it lacks resources such as oil and coal. To compensate, it had to become economically powerful in manufacturing. Since 1945 governments have focused on the productivity of manufacturing firms and, also, have invested heavily in public education to ensure that good quality workers would be supplied to companies. Employees have been conditioned to work from morning to evening and, indeed, to devote their lives to their companies. Firms prefer their workers to be 'obedient' and passive towards authority – it has been generally assumed that such workers would be more productive. Critical and analytical thinking were not emphasised in schools; students who are critical towards their teachers, schools or society would be a danger both to themselves and to the system.

Again, though teachers explain that friendship between students is very precious and valuable, nurturing true friendship is inhibited by the deep levels of competitiveness ('enmity') between students when taking exams and entering universities. Moreover, Japanese egalitarianism (平等主義), by which teachers should assume that students are equally talented and can achieve the same results if they make enough efforts, increases the competitiveness. Finally, there are problems of 'seniority' in how older pupils relate (or fail to relate) to younger pupils in schools, in particular the prevalence of bullying that is much discussed.

Thus the system may generate great energy for developing production, but it creates divisions among colleague workers and, earlier, among the students who become the workers. In both cases it hinders their communication and bonding.

Japanese people (including me) are accustomed to this 'seniority' ('top-down, 'vertical',) system. It is very difficult for employees to complain to their employers. Rather, they want to work as hard as they can to satisfy employers. For example, I was told by my parents to work very hard, but not to show this off to other people; hopefully, my boss would notice my diligence and promote me. This is typical of the Japanese 'slave mentality' (奴隸根性)', as was earlier described by Yoshimi Takeuchi (1943). For me, its distinctiveness became very clear while working as a Japanese lecturer at Imperial College. In writing my end of year self-appraisal, I did not think I had to 'boast', because everybody would know that I had worked very hard, but I soon found that my hard work would mean little for promotion if I did not 'prove' it on paper to my line managers.

Nakane also observed how and why we Japanese value our seniority system positively. The superior usually takes care of subordinates emotionally. The subordinates can take various private matters to their line manager and, being then emotionally dependent on their superior, they try to work harder to satisfy him/her. The superiors take care of their subordinates, almost as if they were their children, while also often explaining to them how difficult their management role is, so the subordinates can empathise with them in return. This is then the

co-dependency emotional relationship between superior and subordinates. (This emotional bonding to each other is not through *formal* contractual arrangements – or, perhaps, this could be thought an informal kind of ‘contract’.)

I did not properly realise this until I began to work in Britain, but then I was reminded of it on a regular basis. In Japan, the emotional bond between superiors and subordinates is usually much stronger than the bond between colleagues. Subordinates respond to and proactively think about the superior’s needs, while the secret battles are between colleagues – and are about who can satisfy the superior most. This hinders democracy at a subconscious level because it hinders open communication and discussion. Indeed, subordinates fear that if they are perceived as too clever, in that they can discuss matters analytically and critically as well as or better than the superior, they will become a threat to the superior and this would threaten their own position and prospects. So, almost instinctively, they relate to their superior in a manner that is not too argumentative. In Japanese schools too, as I could now realise more clearly, behaving well under the boss and faithfully ‘following orders’ in order to ‘get ahead’ of one’s colleagues was generally a stronger force than teamwork and loyalty to colleagues.

**The Example of the Sarin Gas Attack** Between Nakane’s original analysis and the period of my research, the 1995 ‘Sarin Gas Attack’ on the Tokyo Subway (地下鉄サリン事件), in which 12 people died and 5510 people were injured, provided a powerful example of the seniority system in action. Haruki Murakami’s analysis in *Underground* (1999) stresses the depths of its hold on some people. I see this as suggesting, in turn, the need for a comparable depth and internalisation in peace and democracy education.

Shoko Asahara, the leader of the Aum Shinrikyo religious-cult, organised a group of followers to train for ‘creating a new world’ by using Sarin gas to kill people. Murakami considers the relationship between him and one of his principal followers, Ikuo Hayashi (who dropped sarin gas in the Chiyoda line of the Tokyo Subway).

Born in 1947, Hayashi was the second son of a Tokyo medical practitioner. Groomed from middle and secondary school for Keio University, one of Tokyo’s two top private universities, upon graduating from medical school he took employment as a heart and

artery specialist at Keio Hospital, after which he went on to become Head of the Circulatory Medicine Department at the National Sanatorium Hospital at Tokaimura, Ibaraki, north of Tokyo. He is a member of what the Japanese call the 'super elite'. (1999: 9)

Asahara, by contrast was certainly not from this elite. He was blind and had studied in the blind school until the age of 20, when he failed the entrance examination to enter Tokyo University. He committed some criminal attacks on acquaintances in the 1970s, before acquiring yoga and going on to establish his Aum cult.

How did Hayashi come under this man's influence?

Somewhere along the line Hayashi seems to have had profound doubts about his career as a doctor and, while searching for answers beyond orthodox science, he became seduced by the charismatic teachings of Shoko Asahara and suddenly converted to Aum. In 1990 he resigned from his job and left with his family for a religious life. His two children were promised a special education within the cult. His colleagues at the hospital were loath to lose a man of Hayashi's calibre and tried to stop him, but his mind was made up. It was as if the medical profession no longer held anything for him. Once initiated into the cult, he soon found himself among Asahara's favourites and was appointed Minister of Healing. Once he had been called upon to carry out the sarin plan, Hayashi was brought to Aum's General headquarters ..... (p.10).

Murakami also notes that why Hayashi was chosen for this mission remains unclear, but that Hayashi himself conjectured it was to seal his lips.

By this point Hayashi already knew too much. He was devoted to ....Shoko Asahara, but apparently Asahara did not trust him....(p.9)

It seems the relationship between Asahara and Hayashi hindered open communication and discussion and when Hayashi is perceived as too clever he becomes a threat to Asahara. However, the more important question is why an intelligent and well-educated man like Hayashi would not reject Asahara's order. It seems that members of the elite do not escape from the deeply rooted Japanese seniority system, in which independent thinking is severely hindered, sometimes even to the vanishing point. In the conclusion of *Underground*, Murakami reflects on the nature and appeal of this kind of followership:

...by merging themselves with Shoko Asahara's 'greater, more profoundly unbalanced' Self, they attained a kind of pseudo self-determination. Instead of launching an assault on society as individuals, they handed over the entire strategic responsibility to Asahara. We'll have one 'self-power versus the system' set-menu, please. Theirs was not

Kaczynski's 'battle against the system to attain the power process of self-determination'. The only one fighting was Shoko Asahara: most followers were merely swallowed up and assimilated by his battle-hungry ego. Nor were the followers unilaterally subjected to Asahara's 'mind control'..... they themselves actively sought to be controlled by Asahara. 'Mind control' is not something that can be pursued or bestowed just like that. It's a two-sided affair (p.201).

On this analysis, Hayashi's willing enslavement seems to have occurred as the 'answer' to something like an internal value-vacuum in his life. Does it not point to the importance of communicating positive values like peace and democracy, and of doing this in ways that reach deep into the psyches of young people, individually as well as collectively?

This analysis and this question can also apply to the high levels of recruitment of fighters and suicide bombers to mainly Muslim terrorist groups, especially those connected with the '9.11' attacks in New York, the London bombing in 2005 and the civil war in Syria. In *Mind Control*, Takashi Okada has recently pointed out the similarity with the case of Hayashi in the 1995 Sarin attack.

Most terrorists do not come from desperately poor families; rather many come from rich, affluent and elite families. Most of them had high academic achievement and worked as doctors or engineers. (2012:10).

He also observes, citing research into Al-Qaeda terrorists, that three quarters of them had spouses and two thirds had children, yet most were able to be quite 'logical' in their explanations of why they had decided to do terrorism. Including the suicide bombers, they understood what would be involved and had agreed the result in advance. Most were not formally 'recruited' by the terrorist group, but had themselves approached the group. Their perception was that it was very honourable to become one of its members. In their world, it was as if they were becoming star football players. However, Okada questions their real freedom in making this commitment:

When mind control is more sophisticated, the people who receive this control believe that they act by themselves. (p.13)

Some protection against the glamour and appeal of violent commitment and mind-controlled followership is surely provided by well-informed, thoughtful and sustained attention to the *positive* values of peace and democracy. This protection will be enhanced if that attention is

gained by using teaching and learning methods that implicitly challenge the kind of undemocratic obstacles that were linked with Japan's 'seniority system' above.

**Challenging the Seniority System** Indeed, our ARs were in many ways a 'critique-in-action' (rather than 'in-words') of the seniority system. My appreciation of this aspect developed gradually. Most Japanese teachers, in my experience, discuss democracy only in the context of political institutions such as parliament, cabinet and parties, and not at all in connection with their pedagogy. In Kobe College in the 1990s the 'vertical' teaching methods that were common in Japanese schools served me quite well and I was never challenged about them while there. As described earlier, however, they then proved inadequate in JSSL, because most of my students were acquiring more active learning habits from their on-going weekday education in English schools. So now my students and my colleagues were helping me to move from my 'vertical' assumptions about teaching and teachers to more 'horizontal' views and practices. A part of this shift was to see my former approach as another aspect of 'the seniority system' (perhaps one of its most crucial aspects) and, therefore, as strongly implicated in the more general weaknesses in Japan's democracy and culture that had been worrying me. Then, as the ARs later gained momentum, it became evident that there were, indeed, many ways in which our aims and pedagogy were logically and practically counteracting aspects of this seniority system. Four interdependent ways can be distinguished.

1. The teacher's seniority by age, experience of life and professional qualification is partly natural, but it is also partly socially constructed and it makes a great difference how it is constructed. Compare teaching as talking down ('preaching') to students who are required to 'listen and learn' obediently, with teaching as developing student activity and cooperation, encouraging individual and collective student 'voices', using textbooks as resources but not being bound by them, and letting students see their teachers learning with them and learning from their students' essays, worksheets and evaluations. This is real two-way communication and just to choose it as our pedagogy was already to *moderate the teachers' seniority* appropriately and significantly.

2. That our teaching was simultaneously *research* (especially for me) enhanced this moderating effect. On-going consultations, communications and evaluations with students were more formal, more frequent and more reflective than normal. The student voices had to be collected in a wider variety of ways than normal – including, for example, in-depth interviews with representative students at different points. The research dimension may also have led to some extra precision in our lesson-planning and our feedback to students – though this would be difficult to quantify. The students themselves would have been aware of, and in most cases motivated by, the additional profile and prestige that this research dimension was giving to the projects and to their own participation in them.
3. Our *collaborative teaching* was a clear challenge to another part of ‘the seniority system’, the idea that those in authority should instinctively bind ‘their own’ people to themselves and regard their peers and their peers’ classes as competitive threats. The successive Plenary Meetings were the most public demonstrations of our collaboration and, of course, we planned, implemented and, to a significant extent, evaluated each PM together. But behind the public PMs were our discussions and agreements on the themes for the ARs as wholes, on how to develop the themes across different sessions, on the preparation of our teaching resources, on how we were getting on with our classes, and on what to do next.
4. The PMs were also exciting AR highlights for the students, mainly because they were *cross-age learning experiences* on the theme of the AR. Bringing together three well-prepared age-groups, getting them to mingle, and facilitating their educational interaction and communication moderates the age hierarchy and make very positive use of the different levels of experience at each age. (And, of course, by the time of AR3, the students who had been ‘looking up’ in AR1 were now ‘looking down’, while remembering their previous experience of ‘looking up’!)

As previously indicated, the challenge to the seniority system from these four factors was an indirect critique ‘in practice’ – that is in the form of our pedagogy – more than ‘in words’. I

do not recall that we ever engaged the students in a direct critique of the seniority system.<sup>8</sup> However, involving the students in discovery and critical discussions (beyond the textbooks) of Japanese invasions and misdeeds, including the complicity of education and the media in them, was another kind of indirect challenge to the seniority system, even if we did not frame it in those terms.

## (2) ‘Living together’ – Mono-Culturalism under Challenge

How does Japan see its place in the world and, especially, its relationship with Asia? And what is the treatment and the experience of Japan’s internal minorities? Some introductory observations on these questions will help to prepare the ground in two ways. *First*, it prepares the way for the theme of the Japanese invasions in the last century (considered in depth through literature in AR1 and revisited in both AR2 and AR3) and the theme of international understanding in AR3. *Second*, it prepares for the articulations by JSSL participants during the ARs of their own two-culture and intercultural experience and how it was giving greater balance to their understanding of the AR themes. For example, it was enabling them better to see Japanese invasions from the point of view of the invaded countries.

**Japan and Asia** In *The Boundaries of the Japanese* (日本人の境界) (1998), Oguma analyses how Japanese identity has been determined in its relation to the two nation-blocs of Euro-America and Asia. A constant has been that Japanese viewed Euro-America as superior to Japan and Asia as inferior to Japan, expressed in this figure:

Asia(3)	Japan (2)	Euro-America(1)
---------	-----------	-----------------

Apart from the WWII period, Japan has been ‘looking up’ to Euro-America since the Meiji Restoration in 1868 and ‘looking down’ on Asia. A policy tendency of ‘westernisation and withdrawing from Asia (脱亜)’ was one manifestation of this, and it reinforced the *indirect* tendency in its colonial policies and practice in Asia (though, as Oguma explains, these were still of a different kind to European colonisation). A different manifestation, but really the

---

<sup>8</sup> This may have been because I realized its relevance gradually.

other side of the same coin, was a 'prospering Asia' tendency, preferring the direct *assimilation* of those Asian countries into Japan. In both cases, Japan was placing itself 'above' Asia.<sup>9</sup>

The spirit of 'nationalism' was involved in both the project of assimilation and the colonial resistance to assimilation. Oguma showed how the concept of 'nation' emerged from various revolutions in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries to displace 'absolute monarchy'. In this new concept, all the nation's people would share a common language, common history, common law, common parliament and common rights, and have similar values and life styles. A. Anderson (1983) explains that 'nationalism' is not based only on social structure, but also on how people in a particular period see, feel and consider the world. Before the revolutions, royal families and aristocrats entered into 'political marriages' with people of the same status in foreign countries. They *felt* closer to their foreign peers than to farmers and peasants in their own country. However, with the arrival of the 'nations', governments tried to 'homogenise' within countries, to redefine everyone's role in terms of their relationship with their own country.

Nationalism can even motivate people to die willingly and this was especially important in the context of Japan's view of its 'colonies'. To compensate for dead Japanese soldiers and to expand Japan, it was necessary to re-define these colonised peoples as 'Japanese'.

The Japanese government intended to increase the 'nation' and strengthen its combat power by assimilating all into the common 'culture'. Those who would not assimilate were categorised as 'dubious' persons, labelled as useless, and excluded from combat just like handicapped people. (Oguma: 635)

Oguma describes at the end of this book how Japanese governments came to aim for 'equality' with its recently colonised countries in order to create a single 'expanded nation' under the Emperor. However, this policy was never sufficiently firm to overcome discrimination of many kinds against Koreans and Taiwanese. It was constantly undermined by 'spur of the moment' policies that preyed on the weakest. In addition, complete

---

<sup>9</sup> To some extent how Japan feels about Asia is similar to how the UK feels about Europe. Both are powerful island countries separated from their continental main-lands. They are both somewhat ambivalent as to how much they really belong to their continents.

assimilation was always too radical an aim. It contrasted with Britain's more realistic approaches to empire building and integration. In the end, unlike India, Korea as a colony *neither* had any rights to attend the Japanese parliament (even though they were considered as 'Japanese subordinates'), *nor* was it permitted any elected assembly of its own. And Japan might colonise Korean and Chinese people, but they could not make *them* think they were 'Japanese'.

**Interculturalism** Many factors have been changing Japan from a society that was seen, and saw itself, as mono-cultural into a recognized multicultural society.

...from the 1970s, diversity in Japan has been related to economic conditions and forces of globalization. The influx of Asian women into the sex and entertainment industry was followed by migrant workers in the 1980s to fill jobs described as 3Ks: Kitanai (dirty), Kiken (dangerous), and Kitsui (difficult). Japan also became the destination of students, teachers of English, business people, and others seeking opportunity in the booming economy. ....Grave internal forces of an increasingly aging population with a declining birth rate also produce the need for foreign labour. (S. Murphy-Shigematsu 2004: 305)

And the range of cultures and ethnicities has become much greater than before:

Non-Japanese were once overwhelmingly Koreans, and when the alien registration system was established in 1947 to deal with former colonials, over 90% of registrants were Koreans. In 1987, 76% of foreign residents were still Koreans, but although their actual numbers remained constant, they rapidly constituted a decreasing percentage (37%) of foreign residents, who are now a diverse group of nationals, including Chinese (19%), Brazilians (15%), Filipinos (8%), and others. (*ibid.*)

Of course, as with many other countries that have been becoming multicultural, the members of the new groups are not automatically accepted as 'citizens'. They may be seen as 'non-nationals' and excluded from many of the rights accorded to 'nationals', even some quite basic rights. (Japan, as we have seen above, has a quite complicated history in this matter.)

In **Britain**, multi-culturalism and multi-ethnicity have been evident for longer and are more deeply rooted. First, Britain is itself a 'united kingdom' of different 'nations' (English, Scottish, Welsh and Northern Irish); second, especially since the end of WW2, it has become home for millions with roots in former British colonies; third and more recently, it is home to

more and more people from other European countries under the freedom of movement laws of the (expanding) European Union. London, the home of JSSL, is particularly mixed.

Over almost fifty years, there have been many educational responses, sometimes controversial ones, to this developing multi-ethnic and multicultural reality in England. Two initiatives have been particularly important. The first was the addition of Citizenship Education to the National Curriculum from 2002<sup>10</sup>, which clearly reflected an aim of *internalising democracy* at the level of each individual, including those from minority cultures. The second was the addition from 2007 of a new (fourth) ‘main strand’ to this Citizenship Education curriculum, called ‘Identities and Diversity: Living together in the UK’.<sup>11</sup> This signalled a deeper acceptance of the importance of *intercultural* understanding and relationships, for majority and minority cultures alike.<sup>12</sup>

When people really consider a particular land as their ‘home’ country, they feel that its government has given them enough rights to live independently and to take some free and responsible action for the society. Osler and Starkey (2005: 95-101) stress the link between the Citizenship subject and *community*, an area that matters to both children and adults. They surveyed 600 young people aged 10-18 by questionnaire.<sup>13</sup> It emerged that how people think about their own community is an important factor in unifying diverse ethnic and cultural groups and young people are hugely influenced by those around them at school and in their local area. The respondents were often eloquent about their feeling of ‘belonging’, for example, 14-year-old Morgan, recently arrived in Leicester.

...At my community centre is where people go and relax and chill. At the same centre there are clubs, karate, drama etc. I do karate at this centre and it is good fun. My street is called G. It’s in Highfields, there are many people living there, people of many cultures, religions and races. I like my street people and these many cultures which are fascinating and you can learn more in life with many cultures surrounding you. (p101-2)

---

<sup>10</sup> Following the Crick Report (1998)

<sup>11</sup> The Ajegbo Report (2007).

<sup>12</sup> P.Walsh (2007) argues that the word ‘intercultural’, though not much used in England, is appropriate here and should be seen as the essential complement to ‘multicultural’.

<sup>13</sup> As part of this research, they also conducted some workshops with small groups of students in four Leicester schools. I discuss these in ch.7 (my literature search)

Personally, living in London, I deeply empathise with Morgan's opinion. I do not have to feel 'a foreigner', because there are diverse people in the community where I live. Of greater significance here, most of the mixed heritage students in my classes have felt more comfortable living in Britain than in Japan. One mixed-race Japanese-British girl recently described always getting some curious attentions whenever she goes to Japan. In Japan, she feels she wants to change her face! Also, when she previously lived in Japan, she got bullied by some Japanese students in her secondary school. In contrast, she is very comfortable living in Britain and in her English school – she never feels that she is 'an outsider'. Again, a boy whose two parents are Japanese but who was born in the US and lived there before then moving to Japan (and later to Britain) described being bullied in Japan – because, he thought, he was smart and had learnt to express his own opinion.

Murphy-Shigematsu summarised this Japanese inclination:

'Japanese who do not 'look Japanese' are often referred to as haafu (from the English 'half'), but this descriptor does not match their identities, which are complex and may be as multiple as their passports. Some of their English-speaking parents advocate the term daburu (double) as a term of empowerment, but many youth themselves seem indifferent to this politically correct label.... There are also Japanese whose behaviour leads others to claim that they are not Japanese. Some are returnees (kikokushijo) who have spent part of their formative years abroad, and whose return to Japan is marked by a pervasive sense of being outside the fold and being regarded by others as strange Japanese. Their behaviour marks them as different, by revealing norms and values that contrast with those of mainstream Japanese culture' (2005: 309).

Of course, whether they were mixed-race or not, the students in our cohorts would be able to draw on their two-country experience when issues of ethnic, national and cultural diversity arose in the ARs.

### **(3) MEXT<sup>14</sup>, England and School-based Curriculum Development**

*First*, the ARs were conducted in a school, JSSL, which was part of the Japanese school system and within a Language and Literature Senior Curriculum that was approved by the Japanese Ministry of Education, MEXT. *Second*, the research context differed from the Japanese norm in two large ways. The school, the teachers and the students were in another

---

<sup>14</sup> The Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology

country, England. And the school was a Saturday school – the students were receiving their main education in English schools, and they had also more or less gained their expectations regarding teachers and teaching from those schools. These two factors were a crucial *English influence* on the birth and the pedagogical nature of the ARs, as has already been described. *Third*, the ARs are examples of *school-based* curriculum development, which presupposes a quite significant degree of freedom from central authority. This sub-section provides some background to these interacting points about power, influence and freedoms in our ARs.

**MEXT** In any educational system, the balance of power between government ministry, regions and schools is a crucial aspect, especially in regard to curriculum. The conceptual contrasts are between (relatively) centralized and (relatively) decentralized *structures* and between centralization and decentralization *processes*. A proper description of an educational system at any one time will include both the system’s currently more or less established position and the direction in which it may be moving.<sup>15</sup> In modern Japanese history, the power of the central government Ministry – formerly Monbusho, now MEXT – has nearly always been overriding. Decentralizing initiatives have been short-lived when they are radical and otherwise small-scale and tentative.

After the defeat of WWII, when Japan was occupied by the United States and the imperial constitution was thrown away and replaced by a new democratic constitution, educational decentralization was achieved, but under the supervision of the American ‘GHQ’, rather than by any Japanese initiative.

Consistent with the new constitutional guarantees of local self-government, the Board of Education Law of 1948 provided that education is a matter to be dealt with by local governments. ....However, this decentralization reform, which ran counter to the Japanese tradition of centralized organization and management, was implemented by the dictates of an occupying military force and not by the initiative of the Japanese nation. (H. Muta, 2000: 456)

After the occupation, the educational system once again changed drastically. A revision of the Board of Education Law in 1956 made Monbusho responsible for the establishment of

---

<sup>15</sup> I am indebted to my supervisor, Paddy Walsh, for this distinction.

national curriculum standards for all school levels and, also, for ‘the provision of professional and technical guidance and advice concerning teaching and guidance, the preparation of guidebooks on teaching materials, the provision of free textbooks for compulsory school children and the authorization of textbooks’ (Monbusho, 1997b:16). This centralization seemed inevitable to some degree. The high economic development to which Japan was committed needed workers who had high technical skills and/or an ability to manage people. Moreover, at this time, people were motivated very effectively both by the aspiration to make Japan a ‘better’ nation and by the belief that, whoever they were, when they made efforts there would be some rewards. However, as already noted, this kind of egalitarianism made competition among pupils more severe, especially competition for entry to the ‘good’ universities.

By the time of the fieldwork, the economic depression, along with other factors such as the low birth rate and the diversification of values, had diminished the zest and enthusiasm in this competition. Companies still judged job applicants by the university they graduated from, but those who did not graduate from ‘good’ universities now had great difficulty in getting good jobs. The loss of hope in the future, added now to the excessive competitiveness, was seen as fuelling more school violence, bullying and truancy. (Sakamoto-Vandenberg 1998:59-61).

To address these problems, it seems, and to restore pupils’ ‘zest for living’, MEXT authorised from 2000 a weekly period of *Integrated Study* (総合的な学習の時間) to be interpreted and designed at the discretion of each school and pupil, but with a general emphasis on value-diversity, independent thinking and problem-solving. Though welcome, this promotion of school-based curriculum initiative is obviously very limited. MEXT still has detailed control of nearly all curriculum areas. It also authorises the lists of subject textbooks from which schools must choose, and this form of ‘censorship’ goes beyond matters of format to such historic contents as taking Koreans or Chinese from their lands, the Nang-King massacre in China, and medical experiments on living Chinese people.

Furthermore, the motivation for the *Integrated Study* initiative seems to relate much more to economic regeneration than to political education. The economic recession and the ‘threat’ of other Asian countries have had serious consequences for Japan. Its products can be made more cheaply in countries like China. So MEXT promotes itself as ‘the saviour’ to strengthen the Japanese economy, with a ‘human resources’ strategy to cultivate top-level talents who will lead the Century of Knowledge. Children are to be nurtured to think flexibly, analytically and critically while engaging with the complicated global world – and to develop and venture new market products that can compete in the global market. This seems to be the main context for this limited decentralization.

Some more radical decentralization might begin to address the *social* consequences of Japan’s economic recession. The *Asahi* newspaper of 17<sup>th</sup> March 2008 carried an interesting article by E. Oguma, ‘Disharmonized Twins produced by Homogenization’, which argued that ‘nationalism’ and ‘globalization’ are twin enemies of the ‘localism’, which the author favours. Nationalism is egalitarian in spirit but ignores diversity. Globalization may increase overall GDP but at the cost of greater polarization between rich and poor inside Japan, for it benefits the rich much more than the poor. Increasing economic inequality is already leading to a more socially divided Japan, in which the old collectivist assumptions are breaking down under the experience of winners and losers of globalization. The article sees an increasing focus on local regions as having potential to engender a new sense of local cohesion and enterprise around diversity.

In **England**, the educational system was traditionally quite strongly localized until the late 1980s, but beginning with the introduction of a National Curriculum in 1988 it has become increasingly – and controversially – centralized in many ways. Malcolm Skilbeck’s *School-Based Curriculum Development* (1984) is a well-known study of the arguments around curriculum centralization, written at the time of transition. Its title conveyed the author’s commitment to schools having a significant role in developing their own curriculum. However, he *also* supported the arguments for introducing a national common-core curriculum in England. In fact, the book is an extended discussion of the *best mix or balance*

between centralization and decentralization in curriculum control. This seems to me a good general approach to the question.

The book acknowledges and addresses the difficulties of imposing a common core curriculum where that has not been the country's tradition, as in England at that time, while observing that the current inequalities and disparities of provision and opportunity in the school system surely needed to be remedied (1984:148). It then also acknowledges the challenges in terms of resources and skills that would be involved in getting schools generally to engage in serious and sustained development of their own curriculum. However, the great educational and professional advantages of such an engagement for the schools, the teachers and the students are what most impress the author. In the end, there is a choice between two contrasting visions and definitions of a National Curriculum:

(a) one that 'is prescribed by central government in accordance with declared needs and priorities, secured by objectives, divided into subjects or subject areas, supported by approved texts, assessed in an approved manner' (*ibid*: 146),

OR

(b) one that 'in broad outline is common to all schools and students, is defined in partnership by both central and local bodies, and is interpreted by schools' (*ibid*: 155).

Skilbeck clearly saw (b) as the better way forward. As well as the benefits to professional expertise and confidence in having to 'interpret' the 'broad outline' into a full curriculum that the school would see as 'its own',<sup>16</sup> there would be a significant gain for citizen democracy in the process of reaching national agreement on the 'broad outline':

What is important here is genuine discussion, debate, free and full dialogue, the opportunity for the aims to become an object of public concern and interest, recognition that the aims will be to a degree speculative, tentative, open for review and revision, and an explicit quest for consensus. These are surely fundamental considerations for democracy; the defining of aims could perhaps be seen as ...a responsibility of all citizens... (*ibid*: 168)

The English National Curriculum that emerged from 1988 would be much closer to definition (a) above and it was, therefore, 'a missed opportunity' for many commentators. However, it left space for teacher creativity within narrower limits (Lawton 1996) and

---

<sup>16</sup> Building on Skilbeck, Walsh would later speak of the need for curriculum to become 'embodied' in teachers and learners. (Walsh, 1997:107)

English teachers knew how to use this space, because they had experience of designing curricula.

We JSSL teachers found that the MEXT-defined Japanese curriculum also left some spaces, especially in its wide choice of literary texts, and we were able to build on those spaces. It was important to us that what we were doing could also be done in schools in Japan, *in principle*. However, our creativity was also drawing on the experience of English schools that our students were bringing to our Saturday classes. Perhaps, also, our ‘permission’ to be creative was influenced by JSSL’s more distant relationship with MEXT. The question remains how much more difficult it might be to conduct ARs like ours in a Japanese school in Toyko or Osaka, *in practice*. I will return to this question in the final chapter.

#### **1-4. The Structure of the Thesis**

**This chapter** has described the life-circumstances in which my research in the JSSL Senior Division was conceived; it has presented the research’s main focus as trialling certain pedagogic strategies for advancing peace and democracy education; and it has analysed – in frequent comparison with the British culture in which our students were working – three relevant features of Japanese culture: its seniority system, the continuing grip of its traditional mono-culturalism, and its centralised control of education and curriculum.

**Chapter 2** will address methodological matters. It describes the research site, JSSL, including my teaching and research companions and our more or less bi-cultural student participants. It defends at length the broad ‘philosophy’ of action research with which I worked, drawing especially on John Elliott’s writings, before describing the overlapping research and teaching ‘instruments’ used and my approach to data analysis. Finally, it details the ethical standards it tried to maintain, referring to the BERA Ethical Guidelines.

**Chapters 3-6** describe and analyse our three ARs. Two chapters, 3 and 4, are spared for AR1, ‘Literature Education for Peace’, because it was by far the longest and because it was where we worked out the essential features of our ARs:

(a) **Chapter 3** argues the case for using war-literature in peace education. It introduces the three main fiction texts used with the S1 to S3 classes, with a common theme of ‘invasion’, as well as the supplementary texts chosen for my own S1 class. It describes the evolving planning of the AR. It analyses teaching and learning across the ten Saturdays (mainly with reference to my S1 class) that would lead up to the experimental PM of all classes.

(b) **Chapter 4** describes and evaluates this PM with its *sharing* (i) of the classes’ prior experiences in their separate classrooms and (ii) of now watching and responding to an A-Bomb video together; and it evaluates AR1 as a whole, through interviews and a questionnaire.

**Chapter 5** presents AR2’s focus on newspaper education as part of education for democracy. Contemporaneous coverage of the Iraqi invasion was used to discover how press reports are constructed and the consumer’s responsibility when accessing news. *Common* holiday assignments for all Senior School classes fed into two periods of direct preparation in separate classes for a PM built on mixed-group analysis and plenary discussion of specially selected press materials. The AR’s successes and lessons are considered.

**Chapter 6** presents AR3s theme of international communication and understanding – essential to making a peaceful world – in two inter-related parts. Part 1 describes and evaluates intensive preparations by teachers and students leading up to a presentation to a first PM by Mr. Hirakubo, a survivor of the dreadful WWII ‘Imphal Campaign’ and, much later, a reconciliation-worker with British and Japanese veterans. Part 2 discusses the preparations for, and the conduct and outcome of, a second PM that would draw reflectively on students’ and teachers’ own intimate awareness of *both* Japanese and English ways of thinking to consider how such intercultural understanding can forestall conflict.

**Chapter 7** surveys other researches comparable to mine, five quite passionate Japanese ARs in peace and/or democracy education from the same period as mine, but just one from post 2005 (reflecting a narrowing of Japanese education in this period), an older American AR

conducted in the radical spirit of progressive schooling, a more recent British AR in a secondary school in a deprived inner-city area that was a pilot study for the introduction of Citizenship to the National Curriculum, and a workshop-based survey of young people's intercultural awareness in a high immigration English city. Many points of comparison and reinforcement occur and our ARs stand well in this field.

[There were two reasons why this literature survey was delayed until after the conduct, and most of the writing up, of the ARs. One was the *sudden* need and opportunity to work collaboratively with colleagues, combined with the *rush* from AR, to preliminary write-up, to planning the next AR. The other was my slowness to realise the *precise* focus of my research. Was it innovative pedagogy as such, or peace and democracy education as possible in the Literature and Language classroom? I did some reading and drafting around those themes, before realising that the focus should be none of these in isolation, but – as outlined in the research questions – innovative pedagogy *for* peace and democracy education. Finally, I had found a manageable and coherent agenda for my major literature survey!<sup>17</sup>]

**Chapter 8**, having first summarised the three ARs, evaluates the AR experience as a whole, drawing heavily on individual depth-interviews with 7 volunteer students who had experienced all three ARs, in which they compared them, reflected on what they had learnt from them, and evaluated them as a form of pedagogy. The evaluation briefly considers the difficulties of replicating ARs with similar pedagogy on similar themes in Japan itself, given its current educational and political climate.

---

<sup>17</sup> I should acknowledge the help of Dr Hargreaves and Professor Starkey in forcing me to make this clarification as part of my late upgrading process.

## Chapter 2

### Research Site and Theory-Methodology

#### 2-1. Introducing JSSL Senior High Division

**JSSL and JSL** The Japanese Saturday School in London (JSSL) is for school-age pupils with a Japanese connection who attend English schools on weekdays. It aims to teach Japanese language and literature ('National Language') to the same level as public (government) schools in Japan and it uses the same textbooks. Since it has just 2 hours and 20 minutes every Saturday to reach that level, its teachers are required to be inventive.

JSSL runs on three London sites, Finchley, Croydon and West Acton. The first two of these run separate elementary (7-12) and junior-high (13-15) divisions, while West Acton alone runs an additional senior-high (16-18) division – in which my teaching and research took place. Student enrolment is substantial across the sites and the (part-time) staff numbers correspond to this. Thus in 2005, early in my research, the Acton site was attended on Saturdays by approximately 570 pupils, who were being taught by 29 teachers.<sup>18</sup> The numbers for the senior-high division were a relatively modest part of this, approximately 70 students, who were attended by the 4 teachers who were our research team for the year. But we were definitely conscious of being part of a larger Saturday 'buzz' at our Acton site. Though we had our own area of classrooms, our senior students shared other facilities with the younger pupils and we senior teachers shared the staff room with the other teachers.

The three JSSL sites are managed by three head teachers, sent directly from MEXT, usually for three years before returning to Japan. Of these the Acton head is the overall head. By a coincidence, this position was held throughout our three fieldwork years by the same Headmaster and he was consistently encouraging and supportive of the research. As well as

---

<sup>18</sup>For JSSL *as a whole* in 2005, the approximate numbers of learners and teachers were: **Finchley**: c. 380 pupils and 20 teachers; **Croydon**: c. 200 pupils and 10 teachers; and **Acton**: c. 570 pupils and 29 teachers (made up of 400 elementary pupils and c.20 teachers; 100 junior high pupils and c.5 teachers; 70 senior high students and 4 teachers). In addition, there was a separate Saturday group at Acton of 120 Japanese second-language pupils and their 7 teachers. The grand totals of students and of staff attending the three JSSL sites on Saturdays were, therefore, c.1270 students and c.66 teachers.

permitting, publicizing and attending our ‘plenary sessions’ (PMs), he also undertook to video them, which provided us with an important tool for reflection and research.

It remains to explain that JSSL is an institution within a larger institution, the Japanese School in London (JSL). The other main part of JSL is a *Weekday* (Monday to Friday full-time) Japanese School that is also situated at Acton. Thus the Acton School building becomes a full-time JSL during the working week and then becomes a part-time JSSL on Saturdays. This full-time school is attended by pupils whose families have been put on temporary placement in London by their companies and it runs separate elementary and junior high divisions only. It does not run a senior division. Most of its graduates return to Japan when they reach senior high school age. The minority who then transfer to weekday English schools often take up the option of attending the Saturday School senior division in Acton to keep up their Japanese. They would join the other students who had attended the Saturday School in lower divisions. They tended to be stronger in the Japanese language, but were less accustomed to our more interactive pedagogy because the Weekday School is obliged to be a more or less typical Japanese school.

Mr S was the overall ‘President’ (局長) of the whole JSL, including JSSL, during the research. His position was more permanent than those of the head-teachers and teachers seconded by MEXT to the different sites. His office was at the Acton site and it was to him that I brought my pedagogical problem, as described in the previous chapter, and it was he who gave me the advice that led on to our action researches. He, too, was consistent in his support of our project and regularly attended our PMs.

**A Flexible Approach to Curriculum** It was lucky for our research that we were able to take a quite flexible approach to the standard Japanese curriculum for Language and Literature with our senior students. We were not forced by our superiors, or by anxious students, or by parents, to cover everything in the textbook and there was no difficulty in regularly using, for example, newspaper, video, and library materials. Such freedoms facilitated greatly the cooperative goodwill and experimenting spirit of my senior division colleagues, so we could work as a team both in our separate classrooms and our cross-age

PMs. In principle, these measures are also available to schools and teachers in Japan. In practice, however, and especially as regards their senior division students, they are almost certain to feel constrained by the nature and the importance of the examinations that control entry to Japanese universities. JSSL teachers and students are free from that kind of strong pressure. Good attendance was sufficient for graduation from JSSL and there were no graduating examinations.

Why this teaching and learning ‘luxury’? The answer is in two parts. First, the majority of our students were planning to go to British universities and they were having enough examination stress in their weekday English schools as they prepared for A-levels, or IB, or similar qualifications. It was particularly valuable that they could have a more relaxed and liberal approach to their Saturday work. Second, for the smaller number who intended to go to university in Japan, their status as ‘returnees’ (帰国子女) gave them a huge privilege compared to Japanese home students. Instead of taking the very difficult entrance examinations to enter a Japanese university, they are usually required to take just English, essays and interviews – even for some medical universities.<sup>19</sup>

**Collaboration in Research as well as Teaching** The three ARs were carried out *across* the *three* grades of the *senior high* division of the Saturday School (JSSL), the division in which I did all my teaching. The number of classes in each grade varied from one to two during those three years, so that a total of 13 senior classes and 6 teachers were included in the research over the three years. Each year I taught an S1 class (age 15-16). Two colleagues also taught in each of the three years, Teacher Y an S2 class (age 16-17), and Teacher X an S2 class in the first year and the S3 class (age 17-18) in the following two years. Teacher Z taught an S1 class in both the second and the third years. Finally, teachers V and W taught in just one of the three years.

---

<sup>19</sup> Avoiding the complicated and intensely stressful process of entrance exams for national universities gives ‘returnees’ a huge advantage, particularly for entering Japan’s more difficult universities. See *Appendix 2-1*

<i>AR / Class</i>	<b>S1</b>	<b>S1B</b>	<b>S2</b>	<b>S2B</b>	<b>S3</b>
<b>AR1 (04-05)</b>	Miz.	----	Y	X	V
<b>AR2 (05-06)</b>	Miz.	Z	Y	----	X
<b>AR3 (06-07)</b>	Miz.	Z	Y	W	X

We generally perceived our pedagogical project and its exciting AR themes as, not only educationally valuable for our students, but also professionally novel and beneficial for ourselves. For all of us, not just for me, this was a new and experimental form of teaching in its combination of teamwork, cross-age learning and a focus on peace and democracy. It involved considerably enhanced, and unusually collaborative, forms of longer-term and shorter-term planning and evaluation – for all of us. Colleagues could see that the special nature of this teaching was inviting them to become co-researchers with me, up to a point.

**Sharing and Assisting** It is important to distinguish these two forms of research participation. First, my colleagues *shared* with me (increasingly fully) in all the following:

- the choice and development of the AR themes (the planned ‘actions’);
- interpreting and teaching the themes for their own Senior classes and discussing their individual experiences of this with ‘the team’;
- the communal planning and preparations for the PMs, and their implementation and evaluation;
- and, finally, the important evaluative and reflective meetings that ‘bridged’ from one AR to the next (which were kindly facilitated by the Acton headmaster having recorded the PMs and made individual DVDs of them for each teacher).

The later chapters of this thesis will note our growing confidence in the value of our pedagogical concept and in our own ability to achieve this value together. We would find that we could work well together across our student age-groups on the agreed themes, building momentum towards the shared PMs. A significant consequence was that the annual project idea became ‘embedded’ in the senior division. It continued for many years after the three ‘research’ years, though then associated with a wider range of language and literature themes. What had started as a thoughtful experiment became a tradition.

The other form of my colleagues' participation was their gracious *assistance* with aspects of my formal research, contributing now not so much to a new 'tradition' as to my (eventual!) academic thesis. This was in two main ways:

- as *research subjects*, in being available for more or less formal interviews by me at certain points;
- as *administrative helpers*, in frequently facilitating my data gathering and recording for this thesis, for example, making copies of their students' written work for me, or administering my short questionnaires to their classes.

But though my colleagues were my co-researchers and my frequent assistants, the fact remains that I am the principal owner and carry the main responsibility for the three ARs, especially as they are written up and presented in this thesis:

- First, the *initial impetus* for the fieldwork action came from me (and my pedagogical 'crisis' and needs), as chapter 1 has described,
- Second, it will become evident in chapters 3-6 that the write-up is focusing more strongly on *my own S1 classes* than on the other Senior Division classes.<sup>20</sup>
- Third, and most fundamentally, it should be clear throughout the thesis that its *overall structure of narrative and analysis* is my responsibility.

**The Collaborators** However, it will also remain obvious that this research could not have happened without my gifted colleagues and it is very much indebted to them. It is important, now, to introduce them.

Teacher X, who taught an S2 class in AR1 and the S3 class in AR2 and AR3, was our oldest and most experienced teacher. She was regarded informally as the 'head' and 'brain' of our high school division. Though her original major was History, she was also teaching IB Japanese literature in an international school in London. She was highly respected by the President and, indeed, by JSSL teachers generally.

---

<sup>20</sup> This will be especially evident in regard to AR1's ten separate classes.

Teacher Y, who taught an S2 class in all three ARs, was particularly popular with students for her relaxed, laid-back approach, though she is also very keen on the best Japanese expression. The special subject of her teachers' license is Japanese literature and she worked as a Japanese literature teacher in Japan for three years before coming to Britain. Concurrently with her Saturday work in JSSL, she was working as a full-time Japanese literature teacher in an international school. She kindly gave a lot of useful advice to me, a Social Studies specialist, on literature and language teaching.

Teacher Z has a teachers' license in Japanese literature, but had not previously taught in Japan when she joined JSSL in 2005 and taught an S1 class for AR2 and AR3. Since I was teaching the other S1 classes, we worked closely together in those years. I came to appreciate the passion and the originality in her teaching and, thanks to her, the quality of our S1 worksheets and other constructed materials became a lot more sophisticated. Her weekday job was in a London bank.<sup>21</sup>

Teacher V taught the S3 class in our first year only (2004-5). He had taught Math in Japan for almost 20 years before coming to Britain and also possessed a deep understanding of both social studies and literature. He was, indeed, a very knowledgeable and thoughtful teacher and collaborator on the AR1 project of peace education through literature. Later he became a full-time administrator for JSL/JSSL and in that role he helped me a lot in organizing the key visit of Mr. Hirakubo for AR3. He quitted JSL/JSSL a few years later and went back to Japan as a full-time Math teacher.<sup>22</sup>

Teacher W taught one of the S2 classes for AR3 in 2006-7, soon after her arrival in JSSL. An intelligent and methodical language teacher, she had taught English in Japan for many years before then teaching Japanese in England. We quickly found we had two things in

---

<sup>21</sup> I also had weekday work at this time and later as a teacher of Japanese to university students, especially in Imperial College.

<sup>22</sup> My connection with Mr V became personal in another way. He was a Catholic, as were my husband and mother-in-law. Knowing that I play the organ, he invited me to be the organist for the Japanese Catholic community in the Farm Street Jesuit Church. Later, I was baptized there in 2011. Mr. Hirakubo was also a member of this community.

common. Having like me had long experience teaching in Japan, she experienced for a while the same difficulty as I had earlier in adapting to the different teaching and learning expectations of most JSSL students. Secondly, she was another doctoral student, which gave her critical eyes for my research and it was thanks to her suggestion that the main AR3 theme was pinned down to ‘international understanding’.

**Bi-Lingual and Bi-Cultural Student Participants** Finally, the senior high (15-18 years old) boys and girls are not typical Japanese students because of their time in England, and they are also different from ordinary English students because of their Japanese background. As an example, 11 of the 21 students in my S1 class in 2004-5 were born and raised in England. English was their first language and most of them confessed to me that they found it easier to catch the news in English. However, they could also speak Japanese exactly as ordinary Japanese speak it and were able to understand Japanese literature of the senior high school level. The other 10 pupils in that year were temporary residents in England because of their parents’ job-postings to the UK for a few years. Their Japanese ability was generally higher than the pupils who were born in England. And though, as mentioned earlier, they were generally less accustomed to the more open pedagogy we were using, their skills and outlook were now being influenced quite intensively by their concurrent attendance at weekday English schools.

## **2-2. Action Research**

For convenience, my two main research questions may be repeated here. They focus on peace education and on the wider field of education for democracy, in turn, and they are regarded as of equal weight in the thesis:

**How could we, Language and Literature teachers of senior students, use literature to develop effective curriculum and pedagogy units around the theme of war and peace?** (Underpinning AR1 and preparing the way for ARs 2 and 3.)

**How, more generally, could we develop and teach Language units that would nurture democratically-minded citizens who would become voluntarily and independently involved in society?** (In the background of AR1 and underpinning ARs 2 and 3.)

The direct focus on pedagogy (including the preparation of curriculum themes and materials) in these questions reflects the close relationship between my research and my own teaching, while also implying the involvement of my colleagues. As such, they pointed towards action research! Committing ourselves to developing and studying our curriculum and pedagogical innovation through collaborative processes of implementation and reflection was, in fact, to commit ourselves to collaborative action research (of a more or less formal kind).

**A Broad Approach** It is necessary to say, however, that the quite sudden way in which the opportunity and the need for action research emerged, as described in chapter 1, gave me little time to think about the deeper nature of this form of research *in advance*. My understanding of its possibilities had to grow ‘from the job’ – further readings and discussions with my supervisor interacted with my fieldwork experiences and analyses. From an early point, however, I thought of action research more broadly than as ‘road-testing’ our pedagogical innovations against narrowly pre-defined objectives for the student and teacher participants. Our first theme of peace education itself suggested a broader approach and something more personal and more ‘transformative’ of us as teachers and students.

Walsh (1997 ch.2) provides a short summary of changing views on the relationship between theory and practice in education leading up to the then favoured view that the relationship should be seen as two-way or dialectical: practice gives rise to theory; theory, in turn, modifies practice; and so on. He refers to Stenhouse’s influential portrait of the ‘teacher as researcher’ in her or his own teaching situation and he quotes him:

...all well-founded curriculum research and development, whether the work of an individual teacher, of a school or a group working in a teachers’ centre or of a group working within the coordinating framework of a national project, is based on the study of classrooms. It thus rests on the work of teachers (*originally* Stenhouse 1975:143)

Walsh also attends to the Stenhouse insistence on teachers to be open-minded:

[For Stenhouse:] Rather than being committed to any particular theory, truly ‘researching teachers’ will be committed to (as well as capable of) the study and systematic questioning of their own teaching and the testing of proposed theories in their practice. They will probably also be ready to allow other teachers to observe them at work and then discuss this work with them on an open and honest basis (1997:20).

These comments resonated with me as I was entering into my collaborative research. We teachers should reflect thoroughly ('research' in a broad sense) in and about our classes, both to improve our teaching and to deepen our students' thinking. The action-research on which I was starting should not be in a one-way style of testing an already fully pre-formed theory. For both teachers and students, there should rather be a commitment to developing critical interactions *between*, on the one hand, our developing 'theories' regarding, for example, peace study through literature, or the pedagogical advantages of mixed-age plenary meetings *and*, on the other hand, our actual teaching and learning 'experiences'. Furthermore, to achieve this, we should have open minds to other theories and approaches and to other evaluations of our 'actions', and be willing to reflect interactively with each other and with the other interested parties about these.

I would find support for these starting aspirations in some parts of the literature surrounding action research, but especially in a seminal work by John Elliott.

### **John Elliott's philosophy of action research**

Walsh (1997: 21) compares two influential definitions of action research:

'small-scale intervention in the functioning of the real world and a close examination of the effects of such intervention' (Cohen and Manion 1994);

*versus*

'the study of a social situation with a view to improving the quality of action within it' (John Elliott 1991).

Is it intervention (action) to increase knowledge, or study (knowledge) to improve action? In my own case, I *could* say that conceiving the big AR themes preceded the implementation of them in our teaching – *theory before practice* – while then adding that implementing the ARs made us realize, for example, the deep relationship between peace and democracy and the importance of educating for democracy – *practice feeding back to theory*. Then it might also be pointed out that this research story did not start with settled themes of peace and democracy, but with my difficulty in holding my students' attention and my willingness to seek a solution for this, with the headmaster's encouragement – again, *practice before theory!*

Perhaps it will be enough to note that both knowledge and practice are necessary and that they should ‘feed’ from each other in a continuing cycle? Walsh’s sympathy, however, is with Elliott’s particular emphasis on the goal of improved practice. Elsewhere in his seminal text, Elliott is very explicit about this:

The fundamental aim of action research is to improve practice rather than to produce knowledge. The production and utilization of knowledge is subordinate to, and conditioned by, this fundamental aim (1991:49).

**A Theory of Pedagogy** Elliott’s development of this position can be analysed and summarised in the six points below, and I came to realise that these articulated and developed our previously mainly implicit theory of pedagogy.

1. Educational practice itself is the main source for the ‘production’ of knowledge about practice and its improvement. It is, also, the main place of the ‘utilization’ of this knowledge. In other words, learning how to teach and how to teach better is rightly seen as a case of learning *through* and *from* experience and while *drawing on* experience. Of course, openness to considerations from philosophy or psychology, for example, is essential, but these considerations have to be interpreted and then validated or revised in the practice of teaching. Now, all this assumes that teachers are being ‘reflective’ in their practice, during their teaching as well as before teaching (while planning) and after teaching (while evaluating). Elliott places great emphasis on reflective practice.

2. This reflectiveness should have a special focus. Where some would separate attention to ‘the process’ of improving teaching and attention to ‘the product’ of the improved quality of learning, for Elliott attention to the *interaction* between this process and this product is the important thing. (Perhaps he would accept the phrase ‘the curriculum-in-communication’ for this focus of attention!)

3. This reflection with the same special focus is also integral to action research. Indeed, Elliott sometimes just identifies reflective practice and action research – while sometimes he seems to permit both a general sense of ‘action research’ (e.g. the action research of my

collaborators) and a specific sense with more emphasis on ‘methodology’, ‘data’ and ‘writing up’ (e.g. my action research).

4. The ends or goals of this teaching-acting-process embody *values* and are, in fact, *ethical* in character. Therefore, they cannot be ‘fixed’, for example, in behavioural objectives:

When values define the ends of a practice, such ends should not be viewed as concrete objectives or targets which can be perfectly realized at some future. (1991:51)

In fact, for Elliott, teachers should be reflective practitioners who *continuously* ‘reconstruct their concepts of value in ways which progressively illuminate practical problems and possibilities’ (*ibid.*).<sup>23</sup> For him education is not a fundamentally technical business that carries some typical ethical issues (e.g. around the punishment of children). Rather it is a fundamentally ethical business to which many technical issues are attached. This implies that, whatever the curriculum subject or theme, character development is involved – and for teachers as well as students. (I could see that this was especially clear for themes like teaching for peace and for democracy.)

5. Reflective practice/action research blossoms with teacher collaboration. When teachers are isolated, they lack the strong power needed to change their existing situation. Whereas:

When teachers engage in collaborative reflection on the basis of common concerns and involve their clients in the process, they develop the courage to critique the curriculum structures which shape their practices, and the power to negotiate change within the system which maintains them. [1991: 56]

In addition, teachers’ opportunities for deep and critical reflection on their own practice are severely reduced when they work in isolation from each other. Elliott claims that improvements in some relatively superficial techniques can easily create ‘the illusion’ of serious development.

---

<sup>23</sup> This may fit with Walsh championing ‘an open model of the theory / practice complex’ for the new millennium, based on a more nuanced sense of the sheer complexity of *both* practice and theory’. On the one hand, there is the enormous variety of, and within, institutions and contexts of educational practice. On the other hand, there are the many different kinds of theory that both feed into and draw upon reflective educational practice. Walsh, 1997: 18

The collaborative research for this thesis began from, and was always supported by, the school leaders, all of us getting some advantage from JSSL's special 'offshore' position in the Japanese system and its 'Saturday' position in the education of its students. So it may not have involved a big challenge to 'the JSSL system'. However, it was indeed intended to deepen and develop our teaching, mine especially at first, but quite soon for all of us. How well these professional aspirations were being met will be a recurring theme in the accounts of the ARs. But that the collaborative AR and cross-age PM would become an annual voluntary JSSL tradition continuing for almost 10 years from its launch in 2004 is already some evidence of the teachers' belief in its value!

6. Finally, for Elliott, when understood in its full potential 'action research constitutes a resolution to the theory-practice issue as it is perceived by teachers' (1991: 66). For it makes theory and practice inter-dependent and so puts them at each other's service. More generally, it unifies different aspects of education to the advantage of teachers and the teacher-voice:

Action research unifies processes often regarded as quite disparate, e.g. teaching, curriculum development, educational research and professional development' (p.53-4)

Again:

'Action research integrates teaching and teacher development, curriculum development and evaluation, research and philosophical reflection, into a unified conception of a reflective educational practice.' (p.54)

For instance, it brings together teaching, research and evaluation:

.....teaching is conceived as a form of research aimed at understanding how to translate educational values into concrete forms of practice. In teaching, diagnostic judgments about practical problems and action hypotheses about strategies for resolving them are reflectively tested and evaluated..... [It follows that] one cannot separate the research process of testing hypotheses from the process of evaluating teaching. Evaluation is an integral component of action research. (p.54)

These integrations in good action research may challenge the isolation of some specialisms in the study and administration of education from classrooms and teachers. In the first place, however, they challenge teachers to think in broader and deeper ways about their practice, together and individually. In our collaborative ARs, we found we became teachers and researchers, curriculum developers and evaluators, teacher educators of each other as well as

of our students, and occasional ‘philosophers’ considering the meanings of peace, democracy and history.<sup>24</sup>

From conversations with my supervisor, a useful summary and an acronym emerged for this pedagogic theory:

**RICE:** ‘R’ for Reflectiveness around ‘I’ for Interactions (teaching and learning) that are ‘C’ for Collaborative and ‘E’ for Ethically creative.

**Reframing and reconceptualising practice** In his 1991 work, as well as advancing his own view, Elliott was contesting a different, ‘technical’, view of action research, which he feared was becoming too popular in the strongly ‘centralising’ English system.

...there are signs that action research has become hijacked in the service of technical rationality. Teachers are being encouraged to view action research as an inquiry into how to control pupil learning to produce predefined curriculum objectives targets without any consideration of the ethical dimension of teaching and learning. I am anticipating that action research will become highly recommended as a strategy for helping teachers to maximize pupils’ achievement of the national curriculum targets. (1991: 52)

A recent paper by Griffiths and Williamson (2011) shows that that the fight against this limited technocratic interpretation is continuing, but that the ‘transformative’ version of action research I have associated with Elliott remains a live option. Indeed, these authors distinguish two good varieties of action research. There is a standard view that clearly ‘goes well beyond technical issues of efficiency’, while expressing itself in terms of ‘cycles’, ‘problems’ and ‘interventions’. There is also a broader view that looks out for larger re-framings and re-conceptualizations of practice.

On the broader view, changed understanding, new interpretations and re-formed frameworks are at least as significant as any specific interventions which generated them, or as any specific action strategies which result from them.....We are claiming that the major significance of action research is to be found in the use of evidence and analysis in order to enable practitioners to re-frame and re-conceptualize their practice.

---

<sup>24</sup> Elliott further associates his conception of action research with i) Stenhouse’s process model of curriculum, 2) a classic Aristotelian division of kinds of thinking, and 3) Alisdair MacIntyre’s concept of ‘a practice’ (Elliott 1991, final chapter, also 2007 chs 6-8 and 11) With help from my tutor, these connections are summarised in *Appendix 2-2*.

This broad view best accommodates the kind of action research that I and my colleagues developed over time. Our ARs were simply too big to be considered ‘interventions’ to solve ‘a problem in our practice’. Instead, they *were* our practice for their duration each year. They had quickly absorbed and outgrown my original problem in holding the students’ attention. But they were also an *innovating* practice, in two dimensions: bringing peace and democracy education to the language and literature class; and bringing unusual degrees and forms of collaboration into our teaching and into our students’ learning. As innovations, there was a *special* obligation to be deliberate and reflective about them, to plan, monitor and evaluate each one in turn and the later ones in the light of the reflected experience of the earlier. That combination of extended innovation and reflection was always likely to lead us to ‘re-frame and re-conceptualize’ our practice – and qualify us as ‘action researchers’ in the more radical sense!

The thesis will confirm that ‘re-framing and re-conceptualizing’ as a result of reflective innovating is further facilitated when the innovation is unusually *sustained*, as well as unusually *collaborative*. Thus: at one level, our ‘journey’ over three years was from peace orientation, to responsible media consumption, to intercultural and international understanding – three distinct themes; but at another level it would involve a growing awareness (especially for we teachers) of those themes as different aspects of the larger and unifying theme of democracy and democratic-mindedness. Again: at one level we were developing and evaluating a particular pedagogical strategy culminating in cross-age-group plenary meetings (PMs); but at a deeper level we teachers were surely developing a less individualistic and more open sense of ‘class-teacher’,<sup>25</sup> and our students were surely developing a more open sense of ‘our class’ and ‘our age-group’.

For me, who was the ‘action researcher’ in the full *academic* sense, there was also the more intense and detailed analyses in writing up our experience into the evaluative narratives and more general reflections that follow in this thesis. This definitely has deepened, and

---

<sup>25</sup> Griffiths and Williamson (2011) refer to one aspect of this development when they note: ‘In a series of books and articles, Elliott has argued that teachers themselves should identify the focus of action research projects democratically’.

continues to deepen, my awareness of the possibilities of teaching and of the contextual conditions for realising those possibilities.

### **Some Research Dilemmas and Practicalities<sup>26</sup>**

(1) Elliott observes that the classroom is traditionally each individual teacher's sphere and 'the school as a social organization' is the head-teacher's sphere. So head-teachers may worry about *staff expertise* in implementing action research in sensitive issues across the school (and the curriculum is certainly a 'sensitive' issue). But these different spheres of responsibility may be developed into a fruitful interactive system: the head-teacher's role becomes 'one of orchestrating a process of collaborative deliberation and decision-making amongst professional staff' (1991: 62) The initiative of the JSSL President in responding to my pedagogical problem and his and the head-teacher's on-going support for our ARs obviously exemplify this good system.

However, it is noted that there may also be questions among teacher-participants about the expertise of the colleague who is in some way leading the research. I understand this aspect very well. In just my second year at the school, I felt awkward in proposing the first AR to my more experienced colleagues – particularly the two whose licence was specifically in Japanese literature. I had some 'pride' at having worked in the prestigious Kobe College, but as a 'novice' in language and literature teaching I could never behave as if I were a 'professional'. I also tried to reduce my colleagues' administrative burdens in the research as much as possible, especially in AR1, while, however, seeking to enhance their sense of their own initiative. I wanted ARs to proceed, not under my 'order' or 'suggestion', but with 'mutual agreement and cooperation'.

(2) Another dilemma noted by Elliott arises from the 'apparently conflicting values of the right to privacy and the right to know. ...[T]he insider researcher feels under an obligation not to record or report information gathered as a participant in the everyday life of the school. ... [This] applies as much to disclosure inside as outside the institution'. To solve this dilemma,

---

<sup>26</sup> The first three 'dilemmas' here are among six noted in Elliott (1991: 58-68), the ones that are relevant to my research.

teacher researchers in schools tend to opt for quantitative methods of data collection. Because research 'discloses' the school to some degree, they try to 'formalise and depersonalise their data-gathering methods'. But action research, by its fundamental nature, is collection and analysis of data relating to a concrete context, 'educational practices in particular contexts with an identifiable group of individual practitioners'. (*ibid*: 63)

I wanted to analyse deeply students' thinking regarding wars and peace, democracy and interculturalism. Qualitative data was much more suitable for this. However, some 'head-counting' seemed inevitable and desirable, especially given that the whole Senior Division student body was involved in each AR. The compromise was 'before and after' questions that were open-ended rather than closed. Actually, it will emerge that the data from these questionnaires was more useful for qualitative illustration than for quantitative findings.

(3) A related dilemma is teacher researchers' distrust of 'case-studies' for their perceived lack of generalizability. Citing Simons (1978), Elliott observes that the cure for this distrust is said to be reading other case studies written by peers.

Giving 'reluctant' teachers access to a conversation about other teachers' case studies is a way of helping them to resist the temptation to resolve their reporting dilemma by embracing the empiricist assumption. (1991: 65)

Teachers and researchers are drawn to more apparently 'objective' methods, thinking that their findings will then have wider relevance and application. But when they read good quality case-studies of other schools and projects and are stimulated to consider the similarities and differences with their own situations they can experience how a new understanding of their own possibilities can occur. That is the way in which case-studies – and action research – can have even a high general interest.

I can apply this to my own thinking about replicating our AR approach in other times and contexts. When I look back to the years 2004-2006, I can say, first, that it was a most fruitful moment in JSSL because the levels of both Japanese and English were very high. Two thirds of the students then had their previous education through Japanese (whether in Japan or in the weekday JSL). Their level of Japanese was truly advanced, their understanding of

Japanese literature sometimes seemed deeper than mine, and almost all of them who remained in the UK for university went to Oxford or Cambridge. The students who were born and brought up in London could be impressed and influenced by them. Therefore, the conditions were ideal for ARs that promoted intercultural exchange and learning. However, there would be a turning point around 2011. ‘Returnees’ became scarce as a result of the economic recession e.g. 2-3 out of 25 students in 2011, and 2 out of 18 in 2012. Yet we were still able to make good use of the AR strategy of team-teaching and cross-age learning as part of our annual programme, though not usually focusing on political themes and with less emphasis on intercultural exchange in the classroom.

Again, it is one thing to be surrounded by very thoughtful and experienced teacher-colleagues who improved the quality of my ARs very much in the special circumstances of JSSL. Their contributions – based, first, on their own dual culture experience, second, on sparing vast time and passion for study meeting / preparation for plenary meetings and, third, on being almost free from the Japanese vertical culture – really made my research. In the absence of those conditions in contemporary Japan, it is hard to see how such exciting ARs could be implemented year by year. Yet, it should remain that Japanese teachers – including me – could find and use in our three ARs particular ideas and methods for developing our students’ thinking processes.

(4) In their *Action Research Planner*, Kemmis, McTaggart and Retallick, provide a chart of the changing balance and relationship between practice and discourse across four (repeating) phases of action research:

**The ‘Moments’ of Action Research** (adapted from 2004:7)

	<i>Constructive</i>	<i>Reconstructive</i>
<i>Discourse (among participants)</i>	1 PLAN Prospective to action	4 REFLECT Retrospective on observation
<i>Practice (in the social context)</i>	2 ACT Retrospective guidance from planning	3 OBSERVE Prospective for reflection

For them this cycle of four phases should be completed in quite a short time, between a single day and two weeks (*ibid*: 30). However, our JSSL classes are only once a week and we teachers attend the school only on that day. Particularly during the long AR1, I could not ‘bind’ my colleagues to attend reflection and planning meetings every week (though, since every week I recorded my own class experience in my diary and also considered how I could improve this in the following week(s), I personally met this recommendation). Instead, we had some such meeting every two/three weeks when the year’s AR was active – and then in the week after each PM we had a major extended meeting that included the headmaster, in which we watched and discussed the recorded DVD of the PM and drew lessons for the next AR and PM.

When doing action research collaboratively, then, the timetable has to work for colleagues also. In my context, the ‘interruptions’ in collaboration in a Saturday school were more than compensated by the particular value of the plenary meeting. Beyond just sharing ‘the plan’, it gives teachers (i) a ‘common goal’ (ii) of implementing together an actual ‘united class’. If we share a plan, but implement it only in our individual classes, we are missing a chance to have a great dynamism in our nurturing of students’ democratic skills, not only the actual experience of sharing the same passionate atmosphere as they mingle and discuss opinions with different year classes, but also the anticipation of this throughout the AR. And, from the teachers’ point of view, listening to other students and comparing them with their own students can stimulate reflection to improve their own teaching methods.

## **2-3. Research Instruments**

### **(1) My Research Diary**

This was a diary (written in Japanese) that I kept of our AR reflective meetings and my own AR classes. It is an extremely large document, especially the part that relates to the 10 teaching sessions over 3 months of AR1. During team meetings I made rapid notes by hand, which I typed up soon after the meetings. Accounts of meetings and of my classes often dovetailed, especially in ARs 2 and 3 where we were using the same themes and similar teaching materials, and meetings generally focused on shared evaluations of our last classes and/or preparations for our next classes. Some of our meetings were attended by one or more

of the senior staff (President, Headmaster, Deputy-head), and their useful advice is recorded. Some parents' opinions and responses at the time of AR1 are also included. (*There are translated sample diary entries in several appendices.*)

As a record, this diary was *supplemented*: for all the ARs by copies kept of worksheets and questionnaires and by the Headmaster's DVDs of PMs; for AR1 by diaries very kindly kept by my colleagues of their own class activities across the 10 weeks when our curricula varied in accordance with the literary texts we had chosen; and for ARs 2 and 3 by tape records I kept of the student presentations and discussions in my own class's preparatory classes.

I referred regularly to the diary and its supplements, not only for explicit research purposes after the ARs, but also as a guide while developing the 'action' of each AR and when choosing basic themes and strategies for later ARs that would complement earlier ARs for on-going students. The diary was also crucial for this thesis, especially since my data analysis and drafting have been spread out over many years. The accounts of our team thinking and planning during the ARs, and of the week-by-week progress in my own classes, have drawn mainly on it.

## **(2) Tape-Recorded Interviews of Students and Teachers**

I conducted four sets of interviews, two sets in AR1, one set in AR3 and a final set when all three ARs were over. These were individual interviews of my colleague teachers and group and individual interviews of students. All were of people I knew well, which made it easy to arrange the interviews and to get their permissions to tape the interviews, and, also, it largely freed me from having to ask warm-up questions and go quickly to 'core' questions.

On the spectrum from unstructured to structured, the interviews were semi-structured, though not very far from being unstructured in the case of the teacher interviews. As Newton points out, 'semi-structured' covers the whole range between 'structure' and 'unstructured'.

A useful concept in describing types of interview is the continuum; any particular interview can be placed somewhere between 'unstructured' and 'structured'. The 'unstructured' pole is closer to observation, while the 'structured' use of 'closed' questions is similar to types of questionnaire. (2010)

The recognised advantages of the semi-structured approach to interviewing are *flexibility* in relation to different interviewees and increased *depth* in both the data and the analysis. Unlike questionnaires and tightly structured interviews, interviewers can vary the follow-up questions to the individual interviewees, who will then feel themselves freer to develop answers and, even, to change their opinions as they would like. The semi-structured interview, indeed, might be described as a mixture of conversation and questionnaire.

### *Teacher Interviews*

(i) Immediately after the PM of AR1, I interviewed *three colleague-researchers individually* in the teachers' room, for a half hour each on average, to get their views of the AR. It, and the PM in particular, had been our joint-creation and, after I had begun by expressing my gratitude to them, colleagues were very eager and excited to share their observations. Because of this common standpoint between interviewer and interviewees, their comments seemed more like contributions to a conversation than answers to an interviewer's questions (and the temptation to 'slide' into shared evaluation or planning of our teaching might not always have resisted).

(ii) Two years later, immediately after the final PM of AR3, I again interviewed *three colleague-researchers individually* in the teachers' room for a half hour each on average, to get their views of AR3. This time, as I interviewed each one – beginning again by recording my gratitude to them – the other two chose to listen in, with the result that their responses tended to complement and relate to each other's, rather than to repeat each other's – almost as though it had been one long group interview – and this seemed appropriate to that AR's main theme of international understanding. They did not seem at all 'pushed' to be interviewed by me, rather to be enjoying this extension of their AR3 experience.

Through the experience and later analysis of my colleagues' interviews, I learned a lot about their view of education that helped me improve my own teaching.

### *Student Interviews*

(iii) After AR1 had finished, I interviewed *two selected groups of my own S1 students* – three boys and two girls – in our own classroom, for a total of one hour and fifteen minutes. I was careful to begin by explaining my purpose of getting their views of the AR. For most of them it was their first experience of being interviewed – as I had anticipated – but the group context encouraged them to speak up willingly (as well as limiting the amount of simple repetition of other students' replies). Indeed, they gave every sign of cooperation in addressing my questions and expressing their opinions as best they could.

(iv) Five months after AR3, I interviewed an opportunity sample of *seven willing S3 students who had experienced all three ARs* (excepting one who had missed much of AR3). My purpose was to encourage them to reflect on their overall AR experience and, more specifically, to compare the three AR themes, to express their current thinking on democracy and peace, and to evaluate the AR pedagogy, especially its use of PMs. They were five boys and two girls who were soon to leave school and, with the necessary permissions, I interviewed them individually after class on three successive Saturdays in their own S3 classroom for around 45 minutes each. I prepared the ground carefully by supplying them with reminder-summaries of the three ARs and copies of their own questionnaire returns and worksheets to read through in advance and I began each interview by explaining my purpose and then reading through the AR summaries with them. The findings from these seven interviews are central to my overall project evaluation in chapter 8.

The students were eager to engage with the interview and to help me as much as they could with my questions. (I was repeatedly astonished by how they had grown up since I had taught them in S1, how even those who were 'shy' in S1 were now making lots of thoughtful comments.) At the end of the interview, they all expressed deep appreciation to me in saying 'thank you very much'.

### **(3) 'Before and After' Student Questionnaires**

These were administered to all class-groups at the beginning and again at the end of both AR1 and AR2. The questions focused on that year's AR theme and exactly the same

questions were used 'before' and 'after' the AR. For AR1, questions investigated student thinking about war and peace, making particular reference to the war that featured in the main literature text chosen for their class: Japanese involvement in WW2 for S1 and S3; the Vietnam War for the two S2 classes of that year. In the following year, the AR2 questions focused on consumer approaches to press and mass media information and, because all year groups were now studying with the same materials, only one questionnaire was needed.

In research terms, the principal aim was to provide my colleagues and me with evidence of the impact of the AR on our students' learning. Keeping in with the spirit of action research, however, the questionnaires were intended to also have pedagogical benefits: *before*, to alert teachers to their students' starting knowledge and positions, what they were already thinking about the AR theme, and to give students a 'taste' of what was ahead for them; *after*, to get the students themselves to evaluate – and perhaps enjoy – their own development during the AR.

The students, supervised by their homeroom teachers, took 20-25 minutes each time to complete the questionnaires. I made and kept copies of *all* returns for my research. The originals were returned to students when their teachers had considered them deeply.

However, at the stage of analysing the student responses systematically for this thesis, serious difficulties of interpretation emerged. One factor was the brevity of many responses, but the main factor was that their 'before' answers had been carefully made available to the students for their consideration *as they wrote* their 'after' answers. In AR2 I even divided the questionnaire form into left and right columns for 'before' and 'after' answers, to encourage them more to comment on their earlier answers and on how their opinions had changed (and, also, to make for easier analysis). These measures would prove counterproductive in *quantitative* research terms.

When systematically analysing the responses of all year groups for both AR1 and AR2 for my thesis, after AR2, I found that a surprising proportion of responses were just more or less repeating their 'before' responses, even as to the words. Was this because they were taking

the lazy way in filling in the questionnaire – because they were tired, had not understood the point of the exercise, did not have enough time, or (most likely?) found writing analytically in Japanese difficult at that moment.....? Or, on the other hand, was it because they really had not developed their opinions and perspectives? I accepted that it would be impossible to resolve this ambiguity in a systematic and reliable way.<sup>27</sup>

The data gave me many clear and interesting examples of student development of different kinds to add to my *qualitative* analyses and illustrations. However, I decided against repeating this exercise for AR3.

#### **(4) PM Evaluation Forms**

Directly after each PM we asked the students to complete a short PM evaluation sheet, mainly to enable us to understand what students had learnt from that PM. We were able to collect and read these evaluations quickly before our own main reflective meeting, where they played a useful role (although, the return rates were reduced by some students being too excited and others too rushed to engage with them).

#### **(5) Constructed Learning Materials**

These were of two kinds that sometimes overlapped: constructed worksheets and holiday assignments. They were primarily intended to contribute to student learning, of course, but they also contribute to my thesis narratives and analyses.

#### **(6) Use of Video / DVD**

Twice, we used *pre-constructed, 30 minute, video films*. In the PM of AR1, we used the 1996 *Boys and girls in Nagasaki* (ナガサキの少年少女たち), which describes how the A-bomb in Nagasaki affected children. In the first PM of AR3, we showed ‘*Dear Grandfather, I am in England*’ (2003), which portrays Japanese army struggles against the British in WWII, but then describes how certain Japanese veterans later worked for reconciliation between Britain and Japan. Both films are well constructed and powerful, vividly evoking the disasters in

---

<sup>27</sup> The difficulty continued from AR1 into AR2 because I had not analysed the returns from AR1 sufficiently before we moved on to AR2.

question while offering hope for better futures. They impressed the students greatly and seemed to elicit more concentrated and intense work from them. But in using them as teaching materials, we feared the danger of emotional manipulation – especially with the first one – and took precautions against this and monitored for it – as will be discussed in chapters 3 and 4. To that extent, this use of video was ‘experimental’ as well as ‘pedagogical’.

By contrast, the *video-recording of our four PMs* and the subsequent burning of these into DVDs – courtesy of the Headmaster – was directly intended and used for teacher discussion and reflection. With colleagues taking turns to hold and to circulate with the camera and the microphones, the recordings were comprehensive, from the chairpersons’ opening greeting to the formal ending of each PM. (With 70+ students and teachers gathered together, the availability of multiple microphones was crucial for the sound quality of the recordings – which, in our case, was very good.<sup>28</sup>)

These DVDs proved their usefulness, not only in the main meetings for evaluation (and beginning to look ahead) that came after each AR, but also as an important source of data, questions and confirmations in my data analyses for this thesis.

## **2-4. Analysing Data**

A major part of research is analysing data. Dana and Yendol-Hoppey use the analogy of a special kind of jigsaw, which I found appealing and useful – but with some serious qualifications.

If you are a jigsaw puzzle enthusiast, a useful way to understand the process of data analysis is to imagine yourself putting together what is touted in every hobby store across the nation as the ‘world’s most challenging puzzle.’ One of the reasons for this description is that the puzzle comes in a bag, not the traditional box with a cover that pictures the completed puzzle. Hence, as you work, you know that the different pieces you are putting together will result in a picture, but you are uncertain of what it is going to look like in the end. To top it off, the directions to completing this puzzle indicate that there are more pieces in your bag than you will need, and other pieces may still be at the store! (2009: 119)

---

<sup>28</sup> S. Alghanem (2010) rightly observes that the in-built microphones in most cam-recorders are not adequate for recording classroom sounds.

I did indeed approach my data as items to be categorized on their way to being given their proper place in a still quite unclear and uncertain whole – like grouping jigsaw pieces initially into dark, bright, sky, ocean, houses, trees and so on. For *documents*, as I read them over several times, I would crystallize the data into (revisable) conceptual ‘memos’ – on the right hand of the pages where possible – and later I would draw draft sub-themes and themes from these memos. For *interview data*, of course, I would first have listened all through each tape at least once – and then several more times as I changed the oral into written data, before then treating these transcripts like the written questionnaire returns and student work.<sup>29</sup> For *DVD data*, on one sheet I had written rough observations on the students’ general attitude against the real time progress through the PM programmes and, on another sheet, I transcribed – and sometimes translated – what I could see and hear of the group and plenary discussions (repeating the clips many times). In creating and reviewing these sheets, I was impressed and influenced by the emphasis my fellow doctoral student, I. S. Alghanem (2010), placed in her video analyses on understanding the ‘lived philosophy of education’ that was on view. For me, this meant focussing especially on initiatives (‘teaching’) and responses (‘learning’) – from teachers to students, students to students in discussion groups, and students to teachers – in order to understand more deeply what teachers and students in JSLL are really questing in their teaching and learning.

However, the jigsaw analogy plays down the crucial point that analysis occurs at many levels and through many phases. So, for AR1, each individual questionnaire return, for example, deserved and got some holistic analysis by itself, before then being included in the holistic analysis of the particular set of returns to which it belonged, which, in its turn, was later taken up into an analysis that also included other sets of data analyses, and all on the way to an overall AR analysis. When these processes were then repeated for ARs 2 and 3, it had to be in ways that also showed how each had ‘grown’ out of the experience and preliminary analyses of its predecessor(s) i.e. the continuity of the research over the three years. Therefore, a better jigsaw analogy would be many smaller jigsaws transforming themselves into clusters of different sizes at different levels before being brought together into a

---

<sup>29</sup> The ‘shortcut’ of transcribing only the oral responses that I had identified by ear as significant did not work for me, mainly because it was very difficult to then understand the relationship from previous comment to next comment. I went back to more or less whole transcriptions of interview data.

reasonably coherent overall picture, with the possibility remaining that this was not necessarily the only true ‘picture’ that could have been made out of ‘the pieces’ (the data).

## **2-5. Ethical Issues**

### **Benefit to the Student and Teacher Participants**

My collaborators and I were part-time teachers, unlike the full-time head and deputy head teachers sent by MEXT, *but* we had indefinite contracts, monthly salaries, paid holidays, sick holidays and maternity leave. That status, and the fact that I had been a homeroom teacher of S1 for a year – I was already an ‘insider’ – contributed to the welcome and acceptance the headmaster and my senior division colleagues gave to my first suggestion of ARs in 2004. Of course, they were evaluating the suggestion first and foremost as ‘action’, that is, as an interesting and promising development of our practice – to the benefit of our present and future students – much more than as ‘research’. Indeed, this benefit to students was, and had to be, my own ethical priority both at the beginning and all through the ARs. For my colleagues and me as JSSL teachers, the ARs always had to be educationally valuable for our students in their themes and pedagogy, as much as we could make them so. The BERA ethical guidelines remind researchers that ‘in all actions concerning children, the best interests of the child must be the primary consideration’ and, again, that ‘children who are capable of forming their own views should be granted the right to express their views freely in all matters affecting them (para 16). Those two obligations are drawn from Articles 3 and 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, and they obviously apply to education itself before they apply to educational research. The obligation on researchers ‘to minimize the effects of designs that advantage or are perceived to advantage one group of participants over others’ (para 24) is also already familiar to class teachers who are being fair to all their pupils. We could perhaps say that these obligations apply ‘twice over’ to teacher-researchers.

Some other BERA Guidelines are more specific to researchers and action-researchers.

### **Informed Consent**

The securing of participants’ voluntary informed consent, before research gets underway, is considered the norm for the conduct of research. (para 14)

The Association takes voluntary informed consent to be the condition in which participants understand and agree to their participation without any duress, prior to the research getting underway (para 10).

When my colleagues and I introduced the theme and format of AR1 to our classes, we *also* announced that I would be gathering data for my own research and we explained how I would keep confidentiality in my thesis. In then distributing the relevant 'before' questionnaires, I explained to my own class, that they did not have to fill them in if they did not want to consent. My colleagues kindly did the same on my behalf to their classes. However, we did not have any blank questionnaires! Later, during the ARs, I reminded students of their freedom in various ways, for example, when looking for willing interviewees (and students did sometimes decline to be interviewed).

I considered this to be informed consent. I had thought about getting the students' consent more formally on paper. If I had been an 'independent researcher' rather than a regular JSSL teacher, I definitely would have designed and used an appropriate consent form. However, then and later, I did not want to show too much that 'I am the researcher and these ARs are especially for my own research'. Knowing that I continuously needed colleagues' support and cooperation, my instinct was to emphasise the many benefits of the ARs to students, colleagues and even the school (JSSL), much more than my extra purely personal interest.

I took the opportunity of a PTA meeting to brief parents on my special interest in the AR, as well as giving them information on its themes and pedagogy. The progress of the ARs then became a regular item at PTA meetings. In addition, the PMs were very popular with parents and were always reported in detail in the school newspaper. We could be confident that parents generally appreciated them and were eager for them to continue.

The video-taping of the PMs with the headmaster's camera and the DVD records he kindly burnt for the teachers were for the improvement of our practice in the first place and were not considered to require student permission.

## **Collaboration and Confidentiality**

Researchers engaged in action research must consider the extent to which their own reflective research impinges on others, for example in the case of the dual role of teacher and researcher and the impact on students and colleagues. Dual roles may also introduce explicit tensions in areas such as confidentiality and must be addressed accordingly (BG para 12).

.....Researchers must recognize the participants' entitlement to privacy and must accord them their rights to confidentiality and anonymity, unless they or their guardians or responsible others, specifically and willingly waive that right....(para 25)

For AR1, I suggested the theme and format and, over its eleven weeks, dealt with its many management and administrative responsibilities mostly by myself. I was afraid of asking too much of my colleagues. Its success, however, won a deeper commitment to the AR idea from my colleagues during AR2 and AR3. So, for AR2, we discussed and decided its theme together and how its cross-age pedagogy would be built around summer / winter assignments, and we organised study meetings to deepen our own understanding of the Iraqi situation. 'Management' had become more democratic and I became 'one of the team'. Indeed, there were no 'managers' or 'leaders' anymore – as we voluntarily and enjoyably implemented the process of the ARs together. As mentioned earlier, the central idea of an annual cross-age sharing of some curriculum theme leading up to a plenary meeting continued up to, and beyond, my departure from JSSL in 2012.

As the home-room teacher for my SI classes, I had easy access to my class-students' basic personal data (address, educational background, parents' occupations etc.), as my colleagues also had for their classes. It was quickly clear, however, that good management of the shared ARs required some sharing of this confidential data among colleagues – for which a spirit of trust and cooperation among colleagues was highly important. Acting in the dual role of teacher and researcher, I was constantly reflecting on how important *good collaborative relationships* among colleagues are for balancing the duties of confidentiality regarding students and colleagues with the duties of doing what benefits them most. If I had been an outsider researcher, or even the only insider researcher-teacher, confidentiality would have been an issue, more or less, among colleagues: 'what is Miwa going to do with this information?' However, when colleagues are sharers in the research and experience its benefits to all, mutual trust grows and a more nuanced view of confidentiality can be taken.

(I partly think that most ‘confidentiality’ problems happen when other colleagues feel ‘put upon’ by the main researcher-teacher.)

In my thesis, all students’ and teachers’ names are anonymised. Individual teachers are identified sometimes by office, e.g. ‘head-teacher’, ‘S3 teacher’, and sometimes by code-letter, e.g. ‘teacher Y’. Individual students are given fictitious names and on some occasions, when necessary to keep their anonymity, a different national identity.

### **Fairness to All**

....Individuals should be treated fairly, sensitively, with dignity, and within an ethic of respect and freedom from prejudice regardless of age, gender, sexuality, race, ethnicity, class, nationality, cultural identity, partnership status, faith, disability, political belief or any other significant difference. (BG para 9)

I would like to add ‘ability’ to this list of differences: ‘individuals should be treated fairly .....regardless of..... *ability*’. At JSSL, the most prominent ability difference was in the command of the Japanese language between students who had studied in Japan and the others. Since teaching Japanese was our subject, this was the main ‘equality issue’ for us and we focused very carefully on it in all three ARs. Generally, those whose command of Japanese was limited could understand perfectly when teachers helped a little bit. They could also be great ‘commanders’ in English and we created situations to exploit this ability.

### **2-6. Summary**

This chapter first described the JSSL action-research site in its relation to the whole JSL. It introduced my Senior Division colleague-collaborators and distinguished their contributions as ‘sharers’ and as ‘gracious assistants’. It introduced our bi-lingual and bi-cultural student participants in their two broad categories: educated mainly in Japan and educated mainly in England. Starting from the two main research questions, it offers an extended account and defence of action research, drawing mainly on the works of John Elliott. This is the main theoretical base of the thesis. My research instruments – diary, teacher and student interviews, questionnaires, constructed learning materials, video, evaluation forms are then described, as well as the process of data analysis (using the analogy of the jigsaw puzzle). Finally, the ethical character of my research is explained and defended.

## Chapter 3

### **The First Project: Literature Education for Peace**

The first action research (AR1) was designed to examine how peace education could be pursued in the literature class, (i) using literary texts relating to wars and invasions selected from the standard Japanese syllabus, as one part of a pedagogical strategy that also involved (ii) teacher and student collaboration across the three senior year-groups and (iii) building our separate classes towards an extended plenary session [PM] at the end. Our intention was to help the students towards thinking voluntarily, independently and creatively by/while building up their understanding of peace in this way. I taught S1 (15-16 year olds), colleagues Y and X taught the two S2 classes, and colleague V taught the oldest group, S3.

To summarise the ‘action’ in this AR, that was simultaneously ‘research’. Each teacher planned and taught ten class sessions with their Saturday class from the beginning of September 2004, building towards the final PM at the end of November. This plenary included brief presentations from each teacher and a representative student of each class, a dramatic video relating to the Nagasaki bombing, discussion in and report-back from nine mixed-age groups, and a short evaluation questionnaire specifically for the occasion. A more general ‘before and after’ questionnaire hoped to detect changes in pupils’ thinking about wars and peace in all four classes. I conducted final interviews with my three colleagues and with five S1 students – two girls and three boys – and we four teachers had a meeting with the headmaster and deputy head to reflectively evaluate the AR as a whole.

This chapter and the next will report this project in the following main sections: in chapter 3, *rationale and conceptual framework; the texts; planning; class periods in S1 and the other classes*; and in chapter 4: *the plenary meeting; the ‘before and after’ questionnaire; evidence from interviews and a reflective meeting*.

### **3-1 Rationale and Conceptual Framework**

#### **Peace education, more than emotional manipulation**

Teaching peace through literature involves teaching historical backgrounds and social structures, but more centrally it involves an appeal to the empathy of pupils, which is surely one of the most important driving forces for thinking about war and peace more closely, seriously and voluntarily. We usually receive the everyday news of war and peace from TV and newspapers as ‘awful things happening somewhere far away’ and cannot think of the problems as ‘our own problems’. It is very difficult for us to empathise from the bottom of our hearts with the people who are actually suffering in the wars and conflicts. Of course, if we have had some very similar experience, we may more easily enter into their plight and try to do something for them – and perhaps literature can begin to approximate that impact.

However, empathy by itself is not enough in education and this can be illustrated by reference to the development of peace education in Japan. S. Takahashi (1997) summarises its character as follows from the point of museum education:

At the base (of Peace Education in Japan), we can find the idea that we should let pupils look squarely at ‘what really happened’, then pupils can prevent the wars from now on and keep peace because pupils know the facts now.

However, this idea is wrong. Supposing that children can hope for peace, prevent wars, and keep peace if we nurture pupils’ emotional hatred toward wars through letting them feel the misery and cruelty of wars by showing ‘what really happened’ is a misunderstanding. Therefore, too, the exhibitions of the Peace Museums accelerated the mistakes of post-war peace education. (p.18)

The focus is almost exclusively on WWII and the governing idea or formula is very simple: *‘we had a miserable war experience – therefore, we should never have wars; we should seek absolute peace for the world and Japan should become the leading country for peace.’* So teachers get children to read or listen to the testimonies of the war victims, especially the A-bomb survivors, and to follow their miserable experiences emotionally. Often, they let the pupils watch an A-bomb video or DVD. Students are supposed to think *‘Poor people! We should remember these incidents in our lives and never repeat wars. We should aim for peace.’* The approach may be ‘emotional’ throughout the lesson, and/or take the form of

‘preaching’ peace to the pupils and ‘pushing’ pupils into thinking of ‘absolute peace’ (a world without weapons etc).

Appeals to pupils’ emotions can actually be dangerous. Indeed, the present Japanese peace education may be uncomfortably similar to ‘Shushin’, moral education during WWII, even though its aims are completely different. Back then, teachers used similar methods to ‘manipulate’ their pupils’ emotions towards developing an unquestioning ‘patriotism’. The powerful concept of ‘good behaviour’ was mainly interpreted and illustrated by glamorised tales of the bravery of soldiers. Telling pupils how brave soldiers were prepared them for the battlefields.<sup>30</sup>

Furthermore, the change from patriotic education to peace education after the war did not come from sober analysis and self-examination among teachers. Certainly some suffered guilt at having sent their pupils to the battlefields, and some even felt unable to continue in teaching, but many who had taught patriotism to students during the war now obediently changed their thoughts to ‘democracy’. They took it for granted that they could use the same textbooks once they had ordered the pupils to erase the part concerning patriotism. Indeed, the *same* teacher who had previously taught patriotism during the war could now be teaching democracy and peace to the *same* pupils, excusing themselves by saying that they were just doing what the education committee members told them to do – they were still taking their orders from the ‘top’. (Oguma, 2002: 61-66). Their own neglect of independent thinking and analysis regarding either patriotism or democracy carried through to a neglect of independent thinking on *how* they should now educate their pupils for peace and democracy. It led to a continuing over-reliance on emotional approaches in this curriculum area that remains into the present. (*ibid.*)

This type of pedagogy tends to neglect the causes of conflict and violence, to lack the perspective, for example, that some wars come from social and economic structures. It also pays little attention to how pupils in fact think about war and peace and it fails to develop,

---

<sup>30</sup> Anjin Sano and Noriyuki Araki (ed.1990). In this text, C. Fujii uses the famous ‘*The Magician’s Story*’ to illustrate the danger of teachers imposing ‘good behaviour’ on their pupils.

and may even stifle, their analytical and critical thinking in this area, including their applied thinking about how they might promote peace in their own situations. On the other hand, however, my experience as a social studies teacher suggests that causes and social structures by themselves develop little pupil interest in peace issues. The ‘personal’ element is much closer to how they think and live; they can easily ‘imagine’ what happens during wars and ‘empathise’ with people who were, or are, actually suffering from wars and conflicts. How then might a good pedagogical balance be achieved? At this point in the argument, the study of war *through literature* recommends itself as potentially one very useful approach.

When students read novels and stories about war they become emotionally connected with the material. They take the experience of the characters on board and are ready to think about how they would behave if they were this or that character. At the same time, they are more open to learning about the historical background of the novel. Also, good war literature will offer implicit and/or explicit analyses and critiques of war that can be further developed through class discussion and in other media. A wide conception of peace education emerges as moving forwards and backwards between ‘micro’ and ‘macro’ perspectives.

A particular issue for our team of four colleagues as we prepared the AR was the use of video evidence. Powerful video material describing the misery of the atomic Bomb could overwhelm the pupils’ analytical and critical faculties and repeat the mistake of current Japanese peace education, especially if used early in the project. Literature’s less powerful descriptions of personal experiences of war get pupils into the story, but in ways that leave more room for their own thinking. We agreed to use an appropriate selection of texts from the textbooks authorised by MEXT for our grades in our individual Saturday classes, supplemented by some materials regarding historical backgrounds, but also to include a video of the A-bomb and its effects in our final plenary meeting – among other resources and in a context of reportage and discussion. The aim was to demonstrate the reality of wars from personal experience, but without a *major* reliance on visual effects.

### **Three particular objectives in using war and peace literature**

An objective was to make pupils understand that war is not ‘heroic’ and, thereby, to counteract at least part of the message of some popular publications in Japan, such as the so-called *Senso-ron (War Theory) comics*, that seek to reawaken the ‘patriotism’ of young Japanese. In a compilation of his comics, the author Yoshinori Kobayashi describes the ‘reality’ of contemporary Japanese society, as he sees it:

Japan is at peace (no wars). .....Family is not uniting anymore; the rate of divorce is rising. There are ‘prostitute housewives. There are also girls who prostitute themselves under the expression ‘Enjo-kosai’, which means girls in teens voluntarily have sexual relationships with middle age men for money.<sup>31</sup> It is ‘fashionable’ that Junior high school students stab each other with knives. (Kobayashi, 1998, p.8)

He draws a picture of a deteriorated Japanese society in which people have become ‘egoistic’ and he advocates a ‘return to community’ (indeed, to a kind of communism). That much might be thought interesting. However, Kobayashi is nostalgic for the ‘good’ wartime society in which Japanese ‘cooperated’ with each other, had ‘strong’ bonds between neighbourhoods, and could ‘have a dream’ of becoming ‘heroes’. He draws a lot on touching episodes in the lives of soldiers during the war. True or not, if pupils who read these ‘heroic’ episodes think that war is the way things should be, I must say this is very dangerous. It was an objective, therefore, to demonstrate the true reality of wars (without undue reliance on visual effects) as a basis for pupils to think about war and peace.

Another objective was to make pupils realise through the literature how the *result* of a war affects people’s thinking about it – as though final victory or defeat was the only issue. Was Japan ‘wrong’ in WWII because we attacked Pearl Harbour and, so, began a process that led to losing the war? Yet Japan had already been – truly and rightly – condemned for its invasions in China, Korea and other Southeast Asian countries. We should continue to reflect about this and think what obligations it places on us now. On the other hand, many Japanese people also suffered greatly from the war. Families had no choice but to send

---

<sup>31</sup> In the late 1990s, this was notorious in Japan. Girls made contact with these middle age men by mobile phone, had some sexual relationship with them, and got money to buy clothes, cosmetics, expensive bags, and so on.

husbands or sons to the many battlefields. The losses incurred were hugely damaging for their families and even the survivors were vulnerable to trauma after the war.

A third objective was to let pupils realise the economic rationales of states for their wars and invasions of other lands and, so, the connections between war and deprivation. Japan reinforced its power as a nation after it had opened the country internationally. In *The Boundaries of Japanese* (1998), Oguma shows how the need to become industrialised and to build up its military resources came from a Japanese ‘inferiority complex’ in relation to Western countries. To compete with them, Japan then deprived many Asian countries of much of their wealth. To be economically prosperous, we deprived and still deprive ‘developing’ countries of many resources. In other words, our prosperous lives are established by sacrificing others – and that contributes to the conditions for periodic returns to war. Looking back through world history, wars are almost always connected with profits, gains and power. This is perhaps as obvious in British history as in the case of Japan.

### 3-2. The Key Texts

We teachers deliberately selected our three main project texts from literature *textbooks* – anthologies of short stories, extracts from novels, essays, poems, critical reviews, and sometimes Japanese and Chinese Classics – that *are approved* by MEXT for use with S1-S3 grades.<sup>32</sup> This would give wider relevance to our exploration of the possibilities of using Japanese literature to get Japanese pupils to think deeply about war, peace and their own history.

As the main texts for the action research project, we selected the following:

for S1: *After the Bomb* 『砲撃のあとで』, a 15-page extract from an autobiographical novel of that name by Taku Miki (三木卓), in which the author draws on his own childhood experience of living in Japanese-occupied Manchuria;

---

<sup>32</sup> Usually, teachers use just one such Literature textbook during a year, though S3 teachers have an additional textbook for classical (Japanese and Chinese) literature.

for S2: **Ambush** 『待ち伏せ』, an 8-page short story, the 6th in a collection of 21 short stories, *The things THEY carried*, by Tim O'Brien, in which the author draws on his experience as an American soldier in the Vietnam war. The Japanese translation of this work was used by the two teachers of the two S2 classes in 2005.<sup>33</sup>

for S3: **Judgement** 『審判』, written by Taijun Takeda (武田泰淳), a 33-page short story dating back to 1947, in which the author draws on his experience of Japanese people residing in Shanghai to describe and reflect on how they responded to the news of Japan's loss of WWII.

**Appendix 3-2** contains digests in English of these three texts. However, their central role in what follows requires brief accounts here of their perspectives and 'messages'.

In *After the Bomb*, Taku Miki works from his own childhood experience in occupied Manchuria. He articulates that 'boy' experience in its own terms and voice and overlays it with his adult perspective and voice. We can easily guess that the boy is around 10 years old from the contrast with his older brother's voice, as – in one scene – he tries to explain the result of the atomic bomb to the younger brother. These 'voices' would resonate well with S1 pupils age 15 to 16. In a well described scene at the end of the extract, at the same moment when his family are busy preparing to run away from this Manchurian city, 'the boy' is enchanted by the lights all over the city at 2:30am, a forgotten experience in wartime, and thinks the scene is 'beautiful'. And the 'adult writer' reflects on how those 'lights' that implied the end of the 'Japanese' invasion of Manchuria would have been a symbol of hope for the oppressed Chinese people.<sup>34</sup>

**Ambush** (originally 'The Man I Killed') is extracted from a collection of short stories, *The Things They Carried* (original title). A former American soldier imagines how, when his daughter Catherine – now 9-years old – becomes an adult, he could honestly describe his Vietnam war experiences for her, in particular the occasion when he ambushed and killed a

---

<sup>33</sup> Outside the project, the S2 teachers also made use of materials from another textbook called *General Japanese Selected with Care: Classical Literature* for teaching Japanese and Chinese Classics.

<sup>34</sup> Later, I will introduce the important *supplementary texts* I used to expand our S1 discussions.

Vietnamese soldier, a young man coming towards them in the mist, alone and posing no danger to them. The story provides an ‘adult-eyes’ perspective on war, by contrast with the previous text, but also one that is purportedly first-person. This ‘I’ describes in detail his personal action and state of mind before, during and after the killing. Without using emotional words, his description can make us imagine this killing visually. When reading the beginning and end of this story, however, we are led to ask why the story-teller is recalling this event (and others from the war) and why he wants to describe it to his daughter. We may think that while his action had ‘invaded’ a man’s life extremely, he now suffers psychologically from this action: it has turned back on him to wound him.

Given that O’Brien was really a soldier in Vietnam in 1969, the question may be asked where fact ends and fiction begins in his stories. According to the Amazon.co.jp review, most of the short stories are fiction and O’Brien himself admits, including that he did not kill the man as described in *Ambush*. This does not diminish the value of the stories. In connection with this, translator, Haruki Murakami, observes:

O’Brien, of course, detests wars. However, this book is not a, so called, ‘anti-war book’. This book is not focussing on the misery and stupidity of wars, either. Wars in this book, perhaps exaggerating extremely, are metaphorical mechanisms. Wars are very effective and very cunning mechanisms that cause human beings to become insane. For O’Brien, these mechanisms happen to be wars but, in this sense, everybody has his or her own ‘wars’. Therefore, everybody can talk about his or her own real wars. Thus, the real war stories are not the stories about wars. I think, perhaps, this is what O’Brien wanted to tell readers.<sup>35</sup>

That may be true, but it remains that this real war story makes us think about literal wars as well as metaphorical wars. Through O’Brien’s eyes, we ask ourselves what it means to kill people in war, how we would feel if we did this, and how it would affect us afterwards.

**Judgement**, a powerful story by a distinguished Japanese writer – and, again, written in the first person – also asks these questions. Published two years after WWII, it evokes different ways in which Japanese residents in Shanghai’s special Japanese sector were first shattered

---

<sup>35</sup> *Let’s talk about the real war* (1998). Murakami is also the translator of *Ambush*.

by the loss of the war and then started to adjust to it. It focuses particularly on the contrasting trajectories of the scholarly cultural-attaché narrator (who lives on the second floor) and, Jiro, the well-loved son of his third-floor neighbour, who has just returned from military duty in occupied China. In the first half of the story, the 'I' describes how he and his circle are psychologically traumatised by the news of Japan's apocalyptic destruction and how they have been struggling to estimate its place and significance in human history. Quite quickly, however, his own despair begins to weaken as his job makes him very busy preparing his own and others' return to Japan.

Jiro's frame of mind has been moving in a quite different direction, from falling in love with Suzuko and happily preparing to marry her, to depression and breaking off his engagement. The second half of the story is occupied by a long letter of explanation to his downstairs neighbour that describes a much more individual and ethical framework of concern. He has become deeply preoccupied by two 'casual' murders of Chinese civilians that he committed in the ethical wilderness of war, on one occasion following a command to join in the shooting of two clearly innocent farmers, on another occasion – this time by his own impulse rather than following orders – shooting an old blind man as he sat with his deaf wife outside their burnt-out house. His conscience has been awakened partly by news of the war-crimes trials in Japan, but more by his love for Suzuko. Learning to love and being loved has given him a developing empathic awareness of what his actions destroyed.<sup>36</sup> He has now broken off his engagement with Suzuko so as not to burden her with his crimes, and, rather than return to Japan, he is resolved to remain in China so as not to forget those crimes and to deepen his repentance for them.

The story, then, makes us think about what killing people means and why we should not kill them. International law justifies killing people during wars, but can it really 'justify' it? If humans can feel and think nothing before, when, and after, killing someone, can they be proud heroes who 'honourably' killed enemies? Such questions are concentrated in Jiro's letter. Therefore, the story deals with the ethics, not only of the Japanese invasion of China,

---

<sup>36</sup> As is observed in the accompanying guidelines for teachers *Modern Literature: Research for Learning and Teaching*, p.157, 2003

but also with what such an invasion can mean in each human being's mind – at the time and later. Again, if a type of patriotism provides soldiers, in all countries, with an ethical backbone for killing their country's 'enemies', what happens to this 'backbone' if and when the war is lost and the government that guaranteed it is overthrown – as was the case for Japan at the end of WWII? For many Japanese, the loss of the nation they had relied on threw them back on their own consciences and their ethics had to change into a more personal and deep-inner repentance. Therefore, this story gets us feeling and thinking about wars, but also about individual morality and ethics.

**Common themes** The most immediate considerations in choosing these texts at our first staff meeting was that they should deal with war and peace issues, be of a suitable length, and be available in MEXT approved textbooks for the three grades. However, we also agreed that the teachers and students of the three classes would *interact* with each other, the teachers through regular teacher meetings and the students in a final, whole-morning, plenary session [PM] with the four classes together, for which we were planning *mixed* group-work. That led to a progressive focus in our planning and our teaching on *common themes* in the three texts. So in all three the main context and theme is not battles and destruction, but the trio of *invasion, occupation* and *withdrawal*. There is as much, or more, emphasis on psychological damage as on physical damage and each author questions what the invasion means to the invaders as well as the invaded. In all three the invader – whether Japan or the US in Vietnam – loses the war eventually, and in those countries themselves – though much more in Japan – people suffered a lot during the war and after. In the case of the US, there is a telling contrast between the soldiers who came back from the WWII battlefields as admired heroes and those who came back from the Vietnam War and were treated miserably – a theme clearly expressed in Goro Nakamura, 1983, *Mothers got Defoliant – the scars of dioxin* and in the film 'First Blood (Rambo)'. Finally, all three texts dwell on *cross-generation* engagements and perspectives, the differences between a child's involvement and his later adult reflection, between a soldier and the young daughter to whom he would like to explain his actions, or between a troubled demobbed soldier and men of an older generation.

War has on-going consequences for families. Common themes like these were to be brought out in the classes and the PM.<sup>37</sup>

### **3-3. Planning**

#### **Getting Going**

To return to the first Saturday of the autumn term, 28<sup>th</sup> August 2004. This was a training day for teachers and at our senior department meeting, I outlined my action research plans for using literature texts to ‘teach peace’ to my S1 pupils and then asked whether they might be interested in doing something similar with their S2 and S3 classes. I was pleased when they agreed to this, to my rough plan and to my further suggestion to finish the term with a ‘plenary meeting’ of the three classes. We would use different texts relating to wars and peace, so that then each class would have different stories to share and thus make the plenary meeting more constructive. This would give us an incentive to work together and an occasion for pupils of different classes and ages to share their opinions, and deepen their understanding of peace and wars. (At this point we were thinking of what we would be doing as ‘teaching peace’ to pupils. The emphasis on getting students to think for themselves about war and peace issues developed gradually.)

Some events on the world stage contributed to our willingness to work together on this theme. One was the continuously miserable situation of Iraq occupied by the United States and Britain. And a few days later, at the beginning of September in 2004, there was also the shocking terrorism in a Russian school in which hundreds of children lost their lives – which in the JSSL led the headmaster to conduct a discussion with all the teachers on how to act if terrorists should occupy the JSSL.<sup>38</sup> In addition, as I knew, all four of us were interested in peace. We had a shared understanding of many things in the world’s news and we regularly shared the purchase and exchange of books and newspaper articles relating to peace. (This was one of the ‘pleasures’ of working in this school!) Furthermore, all of us were more or less interested in Christianity: one already a Christian, another who had investigated it

---

<sup>37</sup> It must be admitted that in practice we underplayed this ‘family’ theme.

<sup>38</sup> Actually from the beginning of February 2005, the Japanese school began to use a security guard in addition to the caretaker at all times when the school is open.

thoroughly before deciding not to be baptised, a third who had studied in a Christian school, and me, who though not a Christian at the time,<sup>39</sup> had previously taught for six years at a Christian school. This interest in Christianity seemed to cohere well with our texts' emphasis on *individual* experiences of war and it may have contributed to our developing emphasis on getting students to think for themselves and take some personal responsibility for peace.

Another factor, adding to the sense of 'right timing', was the time of year. For most Japanese the 15<sup>th</sup> August, the day WWII ended in 1945, means a lot: a 'shameful' day of defeat, *or* the day of peace after hopeless war and of liberation from strong state pressure and censorship, *and/or* the start of a 'new era' of freedom of expression defined by the more civilized and secure concept of democracy that the United States would soon insist on putting into the new Japanese Constitution.<sup>40</sup> It is an unwritten rule in both government and private schools that teachers should use some materials relating to peace and war before, and after, the summer vacation.

Of course, the 15<sup>th</sup> August is also important for those other peoples who had been colonized by the Japanese government, for them a day *just* of 'liberation' – while for the occupying Japanese, like the Japanese in Manchuria, the day meant their lives were in danger. The boy in *After the Bomb* feels his parents' anxiety when they hear of the atomic bomb dropped in Hiroshima, but, in his child's way, he could see in the unaccustomed city lights the new 'hope' of the Manchurian people.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> In 2011, I was baptised.

<sup>40</sup> If Japan had not lost WWII and been occupied by the United States, would it ever have such a democratic Constitution? Shortly after WWII, the American GHQ ordered the Japanese government to rewrite the whole Japanese Imperial Constitution; however, the resulting 'Matsumoto Draft' changed some words but looked as 'imperialistic' as ever. GHQ then took charge of the drafting process. The new Japanese Constitution owes a lot to the United States members who enthusiastically tried to develop democracy in Japan.

<sup>41</sup> After the war, the Japanese government, using newspaper channels to urge people 'to repent', seemed almost to shift the blame for the war to ordinary Japanese people. Indeed, some responsibility could be said to belong to every Japanese adult who accepted the loss of the right to think voluntarily and the lack of democracy before and during WWII. However, in my opinion, the main responsibility was with the government that manipulated the newspaper companies and radio to persuade, or force, a lot of people to sacrifice their lives. (We would return to this issue in AR2)

### **‘Before and After’ Questionnaire**

On our first Saturday with the students, on 4<sup>th</sup> September, I announced that all four senior classes would work on ‘wars and peace’ until the end of November and would finish with a plenary session. In our first or second classes, we teachers also administered a ‘before and after’ questionnaire to investigate the students’ starting understanding and ways of thinking about: the suffering caused by Japanese (or American) aggression; the eventual suffering of the invaders themselves; comparisons with British colonialism – assuming student familiarity with this from their weekday attendance at English schools; and relevant contemporary issues. We would re-administer the same questionnaire on the last day of the AR (27<sup>th</sup> November 2004).

Obviously, this exercise had a research and evaluation purpose, to find out how much students’ views had developed during the AR. However, it also had two immediate pedagogical purposes, to prepare students for what they would be studying and to provide teachers with helpful information when planning their classes and the PM. In the case of S1, the responses revealed considerable unevenness in the students’ starting knowledge and appreciation of key WWII events involving Japan; therefore, it would be necessary to strengthen their background historical knowledge. It also emerged that – as expected – they had enough broad awareness of British colonialism and involvement in the slave trade to make sense of comparisons with Japanese expansionism. Thirdly, most students seemed worryingly complacent at the prospect of Japan becoming a military force once again: not only is the Japanese ‘defence force’ necessary for protecting Japan, they thought, but ‘we should have our own army’; ‘every other country has its own army’.<sup>42</sup> This was harder to address, given the ‘political’ nature of the issue and the fact that our classes were to be ‘literature’ classes, rather than ‘social studies’ classes. In discussion with my colleagues, it

---

<sup>42</sup>At the time, Prime Minister Koizumi was promoting the idea of restoring the army. Considering Japan’s experience during WWII and the relative weakness of its democracy, I personally regarded this as an extremely dangerous idea. Japanese education has not prioritised the strong analytical and critical thinking skills that would be needed to withstand a militarily supported government that had become oppressive. In the event, Koizumi and later Prime Minister Abe have been prevented by the difficulty of changing Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution, which would require two-thirds support in both chambers of the Japanese Diet, followed by more than half of the effective electorate voting in favour of the change.

seemed better to be content to challenge the students *indirectly* by using our powerful literary texts to show what happened when Japan was previously a military power.

### **Planning the Class Programmes**

We taught for two hours and twenty minutes per Saturday, approximately 23 lesson-hours for each class over the 10 weeks leading to the PM. Our practice was to meet around a desk after classes each Saturday to review and plan the next move. As we went along, and more individually, we also decided on topics for written work that would match the different main texts – and that could be written in class-time (I would learn that Saturday school students dislike extra homework). S3's *Judgment* raised sharp ethical issues and their teacher let his students think and write essays on 'why we should not kill others'. S1 and S2 pupils submitted work on the thinking, feeling and action processes of the main characters.

In this way, we gradually built up our plans and timetables for each of our classes. (See the summary chart in *Appendix 3-3 (p.261)*)

### **Planning the Plenary Meeting**

For the PM, pupils and teachers would be gathered in JSSL's big meeting room on 20<sup>th</sup> Nov. We four teachers planned it progressively over many meetings that were pedagogically very constructive for us. My research diary confirms that, as well as working up its fine details, our planning included discussion of the links between it and our weekly lessons – which led to some improvements of those on-going lessons. Also, at an early point, we agreed that I should either invite an A-bomb survivor<sup>43</sup> to give a lecture to students or organise a video relating to the A-bombing of Japan in WWII. When the former quickly proved impractical, we agreed to use a video that featured the Nagasaki survivors, and from then on how best to fit the video and its particular 'trauma' factor with the rest of the PM was an issue.

Our planning also included some further discussions of the nature and proper function of literature lessons in the context of peace education. The broad **purpose** of the PM was for pupils to exchange ideas and opinions from different angles, and thus to further develop their

---

<sup>43</sup> Mr. Susumu Tsuboi from Japan whom I knew very well from when I worked in Japan.

way of thinking, on the agreed common theme of the invasion of other countries as described in fictional personal experiences in the literary texts. At an earlier meeting (18<sup>th</sup> September), some colleagues insisted that it would be improper to push a ‘peace philosophy’ at pupils. My idea at the time was to lead pupils to ‘consider’ such a point of view through showing some different perspectives on wars. Another colleague had suggested the alternative of observing how human beings can survive through irrational situations. Others argued persuasively for using the literary accounts and the planned video input to let pupils interrogate their own images of ‘wars and peace’. That discussion led to an agreement to concentrate more on our texts and to construct the lessons so as to focus our students on how they themselves would feel and act if they were the main character in the story.

However, at a much later meeting questions relating to the proper scope of a Japanese literature class were raised again by Y, the one AR1 teacher who was a specialist Japanese literature teacher.<sup>44</sup> My research diary records that, as well as strongly emphasising the need for programme coherence and arguing for making the ‘philosophical’ views of the video producer, as of the literary writers, explicit, this teacher: (i) continued to worry about top-down (teacher to student) teaching of ‘value’ and ‘morality’ in Japanese literature class; and (ii) wondered if some issues under consideration belonged more to Social Studies than to Japanese literature, such as whether there are different ways of thinking about war and peace in the UK and Japan, or what students could do with what they will have learnt from the programme as a whole. Regarding (i), since we could not be forcing a ‘peace attitude’ on pupils, we moved away from ‘peace programme’ as a title for the PM and decided, instead, on *The Programme for Considering Wars*. Regarding (ii), our discussion led us to consult the official MEXT guidance on the Japanese language and literature curriculum, to find that it does include literature-society links.

The correct *order of events* in the PM was another important issue. The PM would have two basic features: a sharing of the different S1 to S3 texts and experiences; and a shared new experience in watching the A-bomb video. My research diary shows that in my first rough

---

<sup>44</sup> The other three of us had been specialist teachers of Math, History, and Politics and Economics in Japan. These backgrounds affected our spontaneous views on teaching Japanese literature quite a lot.

programme draft I put the video first. After further discussion, we agreed instead to start with the sharing of the different S1-S3 experiences, which we would do through presentations by the class teachers and representative class students. This would be more consistent with the goals of continuity between the lessons and the PM and a fruitful exchange of experiences between the classes. It would also reduce the danger of the video's emotional impact diminishing every other element. Those goals also meant that the exchange of experiences should include identification of the **common points** in the S1 to S3 materials, which should then be further identified and pursued in connection with the video. The main commonality to be guessed, revealed and emphasised was *'the physical and psychological invasion of others' lives and lands'*.

### **3-4. The Class Periods**

#### **Understanding the historical backgrounds in S1**

The original adult readers of our selected texts could have been expected to relate them accurately to the appropriate historical events. For our students, however, these were events of their grandparents' generation at best, and, unlike their peers in Japan, they were not studying Japanese history in their English day-schools, while JSSL did not include history in its Saturday curriculum.<sup>45</sup> Therefore, it was necessary at various points during the classes to expand their knowledge of the relevant historical events.

Having read the class responses to historical questions in the first session's questionnaire – regarding why Japan attacked Pearl Harbour<sup>46</sup>, how the Japanese treated Chinese and Korean people during the war, and what Japan gained and lost from the war – I devoted much of the second session, in particular, to discuss this history, with the help of some extracts from a history textbook and other materials. The special focus was on historical facts relating to the 'atomic destruction' in their main text, *After the Bombs*, including even the dates and times of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Again, three countries – Japan, China and Russia – appear in this text and knowing their relative locations and relevant historical interactions would be

---

<sup>45</sup> One student's mother welcomed our literature classes' engagement with history, observing that it was very necessary for her son to know Japanese history from the Japanese side (*diary entry – see Appendix 3-4(a)*).

<sup>46</sup> I was interested in whether any of them would know about the four-nation 'ABCD' oil blockade for some months preceding Pearl Harbour.

important for understanding the story. I used the knowledge of some students to inform the others. I also offered a hard comparison of attitudes to the Japanese and the German war-crimes. The German concentration camps systematically tortured and killed Jewish, Gypsy and handicapped people and this is fully and officially acknowledged because the Allies could seize the camps and release the survivors. There are undeniable proofs there. By contrast, though the Japanese 731-forces had concentration camps in China in order to make experiments on living Chinese people (for example, injecting them with plague and observing how they died) and though Japan is still accused of this in China, the Japanese history textbooks seldom mention it. One reason is that Japanese 731 forces could erase and burn the proofs before the Soviet Union seized the laboratories. Students seemed very interested in this.

### **Reading and Using the Main Text in the S1 Class**

Students' capacity for understanding the texts varied, mainly in relation to the ease or difficulty with which they could read Japanese at high school level. All three writing systems in Japanese, Hiragana, Katakana and Kanji (Chinese letters), were involved, and some students had difficulty reading and understanding some complex Kanji letters in particular. It was essential, then, to read the novel together and ask basic questions about the actions and roles of the various characters in the plot. We read the 15 (tightly packed) pages of the *After the Bomb* extract in two concentrated reading sessions, pausing only where necessary to explain difficult linguistic points or to provide some historical background. After each reading session, we discussed and analysed the development of plot and characters, while re-reading parts of the text more carefully – all done in Japanese, of course. Usually, I would write one or two questions, on the blackboard, followed in due course by the answers that emerged from small groups or general class discussion. Thus, on October 9<sup>th</sup>, we analysed the last section of the novel in which the boy, despite having caught some family anxiety, is transfixed at the top of his apartment by 'the beautiful scene' of the city lit up in the middle of the night as the Japanese prepared their hasty departure. His mother or father could hardly have had this perception, but he was just a dependent child and his fear is not so overwhelming – he could perceive the lights as beautiful. How did the two groups respond to the question I posed?

***The boy now is rather insecure. Why then does he think the lights in the city of Manchuria are beautiful? What does the author mean by this?***

*\*Lights represent the end of the war. The lights mean 'freedom'.*

*\*The Japanese have great insecurity and anxiety; but the lights represent 'hope' for the oppressed (Chinese) people.*

'End' itself represents beauty in Japanese. I explained the Japanese proverb 'Yushu no bi (有終の美)', which means that everything must be sorted out and tidy when something ends; the end should be celebrated by beauty. Therefore, it can be thought that the boy subconsciously anticipated the end of war when he saw the scene as beautiful. However, some students questioned another group's suggestion that the lights represented 'hope' for the oppressed Chinese. Could *the boy* really have thought like that at the time? It seemed more likely to be his view as the *adult author*. These students were beginning to address the issue of the author's 'double view' (perspective in childhood and present perspective). I pressed the further question: 'why would the adult author add the idea that 'the lights might be the hope for the oppressed?' But student responses to this were slow.

Moving on, I gave them a worksheet requesting their opinions of *After the Bombs* more generally and collected their (17) papers at the end of the class.<sup>47</sup>

### **After the Bomb (Worksheet)**

- 1) What image did the boy (author) have of the Japanese army and/or the Pacific War before he heard the news of 'the atomic destruction'?
- 1') If you were in the boy's situation, what image might you have of them?
- 2) Describe the boy's feeling and thinking when he knew that the Soviet Union had broken through the 'national border' and was about to attack them. (And what might the boy have thought about the Pacific War on hearing that the Soviet Union had broken through the 'national border' from behind and was about to attack Japan?)
- 2') If you were in the boy's situation, what might you think about the news?
- 3) What did the boy think when he stared at the lights at midnight?
- 3') If you were in the boy's situation, what might you think while staring at the lights?

---

<sup>47</sup> If I supplied too much homework, students (and their parents even more) will complain. They see the Saturday School as definitely 'second' to the weekday English school. Therefore, it is easier to let students do their JSSL written work during class.

Students discussed the questions in pairs before writing their papers individually. The follow-up' questions were designed to extend their thinking beyond the novel and to reconsider their own situations, but, reading the papers quickly afterwards, my overall impression was that 'their own thinking' was almost exactly the same as 'the boy's'. That is, they understood how the boy felt and thought, but were not yet voluntarily and actively thinking about wars and peace. For example, they could have referred the boy's (or the author's) implied sympathy with the oppressed Chinese in Manchuria to the similar concern some students expressed, in a news summary they presented to the class, about the contemporaneous American and British occupation of Iraq.

There was clearly more work to do and the supplementary texts were going to help us do it. Stories sometimes give students little space to think other than what the story tells. Poems can be better at stimulating students to consider outside and beyond the text.

### **Using the S1 Supplementary Texts** (*Appendix 3-4(b)*)

(i) *Trees* I introduced Tamura's poem, the first of two, to extend our on-going discussion of the justice of 'occupation', to explore our present 'virtue' and attitudes, and to work towards the planned plenary. This poem compares human beings unfavourably with trees. While human beings move around and can harm – 'invade' – their environment, trees do not 'invade' but stay in the same position, give no harm to anybody or anything, and continuously supply oxygen to human beings.

*I like trees because they are serene*

*I like trees because they do not walk and run*

*I like trees because they do not shout love and justice*

Human beings 'shout justice', but do not implement true justice. At this point, a student asked what 'justice' means. The Japanese dictionary did not help much, until another student came upon its concrete example of Karl Marx insisting that justice can be achieved by eliminating the class system through socialism and communism. The continued existence of the English class system was discussed by reference to the difference between Ealing Broadway and Acton Town (JSSL's 'neighbours') and I explained the class system that was

established in Japan during the Edo period (1603-1868).<sup>48</sup> That system lacked justice; class differences cannot be just when considering that all human beings are equal, as the Japanese Constitution regulates. Moreover, there is an inevitable relation between injustice and conflicts / wars.<sup>49</sup> We also questioned ‘love’. Trees give us a lot – ‘altruism’ is a suitable expression – and get no rewards from anyone.

Another worksheet:

- 1) What does the poet want to say about ‘love’ by trees? 1’) What does the poet want to say about the love that human beings give, compared to the love that trees give?
- 2) What does the poet want to say about the justice of trees? 2’) What does the poet want to say about the justice of human beings, compared to the justice of trees?
- 3) What do you think human love should be? What is your own definition of love?
- 4) What do you think the justice of human beings should be? What is your own definition of justice?

Now the papers were becoming interesting. As anticipated, the poem had given the students more room to think. In analyzing ‘justice’ and ‘love’, they used a wider variety of words and concepts and thought more radically and independently. Among the most interesting comments:

*I think it would be much better if human beings were trees. However, in return, we would lose our human nature. The justice of human beings cannot be compared with the justice of other creatures. (Hachiro)*

*I don’t use the word ‘justice’ very often. It is better to respect truth. (Kazuo)*

*Human beings injure and destroy others for the purpose of justice. Human beings get things and water from trees, but they do not return anything to them.(Hideo)*

*People consider ‘justice’ for their own advantage. However, trees always do good things to everybody.....Justice is self-satisfaction for somebody’s sake, because justice includes at least two opposite ideas. (Kyoko)*

---

<sup>48</sup> Shi-nou-ko-sho-eta-hinin: samurai, farmers, craftsmen, merchants, untouchables. Two untouchable classes ‘Eta and Hinin’ were established. Eta, who had roots in the shaman tradition, had a higher status than Hinin, but Hinin, who did jobs such as slaughter, leather-crafts, and sanitation-men, had a chance, if they worked very hard, to ‘become human beings’! That chance was denied to Eta (though many of them became quite wealthy ‘kabuki’ actors).

<sup>49</sup> Paul Rogers (2000) wrote of the increasing socio-economic divide both within and between countries as the major threat to security and peace, as well as being an affront to justice. (Cited in Gaffney, *et al* (2004: 4)).

The 'justice' of human beings' can easily be self-purposed, while trees' justice 'always does good things to everybody'. These students were both appreciating respectful trees and criticising our human invasions of others.

They moved on to 'love':

*Love means empathy, with which people can consider others and the environment and can take action for them. Human beings should love others infinitely. (About justice): people not giving trouble to others and taking action for someone's benefit. If I think something is not right, I need to stop people doing it. (Hiroko)*

*I hope that human love should be the love which doesn't demand rewards, however, human beings are self-centred, therefore, it is impossible to demand love for non-rewards. (Yuko)*

*Human love means that we don't destroy nature and cause wars and we can live peacefully. We should respect everything (nature and space). (Jiro)*

And the following from a well-informed student:

*Three kinds of love were identified in Greece. They are agape, philos, and eros. Human love is originally eros but this love is the shallowest among three loves because it can easily disappear. Tamura (the Japanese poet) insists that the highest love is agape. (Shiro)*

(ii) ***When I was most beautiful***, Noriko Ibaraki's poem evokes the experience of a girl growing up in Japan itself, during the war-years. I let students read this poem several times and then discussion began by noticing that each verse begins from 'when I was most beautiful', to emphasise the sad fact that WWII robbed her of her youth. Students considered the kind of life the future poet had in war-time Japan: she could not dress herself up, could not make up, could not get any gentle present from men, and so on. I briefly introduced material from a famous book, *The Boy H* by Kappa Seno, who also experienced WWII in Japan. 'Luxury is harm' was a saying of Government propaganda at the time and people were required to hand over metal such as personal finger rings and even tooth fillings. Nobody could be indifferent to the war, because the government had various ways to force people to attend, like another propaganda slogan: 'One for all, all for one'. However, we cannot just blame the government of that time, for Japanese people generally were not

thinking properly and had their own responsibilities for cooperating with the government.  
(Some did protest – and went to prison.)

Ibaraki's poem goes on to evoke other aspects of the people's 'reality' during the war. For example, the fourth verse:

*When I was the most beautiful  
My head was vacant  
My mind was stubborn  
My hands and legs were just shining brown*

I asked students to consider in groups what Ibaraki meant by these lines and their presentations were really interesting.

**'my head was vacant'**

- \* Japanese could not get accurate information from outside.
- \* Japanese could not help obeying the authority.
- \* Japanese did not have their own voluntary will and ideas.

**'my mind was stubborn'**

- \* Japanese were not flexible.
- \* Japanese could not think freely.

**'my hands and legs were just shining brown'**

- \* Japanese people worked outside and got sunburn.
- \* Japanese had to work a lot outside.
- \* 'Shining brown' might mean 'muddy' from the work in the fields.

Finally, I asked them to consider a possible contrast between people's 'insides' and 'outsides', along the lines *bodies worked just fine, but as for minds...??* They understood the point, though it was me who supplied the word 'robots'.

(iii) *War Letters (Senchu-ofukushokan)* The purpose here was to stay with the Japanese homeland experience of the war, while now adding the experience of a man and a soldier, but also to focus on the end of the war. Most Japanese had cooperated with the war effort, even though they did not like to do so. They worshiped the emperor (who got power from God) and were often proud at the prospect of losing their lives for him and Japan.<sup>50</sup> How then did

---

<sup>50</sup> Kazutoshi Hando, 2004, Showa History 『昭和史』

they react as defeat loomed and then became a reality? In this non-fictional text, Toshio and Miho meet and exchange love letters around the end of WWII. Toshio was a commander of Kamikaze ships and Miho was a teacher.

I got the class discussing the similarities and differences between ‘ordinary’ love letters and those between Toshio and Miho. Students were shy to answer whether or not they themselves exchanged love letters or love emails, but they certainly looked interested in this topic. Though love ‘letters’ had gone out of fashion, they easily noted the frantic and agonised tone of these letters deriving from the probability of the writers’ love being cut short by death in war. Toshio’s letters were sometimes simply repetitions of Miho’s name over and over again. We noted how the letters seemed to reflect both the development of their relationship and the course of the war. When Miho changes her way of calling Toshio from ‘Commander’ to ‘Toshio’, the students saw a transition from respect and calmness to passion and urgency: *‘when they are about to separate, she really loves him and she calls him Toshio.’*

This text provided an opportunity to consider ‘Kamikaze’ in some detail. Especially as gasoline supplies became diminished, Japan developed the practice of loading planes and ships with enough gasoline for just one way and then crashing them mainly into American aircraft carriers (after crews had a ‘last Sake’).<sup>51</sup> My main concern was to prevent students from ‘beautifying’ Kamikaze in the manner of the contemporary comic writer mentioned earlier, Yoshinori Kobayashi. Presenting the Kamikaze crews as going to the battlefield to protect their country, hometown, family, and emperor, even though they knew they are about to surrender (*Senso-ron*, 1998: 91), he claims they did not thereby lose their ‘individuality’, but also *‘When you want to think of ‘individuality’, you should think of ‘country’ first* (p.376). But did Toshio always think that ‘country’ is the first? These letters were evidence of the continuing importance of personal lives in extreme war conditions. When they were

---

<sup>51</sup> Though ship crews could in theory evacuate just before they crashed, in most cases they lost their lives.

about to separate from each other, their letters were not about their country. Both their minds were full of a passion for thinking about each other.<sup>52</sup>

### **S2 and S3 Colleagues' class periods**

*Ambush* was the main text for the two S2 Saturday classes and it deals with the Vietnam War, which these students did not know very well. The two teachers' on-going records of their work (*Appendix 3-4(c)*) shows that they first spent time explaining this war: when and where it took place, why America was involved, and its outcome. Their classes then read through the text (in the Japanese translation), explaining the difficult terms and phrases. Both teachers divided the story into the same three sections and discussed the relationship between the sections with the students. They were confident that their students did come to understand how the story was constructed.

As to how they dealt with the ambush itself and how they related it to war and the overall theme of 'invasion', some difference of emphasis was noticed. Teacher X's questions easily pointed towards those themes, often via Tim's feelings:

- Where, when, and what did Tim do? From when to when, did Tim do the ambush?
- Make a chart of Tim's change of feeling. How did the ambush affect his 'tension'?
- What did the young man look like when Tim saw the man first? How did Tim respond when he saw the man dead?
- What was the result of Tim's tension? What did Tim do during his tension? Did the young man cause Tim's tension? Did Tim have a reason at that time for his tension?
- Why does Tim tell his own murder story to people (other than his daughter)? What does he want to achieve for himself?
- The *writer* also poses questions to his readers. Is this novel against wars?

*(Italics added)*

Teacher Y, originally a literature teacher, while not neglecting Tim's state of mind, is more focussed on the developing action and structure of the text:

- What kind of mission is the 'ambush'?
- What did Tim think of the young man coming towards him?
- What is the reason for Tim's next action?
- Why did he throw the hand grenade?

---

<sup>52</sup> I added their life after the War. They married and had a son and a daughter. However, according to Toshio's '*Shi no Toge*' (*Thorn of Death*), he gradually became concentrated on his career as a writer and neglected his family. Finally, they divorced.

- What does Tim think of his own action?
- Why is Tim still sorting out his thinking?
- Why does Tim try to think of too many things?
- When does Tim dream about the young man he has killed?
- Why does Tim dream about this?

Both S2 classes were required to write short essays on ‘*What do you think after reading and learning Ambush?*’ I made and read copies of these for later analysis. Many commented on O’Brien’s preoccupation with ‘killing’<sup>53</sup> people – in different ways. The first of three interesting examples reflects on the different ways in which killing people is represented in the arts and it leads up to a final deep observation:

In the story ‘Hansel and Gretel’, Hansel killed the witch to save Gretel. This is self-defence for Gretel’s sake, but it is true that Hansel killed a person. I think Hansel does not notice he did ‘murder’, nor he does not have any trauma.... When I watch a film such as ‘007’, James Bond kills amounts of people, but his killing is justified. However, when I read Shakespeare’s ‘Macbeth’, Macbeth commits suicide because of his murder.

‘Murder’ kills ‘murderers’.

In the second, the daughter’s age is the key factor – she is too young to be told the truth:

[On] TV, I saw a very interesting experiment. They asked the question, ‘A man’s wife got a disease and she will die if he cannot buy medicine. He is very poor and cannot buy medicine. Therefore, he steals money. Is his attitude wrong?’ When they put this question to 4 or 5 years old children, everybody answers, ‘it is wrong’. However, when they put the same question to 17 or 18 year old students... ‘he has no other way to [save his wife], so it is not wrong’..... I think O’Brien is waiting for his daughter to ask him the same question later.

The third implies that the narrator knows in his heart that what he did was wrong:

His daughter asked O’Brien whether or not he had killed anybody. This question drew on her consciousness that killing people is wrong, because killing robs the killed man of his life and his family of their father/husband and so on. .... he doesn’t believe that this killing can be justified by saying that it was during the war. [When] O’Brien says in the story, ‘I was just looking at the dead body...’, he definitely regrets what he did .... Killing/murdering people will certainly place a burden on a man’s life.

---

<sup>53</sup> Japanese language use favours the more general word ‘killing’, even when ‘murder’ is the issue.

This sense of ‘guilt’ is captured in most of the essays across both classes. Killing people (= invasion into others) cannot bring peace of mind to people; instead it brings agony, repentance, regret, trauma and so on.

**Judgement** was S3’s main text. As described before, it focuses on Japanese people’s situation in China at the end of WWII and its main character, Jiro, is preoccupied with the guilt of his casual murders of two non-combatant Chinese farmers and a deaf old woman during the war. At the time, he had felt nothing wrong, but when he later experiences real love, he seriously repents what he did.

In preliminary discussion, teacher V drew parallels with the Biblical book of *Apocalypse*,<sup>54</sup> in which the visionary sees God’s fury reaching to the maximum and leading to a final ‘Judgement’. This could have been very similar to the experience of the final loss of WWII, particularly for Japanese who lived in China. The teacher and students then read the (quite long) short story together over several periods, identifying and explaining difficult words, dividing the story into sections and attending to its structure. After that, they focussed on Jiro’s actions, his later repentance and his decision to remain in China. A worksheet involved reading a short newspaper article by Alvin Toffler that argued for extending to post-colonial situations the concepts of ‘statute of limitations’ for prosecutions.<sup>55</sup> The worksheet was in three parts.

- 1) What do you think about Jiro remaining in China and continuing to punish himself after the war?
- 2) Read the article by Alvin Toffler and say what you think about the concepts of ‘time limit’ and ‘prescription’ on which he insists;
- 3) If you were Jiro, would you agree with Toffler’s idea, or would you continue to punish yourself?

Most students admired Jiro’s brave action in remaining in China to punish himself. Their comments were often quite ‘deep’.

It is only he that can truly punish himself for what he did. For example, if I killed somebody and was judged by the court, I would not be truly punished if I did not

---

<sup>54</sup> which had been referenced in *Judgement* itself

<sup>55</sup> Alvin Toffler, *Yomiuri Newspaper* 10<sup>th</sup> Oct 2004. (This is a right-of-centre newspaper.) Toffler insists that history has the conception of a ‘time limit’. If the colonised country continues to demand apology and damages from the previous suzerain country, they just create hatred and violence to be used politically.

recognise and reflect myself on how wrong I was. .... We may have laws and God, but it is only me that can punish myself. (Akira)

Jiro only had this one way..... Some people think it is meaningless to continue to punish oneself, but I think that it is meaningful for him to consider his own guilt, which binds him. (Keiko)

...I feel very sorry for him because he is apart from his happiness and he punishes himself. However, he is very brave in continuing to punish himself to be released from his guilt. He is a very responsible man. (Haruko)

Most agreed with ‘time limits’ on prosecutions,

As our society has time limits, we can have time limits for our human history. (Takashi)

though some had reservations:

I think it is wrong to think that crime will disappear when time has passed. If there is the conception of time limits, people tend to think that they can just hide their crime..... We will forget to repent what we did. (Chiyoko)

However, everyone agreed with Chiyoko that a ‘statute of limitation’ would not have changed Jiro’s decision to stay in China. It would not have been relevant to his determination to ‘punish’ himself:

Some people take more time to realise what they did wrong, therefore, their crime will not disappear when the time has passed. They should understand and reflect on what they did. Jiro will not act as Toffler supposes. (Chiyoko)

The S3 students also had to write a short essay on: *Why is it wrong to kill people?* In *Judgement*, the main character killed the Chinese old man for no reason, feeling nothing at that time, but repenting later when he has experienced love. But why, in the first place – teacher V asked – is it wrong for us to kill others? This question, too, provoked important answers. For example:

I did not even [have to] think deeply ‘why it is wrong to kill others’. I believe it is obvious that killing others is wrong. When I was brought up, I learnt a certain morality and values... We, human beings, have the language to communicate with each other. We try to consider others’ situations and to empathise with them. As long as we have this empathy, we DO NOT kill others. In other words, we MUST NOT kill others. Nobody has the right to deprive life from others. The war for ‘peace’ makes others lose their ‘peace’. (Teruko)

Another answer offered a more self-interested point of view:

For civilisation, we need order and stability. To maintain our civilisation, we cannot kill each other ....Moreover, we have some conscience. If we kill others, we will regret it at some point. Therefore, we cannot kill others for our own sake. (Keiko)

Many referred to the law against killing. However, is that sufficient? Like *Judgement's* author, Takeda, I believe that we have to think by ourselves (not from 'law') and repent from our own consciences. One student was quite eloquent about this:

..... In the modern world, we are educated not to kill others, therefore, we take this rule for granted. However, in some special circumstance – where this rule does not exist – anybody, possibly, might think like Jiro. In this circumstance, we could kill people easily. .... Then if we are not punished for killing (in the special circumstance such as wars), can we kill others? .... We are not just a collection of 'atoms'. We have parents, brothers and sisters and friends. ...We should always consider them. ... We are not ruled by law, but we are ruled by 'law made by ourselves'. (Takashi)

These S3 student essays impressed me a lot, by the maturity of their thinking but also by their grasp of the issues in *Judgement* – including their implicit grasp of 'invasion into others', the intended theme of the forthcoming plenary meeting.

## Chapter 4

### The First Project (cont.): Plenary Meeting and Final Evaluations

#### 4-1. The Plenary Meeting

One late issue had been how much to leave it to the students to discover for themselves the common theme of ‘invasion’ in the S1-S3 texts. My colleagues convinced me that they would need *hints* in the teachers’ introductions and the student Chairperson’s initial remarks. We hoped this would enable them to then see the video presentation as the ‘ultimate case’ of invasion. (We would soon find we were too optimistic!)

Over several late discussions, we agreed *follow-up questions* for the mixed-class discussion groups following the video, a short *4-point evaluation of the PM* to be completed by pupils individually at the end of the day, and *a detailed programme* of the day’s events<sup>56</sup> which we distributed to students a week before the PM – and which began with the following summary:

- Opening;
- Each teacher will explain the story line of the textbook which he/she taught;
- Class representatives will present what they learned during classes, what they focused on, and what they thought;
- As a visual example, all will watch the video showing how people in Nagasaki suffered physically and mentally from the atomic bomb;
- All will have a 10 minutes break;
- Students will discuss issues arising in mixed S1-S3 groups;
- Group representatives will present their group thoughts and, if there is still time, students will discuss further as a whole gathering;
- Students will write what they learned from this plenary meeting on the supplied template paper;
- Closing.

---

<sup>56</sup> See *Appendix 4-1(a)*

The day began with each class making a brief presentation of their main text and themes, first the teacher, then a volunteer student<sup>57</sup> saying what it had meant to him or her. This was done for continuity – to recapture what had been learnt in each class as well as its thoughtful atmosphere – and to share this with the other classes, before taking on the trauma of the video. Two student chairpersons then conducted a brief dialogue with the 80 students looking for the common theme in the three texts. Actually, ‘suffering’ was the favourite answer from the floor (understandably!). In spite of the hints, the chairpersons had to ‘give’ the students the more specific answer ‘invasion’.<sup>58</sup>

### **Watching and Responding to the A-bomb video** (*see Appendix 4-1(b)*)

The title of this 1996 video is ナガサキの少年少女たち (Boys and Girls in Nagasaki) and it is mainly about the children on whom the bomb fell on 9<sup>th</sup> August 1945. It starts with the making of the bomb in the USA and the successful testing of ‘Fat Man’ in July 1945 (with the help of Jewish scientists who had discovered uranium fission in Germany, before the Pacific War began, and had left Germany because they were afraid that Hitler would develop and use these weapons). President Truman ordered the dropping of atomic bombs the day before Japan received the Potsdam Declaration. The Nagasaki bomb was dropped over the famous Urugami Catholic church on a day that many Christians were gathered there for confession, in preparation for the feast of the Assumption of Mary on 15<sup>th</sup> August. Many Japanese Koreans and Chinese were also among the dead in this ‘human experiment in a city’, as the video presents it. It depicts its effects and the subsequent radiation effects on a number of individual 10-15 year olds. Their memories were very vivid and detailed and the photos and their stories are very shocking.

The video goes on to observe how criticism of atomic bombs was severely prohibited in Japan after WWII, until the Bikini Atoll incident in 1954 got Japanese talking about A-bombs and H-bombs. In 1955, Hiroshima hosted the first world conference appealing for a prohibition on nuclear weapons and the grassroots movement grew for ‘no more Hiroshima, no more Nagasaki’.

---

<sup>57</sup> My S1 class ‘volunteered’ Shiro in this way: I asked who would like to make this presentation for the class and almost all the students pointed to him!

<sup>58</sup> A contributing factor, perhaps: the video record suggests I had spoken too quickly for the students who did not have Japanese as their first language!

All the students were watching the video carefully; everyone was concentrated on it. When it was over, the students remained very quiet, every student seeming to think about it. In contrast, the later discussion would become very passionate and energetic.<sup>59</sup>

### **The Discussion Groups (*Evidence for 'RICE'?*)**

Following the 10-minute break, 9 mixed-class groups got down to discussion and work on their choice of 3 of the 5 follow-up questions set by their teachers. These had just been given to each group in a handout that also provided space for brief group presentation answers.

1. *What does 'the invasion of others' mean? Why do invasions happen?*
2. *What does the producer of the video we watched want to tell us?*
3. *What did we learn about wars from the classes and the video?*
4. *What about wars drove the writers to write? (Are there different ways of thinking about wars and peace in the UK and Japan?<sup>60</sup>)*
5. *What can you do with what you have learnt from the classes and the video?<sup>61</sup>*

This exercise was planned as the AR's teaching and learning *highlight* and it became retrospectively the fullest expression – *and test* – so far, of what this thesis is calling our 'RICE' theory of pedagogy. Therefore, it is worth reporting quite fully.

A question-by-question analysis of the groups' responses, largely in their own words (translated), suggests the intensity that had been generated, especially by the A-bomb video, and was now continuing in the group discussions. My analysis starts, however, with the two questions, 1 and 3 above, that did not necessarily require reference to the video.

---

<sup>59</sup> Such remarks are based not only on the observations I shared with others at the time and put in my research diary, but also on our viewing of the video record we made of this PM.

<sup>60</sup> The interpretation of history varies with countries. For most Japanese people, the A-Bomb is the symbol of 'evil'. However, others are impressed by the argument that its use in Japan shortened the war and 'saved lives' in the longer run. We teachers knew that some students who attended local English schools probably thought like this. What we could do for *all* our students was get them to consider the results of wars through literature and video and to try to understand various way of thinking.

<sup>61</sup> We had almost decided to omit this question as too much for the occasion when the headmaster intervened to ask that it be kept.

**Q1:** One group included this question in their three chosen questions and it reported insightfully:

*'invasion of others is designed to make them obey unconditionally despite their own different views'.*

But why only one group? Perhaps the measures we had taken to highlight 'invasion' as the common S1-S3 theme were 'too little, too late'. Or was it because this subtle theme had difficulty competing with the immediate force of the video? It was probably both.

**Q3** was successful in reminding the students in the 4 groups who chose it of their literature.

*'we, who have never experienced wars, study literature relating to wars to understand wars better';*

And another group adds:

*'...so as not to repeat having wars';*

In other formulations:

*'.....to understand the importance of the peace; we take it for granted, but considering the feelings of characters in literature can make us appreciate the peace...';*

*'...literature can help people in later generations to understand each other as human beings and help establish a peaceful world'.*

Observations with a more historical emphasis:

*'...to broaden our outlook' ...to understand various views and different angles about wars';*

*'Literature is deep in content, so we can get a chance to analyse the fact beyond just seeing the fact [implying a contrast with video!] From this point of view, Japanese literature is important because we got two A-Bombs in the past';*

*'We should know our own past mistakes through knowing wars more and literature makes us consider what we can do from now on and how we can deal with situations'*

**Q2:** All 9 groups addressed the question of the video producer's intentions. The major emphasis was on communicating the sheer terror of the event:

*'....to tell the shock and suffering which Nagasaki people experienced .... to criticise the atomic bomb as an indiscriminate bomb that kills everyone';*

*'....to tell the terror of the A-bomb to the next generation;*

*'....to tell the people who have not experienced wars how dreadful the war was'*

*'....to tell us not to repeat the same history. It is outrageous to kill civilians by A-Bomb'*

*'We think we know what the A-Bomb is, however, we do not really know..... we should remember and not forget'.*

*'...to tell the facts of wars: ...men kill other (innocent) men... treat them as non-human beings... and involve 'irrelevant' (non-combatant?) people...In wars, chaos and confusion are created, then men happen to do some wrong things'*

#### References to the courage of the survivors:

*'there are some people who are still suffering the after-effects of atomic Bomb; survivors have some hope for living even though they suffer'*

*'(the survivors) want to send the message that these people always have had hope for the future.'*

#### Explicit appreciations of the visual medium:

*'...to tell the agony that we do not know at all, through vivid image (video)'*

*'...to tell us visually what wars are like, because that passes more easily to people - people can remember it for a longer time'*

*'...we can attend not only to survivors' interviews and stories, but also to images. Through the video, our own impression of the A-Bomb became definite'*

#### The Japanese as best-placed to broadcast the Japanese message to the world:

*The producers want to depict the different (Japanese) angle, because Japanese can describe the victims' experiences and outcry more clearly than non-Japanese.*

**Q 4:** Six groups chose to discuss the different perspectives of the winning and the losing countries and they offered two valid though contrasting points. Some emphasised victor arrogance:

*'Afterwards, victorious countries do not care about wars, but defeated countries 'know' wars and convey this [knowledge] to the world. Also, defeated countries are 'assumed' to have been wrong.'*

*'Japan lost the war, but we got and learned something: we do not have the Atomic Bomb. Winning countries are proud of their wars, hold 'good' memories, and try to control the world.'*

*'Winning wars does not mean 'justice'. People on the winning side should know better than to make jokes about the atomic Bomb.'*

The theme of war having no victors was just as common:

*'Win or lose, wars produce victims. Deep in our heart, we do not want to die whether we win or lose. For example, the United States was proud of its WWII soldiers, but they wanted soldiers not to go to Vietnam. Wars may produce profits for the 'upper class', but soldiers' families suffer whether they win or lose. As a result, wars bring sadness to most people.'*

*'We cannot understand what we won for or what we lost for. This means that the difference is not so big between victory and defeat. Both lose families and loved ones.'*

*'.....even in the winning countries, there are people who are suffering from wars.'*

**Q5:** Six of the 9 groups included the 'future question' in their chosen three. Working to prevent wars was the overwhelming theme in their responses, whether focused on stopping wars between other countries, or stopping one's own country from going to war.

*'After learning the reason why two countries are at war, we can form our own opinions and pass them on.....[also] tell people our atomic Bomb experience and stop them getting arms so easily. We should send these messages in songs and films and so on.'*

*'....we can promote anti-war activities, send the message how dreadful wars become to those currently at war, also .... save those who are suffering from wars'*

*'....we can prevent [the Bomb] being dropped again by knowing 'the facts' and by thinking for ourselves; then we will not repeat this mistake. We can send the message to the world about the agony the A-bomb creates for people. Also, we have to understand for ourselves the mentality of the people in both countries, not just accept what the mass media passes to us.'*

*'We cannot change people's views easily, so we need time to spread the terror of the A-Bomb to as many people as possible. Also we should not think that science exists to hurt others; to the contrary, scientific progress [should] help people.'<sup>62</sup>*

*'....Government should respect citizens' opinions and we should have a more active movement to avoid being bombed again.'*

*'....when the government [wants to] begin a war, we should appeal to the public, conduct a campaign to collect signatures against it; [indeed,] we should make the government lead us in the prevention of wars. Also we can make some songs, poems and videos to appeal for this, and we can study harder and take action through donations and volunteering.'*

*'.....we can pass the experience of wars and the A-Bomb to the next generation to remind them of 'the facts'.'*

---

<sup>62</sup> This was a comment offered to question 5, but it seems to belong better here.

Independent thinking, understanding a conflict's causes, challenging war-supporting media, supporting and participating in citizen-volunteer movements, sanctuary for war-victims, songs and films are all included here, along with passing on the Japanese experience. The sincerity and passion that we teachers had observed during the group discussions has carried through to these reports. It can be said that they are clear evidence of the *educational value* of the discussions that produced them, of the PM as a whole and, indeed, of the AR which they pull together.<sup>63</sup>

### **The PM Evaluation Questionnaire**

This short questionnaire was handed out to the 65 attending students at the end of the PM and the 37 students who returned responses<sup>64</sup> provided some further evidence for a positive view of the PM.

- 1) What did you learn from this Plenary Meeting? Please write theoretically in detail.
- 2) What did you feel about the war?
- 3) What can you do personally in future after this plenary meeting?
- 4) (*if you have time to write more*) What do you think was the aim of this Plenary Meeting?

1) The first of three important themes in responses was the impact of the video, picked out by 28 students. Its 'visuality' had let them imagine the horror more vividly, but also to empathise strongly with the survivors. It had given them a strong vicarious sense of what those survivors had experienced. This led many to then reflect again on war itself and their own peaceful daily lives and/or to connect their compassion for past war victims with 'saving the peace' in their own lives and time.

The video provides us with a shocking image. This made me think about the meaning of the war and the kind of thinking that leads towards war. Moreover, to experience war must be very frightening. I learned the fact [truth??] of 'war' and 'the atomic bomb'.

---

<sup>63</sup> Later we will consider evaluations of these group discussions that were made by the teacher-observers – including the Headteacher and the Deputy-Head. These were highly significant for the continuation of the ARs.

<sup>64</sup> Some students have to hurry away at the end of Saturday classes. Also, after a very busy morning, writing answers to these questions *in Japanese* would have seemed burdensome to some students.

Watching a video which shows those who experienced the fearful atomic bomb in Nagasaki, and listening to their stories, I thought again about the loss of the war and I questioned the war itself.

I think wars affect people a lot and I understood that people gave other people pain not only for during the wars but for after the war – and they are still suffering. Comparing with them, my life is very peaceful. I thought I should live every moment very valuably.

## 2) The importance of discussion was another theme

I learnt a lot from the ideas and opinions of other people in the same group. I never experienced 'war' and I take 'peace' for granted. However, I realised the importance for what we can do in the future by discussing these matters.

All of the 5 students who got as far as the final question in the short time available, were among those who chose or included this as the aim of the PM as a whole. For example:

The aim was to discuss the same issue with three different age groups, to mingle with the others..... to discuss war with the others.

The aim was to deepen our knowledge by considering the war and listening to others' opinions. It is to recognise the importance of peace.

The aim is to accept the fact of the War and to deepen our understanding and consider what 'I' can do. And it is to listen to others' opinions.

As their first experience of cross-class and cross-age-group discussion groups, and of the wider context of a meeting of all the senior high students, it would have seemed very fresh and new, giving them an opportunity to think in different ways – not only to 'borrow' ideas from others, but to expand the views they had been forming in their own classes and to take more responsibility for developing their views.

## 3) Finally, some students instinctively realised the connection between discussion and peace, and, therefore, the appropriateness of the PM pedagogy to the goal of developing the students' peace conceptions. For example: '

Listening to others' opinions makes students recognise the importance of peace.

The 'knowledge' of peace that students may acquire from teacher-led, lecture-style, classes is likely to be superficial and one-dimensional, compared to the knowledge acquired by questioning, discussing and analysing issues.

## 4-2. The ‘Before and After’ Questionnaires

The account above of the PM, like the earlier account of the classes in chapter 3, was already implicitly, and sometimes explicitly, evaluative. They provided evidence for, and many examples of, the learning of both the students and the teachers during the AR. This section and the next will present evaluations that are more ‘summative’ of the whole AR and more ‘formal’ – using explicitly evaluative research instruments. This section deals with the before/after student questionnaires, while 4-3 will analyse data from final student and teacher interviews and a decisive final ‘reflective meeting’ of teachers, Head-teacher and the Deputy-Head, which began by watching the DVD of the PM.

First administered in September, the ‘before/after’ questionnaires were then re-administered to all classes on the 27<sup>th</sup> November, the Saturday after the PM that had brought AR1 formally to an end. Though they were seen as useful revision and consolidation for the students, their primary purpose was to provide me with research evidence of how their thinking had changed through the AR. However, filling in the questionnaire that morning had to compete for time and attention with the various new topics that we were now introducing to our classes and this would affect the return-rate from my colleagues’ classes more than I had anticipated. In addition, returning their ‘before’ answers to them as the ‘starting point’ for their new answers would contribute to the ambiguity of ‘no progress’ responses, as explained in chapter 2-3.

### Rationale of the Questions

What ideas governed the selection of questions? Wars and invasions have various *phases*, they are the subjects of different *perspectives*, and there are *contemporary* as well as historical wars and invasions. *Phases*: they cause enormous suffering initially, all the while they last, and after they have stopped. *Perspectives*: the contemporaneous perspectives of the aggressor / invader and of the attacked / invaded are very different, as are the perspectives of the eventual ‘winners’ and ‘losers’. *Contemporary reference*: it would also be important to include some reference to contemporary wars, though the primary foci of this AR were two historical wars.

In addition, the fact that our JSSL students were attending English schools on weekdays – and that they access British history also through literature, cinema, and museums and so on – suggested comparisons with *British* imperial history, for example, the colonisation of India, the Opium War (spreading opium), and participation in the slave trade. Would the students' thinking regarding such British 'invasions' be changed by their study of Japanese invasions of China and Korea, or the US 'invasion' of Vietnam – and vice-versa?

These considerations were embodied in the 11/12 items on the questionnaires. (Appendix 4-2(a))

My hope, of course, was that later responses would show a more informed and thoughtful awareness of the value of peace and of working for peace, and less acceptance of an inevitable cycle of 'war/peace/war/peace...' However, as explained in chapter 2, I had to accept that 'negative' results were ambiguous: they could not be *assumed* to show 'no progress'. 'Positive' results had potential significance, though in different ways: in particular, they could be 'better informed', or 'more caring', or 'both better informed and more caring'.

I worked initially with four possible degrees of change: None, Small, Moderate and Large, but I found that the data could only support one broad distinction between *Clear Development* and *Little Or No Demonstrated Development*. Though the 'after' responses were generally longer than the 'before' responses, they still tended to be too brief for more refined judgements.

The quantitative potential of the exercise was now very much reduced, but it retained some qualitative and illustrative potential, despite the often frustrating brevity of the responses. To explore this potential, I grouped the questions into four thematic categories and made a judgement as to whether or not *clear development* was demonstrated for each respondent in their responses in each category. The categories are:

**Category 1:** Questions to investigate changes in the students' views of the consequences *for the invaded countries* of Japanese aggression around WWII and of American aggression in Vietnam.

**Category 2:** Questions to catch students developing recognition of the harm and suffering that came *to the invaders themselves*. There was the shame of eventual defeats for both countries and, for Japan, the enormous suffering of its people caused by the A-bombs, which these students could now imagine better from the video. There was also the continuing spiritual traumas of the soldier invaders, which was a theme in all three main texts. In O'Brien's *Ambush* (S2) and Takeda's *Judgement* (S3) it was expressed powerfully as the result of experiences of needless killings by individual soldiers in the moral chaos of war. The students' main texts had presented 'invasion' and the invaders' own psychological and physical suffering as strongly connected with each other.

**Category 3:** Questions for discovering changes in students' views of *Western/British, imperialism* in comparison with Japanese imperialism.

**Category 4:** Questions that look for changes in how students considered *current Japanese political and policy issues* concerning the change from a militarist to a pacifist / democratic regime, which is the continuing political and military legacy of the WWII defeat. In the US, too, the lost Vietnam War provoked a strong anti-war movement. (Between post-WWII Japan and post-Vietnam War America, there is a remarkable similarity in how soldiers were regarded, and regarded themselves.)<sup>65 66</sup>

## **Analysis of Students' Responses to the Four Categories of Questions**

### **(1) Japanese aggression in WWII (US in Vietnam War)**

#### **[S1 and S3]**

What do you think about the fact that Japan participated in WWII? Why did Japan need the war? What do you think about the fact that Japan attacked Pearl Harbour? What do you think about the fact that Japan took many Korean and Chinese people from their own lands?

#### **[S2]**

*What does the "Vietnam War" remind you of? What do you think about the fact that the United States dropped "defoliant" bombs in the jungles of Vietnam during the war?*

In my judgement, 23 of the 31 respondents to questions in this category gave more or less reasonably clear evidence of some development. But two of these can illustrate the fine difficulty in some judgements. The first is an absolutely clear S1 example of '*little or no demonstrated change*':

*Before:*

Japan wanted to expand their territory like Germany.

---

<sup>65</sup> With hindsight, it would have been good to include at least one question relating to *how people's ways of thinking are changed by wars, the propaganda associated with wars, and the eventual results of war* – so, in Japan, most people supported Japanese militarism during WWII but after they lost the War, they changed from militarism to pacifism. These were important themes in the texts being studied.

<sup>66</sup> *Appendix 4-2(b)* charts the positioning of questionnaire items to these four categories.

The Pearl Harbour attack was necessary for Japan.

Many things happen during wars. Reflecting on them afterwards is wrong.

*After:*

Japan wanted to expand their territory with Germany.

The Pearl Harbour attack was necessary for Japan, therefore, it was a very good strategy.

Reflecting on wars afterwards, we think this or that was cruel, however, the other countries might do the same as Japan in the same circumstances.

This contrasts with what I judged a *subtle* development in another S1 student's responses:

*Before:*

Japan had to catch up with other countries; for which the Pearl Harbour attack was the only measure left for the Japanese army.

*After:*

The reason for Japanese participation in WWII is that Japan wanted to make other countries aware of the existence of the country 'Japan'. From this point of view, the attack on Pearl Harbour was successful, but it awoke 'the sleeping tiger'.

The basis for my judgement here was the addition of a psychological element to the military logic in the reasoning – which I could associate with his immersion in our *literature* and the PM, so that he could now think about how 'invading' and 'invaded' peoples *feel*. But, then, how much was my judgement here influenced by my general experience of the student?

However, the next two examples of development leave little room for doubt.

## **(2) Japanese Suffering in the War [US in Vietnam]**

**[S1 and S3]**

What do you think about the fact that the United States dropped the A-bomb on Japan? What did Japan get out of WWII? What did Japan lose through WWII?

**[S2]**

*There are American soldiers who are still suffering from the side effects of "defoliants". What do you think about them? What did the United States gain from the Vietnam War? What did United States lose through the Vietnam War?*

16 out of 30 response sets could be seen as positive here, including Akira (S3) and Kyoko (S1) who have clearly moved forward in relation to this category of questions. First Akira:

*Before:*

The US did not have to drop the A-bomb in Japan. The 'experiment' of the A-bombs was more important for the US than finishing the War.

*After:*

I still think that the US did not have to drop the A-bomb in Japan. What I do not like is that the US still develops A-bombs and weapons. I feel very sorry now about this. I hear that Iran and North Korea have nuclear weapons today. It is very sad that human beings do not make progress.

His opinion remains, ‘the US did not have to drop them’, but he is now better informed of the increasingly international nature of the nuclear threat, and the danger feels near rather than far away – so he cares more (‘very sorry’, ‘sad’). Next Kyoko (S1)

*Before:*

People’s suffering from A-bombs was similar to people’s suffering at Pearl Harbour. They were civilians in both cases, but they suffered!

*After:*

Did the US drop A-bombs because Japan did not surrender? Or did they drop them because US wanted to show their power to other countries? If [it was] really for the first reason, Americans should have been more responsible for the after-effects of the A-bomb.

Kyoko is moving on from the ‘equivalence’ between Pearl Harbour and Hiroshima/Nagasaki that is frequently taught in Japanese schools. More aware now of Japanese suffering resulting from the A-bombs, she is close to condemning the USA for not doing enough to at least moderate their effects. Why? She was a very diligent girl with an exercise book full of her thinking and empathy with the characters in the S1 texts, and the PM seems to have moved this empathy from ‘passive’ to ‘active when it came to the A-bomb effects. It seems that she had ‘to do something’ for this misery and what she could find was to demand that the US take responsibility for it.

### **(3) Other countries and other invasions**

**[S1 and S3]**

What do you think about the fact that Japan took many Korean and Chinese people from their own lands? What do you think about the fact that Britain colonized India and China in the past? What do you think about the fact that many British took many black people from Africa as slaves?

**[S2]**

*Why is war “necessary”? Give one example that you know and answer the question. What do you think about the fact that Britain colonized India and China in the past? What do you think about the fact that many British took many black people from Africa as slaves?*

16 of the 29 respondents to questions in this category gave evidence of development. A passionate S2 example (one of several):

Kiyoshi

*Before:*

[The slave trade] illustrates the arrogance of powerful people who do not regard those people as 'human beings'.

We need wars to bring back lost peace.

*After:*

I feel very ashamed that some people hit upon such an idea (taking some people as slaves). It is very sad that they did not treat those people as human beings, saying that 'the colour is different' or 'they can work a lot'. We should not forget this history. We did not live in that period; but we should remember this sad history.

We do not need wars. A lot of people die, but we cannot really 'get' anything.

#### **(4) The Japanese Situation and the Present Day**

[All S classes]

Can peace be achieved? If you think yes, how can it be achieved? If you think no, give the reason why you think so. What are the advantages and disadvantages if peace could be achieved in this world? Is an Army in Japan necessary? Answer yes or no, and give the reason why you think so. Do you think a Japanese defence force is necessary or unnecessary? What do you think of the fact that there are American military bases in Japan?

Of the 18 of 30 who could be judged 'positive' for progress in this category, the 'optimists' and 'pessimists' about peace were roughly equal. Some changed from one to the other in this respect, for example, Shigeru (S3)

*Before:* (Shigeru)

We can achieve peace. We should abandon cheap pride.

We do not need defence force because Japanese constitution prohibits us from keeping it.

*After:*

We cannot achieve peace. We are human beings; therefore, there is no eternal peace.

When we have some competition, we can make progress. I think the important thing is to *seek* for peace.

We need a defence force because we cannot survive in this world without arms.

However, it is wrong to threaten and spy on other countries.

An interesting point is that the students who had become more pessimistic about peace, perhaps through learning more about 'human nature' in the AR, still had the urge to seek for

peace in their inner minds, like Shigeru, and to make much of people's voluntary action toward peace.

### **4-3. Evidence from Interviews and a Reflective Meeting**

This much more satisfactory direct evidence for evaluating AR1 is 'conversational' in its nature and it includes data from late student and teacher interviews and from an important final 'reflective meeting' that approved the continuation of the AR-style project into the following academic year. The students were 5 volunteers from my own S1 class who I interviewed in two groups.<sup>67</sup> The teachers were my 3 colleagues and research partners: Y (teaching S2); X (S2B); and V (S3). The final '*reflective meeting*' also included the Headmaster and Deputy-Head and it began with a viewing of the video we had made of the PM (considering it as the AR1 climax).<sup>68</sup>

#### **Ten Recurring Themes**

It will become noticed that in these 'conversations' certain topics and themes were recurring in the perceptions of the students and/or teachers (including the Headmaster and his deputy). These regarded:

- the students engaged in serious discussion – with normally quiet students joining in;
- the differences between, and the interactions between, the long-term England-based and the previously Japan-based students;
- students being 'pushed' to think for themselves;
- the impact on the students of the A-bomb video, of the visual in contrast to the literary, conveying 'the reality' of war;
- some 'deep' student insights regarding war – especially its awfulness for victors and losers alike;
- student difficulty at the PM in finding the common ground between the classes and the texts of the different age-groups;
- teacher uncertainty as to how well the students integrated their literature learning in class with their experience of the PM and the A-Bomb video;

---

<sup>67</sup> Not including S2 and S3 interviewees reflected my reluctance to impose too much on my colleagues and their classes during AR1.

<sup>68</sup> The (translated) interview transcripts are in *Appendices 4.3(a) and 4.3(b)*. The notes I kept of the reflective meeting (including my own commentary) became part of my research diary.

- the value of the younger and older students working together – the whole Senior School working as one – and some minor obstacles to address here;
- the value of an extended AR, including the value of thinking space between sessions;
- the developing commitment of my colleagues to the AR idea.

In now presenting the three data sources, I will as far as possible let the participants speak for themselves. The links with the themes above will usually be obvious.

### **The Student Interviews** *(translated transcripts in appendix 4-3(a))*

After the PM, I asked my S1 class for some boy and some girl volunteers to discuss their AR1 experience in two small group-interviews with me that would last about 45 minutes each. As well as helping my research, it could be a further learning opportunity for them.<sup>69</sup> Shiro, Jiro and Hachiro volunteered for the boys' group, and Kyoko and Sakura for the girls' group.<sup>70</sup> I conducted the interviews on two successive Saturdays – in Japanese, of course. The students gave me permission to tape-record the interviews for later analysis.

For all of them it was the first interview in their life and they looked very shy in the beginning, but, as I had hoped, the 'group' format encouraged them to speak without tension and both groups became very cooperative. I experienced much more the merits of the group-interview method than its demerits. There seemed to be much more of students using other students' opinions as a 'boost' to finding their own 'voices' and trying to develop, or describe in a different way, what others had said, and much less of 'hiding behind', being frustrated by, or being intimidated by, the voices of others.

My four guiding questions for these interviews were:

- 1) What did you feel or learn when discussing with other students in the classes?
- 2) Did the 'plenary meeting' make a difference? How was it different from the classes before?  
Did you find it changed any of your ideas?
- 3) Did you think independently and not as directed by teachers?

<sup>69</sup> Indeed, when I listened to the student interview tapes, I could see that I had been too inclined to 'teach' rather than to 'interview' – in major contrast with my interviews of individual students two years later, reported in chapter 8.

<sup>70</sup>These names are fictitious, of course.

4) What are the merits of the whole programme implemented from the beginning of September?

***About Discussion – and Japanese education contrasted with English education:***

*Me: I would like to ask about what you found during this PM. Did you learn anything?*

*Jiro: I heard lots of opinions during the PM. I lived in Japan before and I think, maybe, that I could never have heard such opinions in Japan.*

*Me: Why do you think that?*

*Jiro: Nobody says their opinions.*

*Hachiro: .....The (Japanese) person brought up in London and the (Japanese) person brought up in Japan have very different views of the world. I am very amazed by the people brought up in London. Their views seem very precious to me.*

Hachiro and Jiro had little or no previous experience of really active class discussion and I could appreciate its impact on them, knowing from my own experience that pupils in Japan did not often express their own opinions in front of others.

***About the impact of the PM and the A-bomb video – and student insights about war:***

*Me: Did this PM change your way of thinking from before?*

*Jiro: My view of wars had been that they always have ‘winners’ and ‘losers’ and losers are always at a disadvantage after the war. ....[But] during the PM, one person said that both are losers when they begin to have wars. This was the first time I heard this view. Yes, it is very fresh.*

*Hachiro: ... I already knew and had learned how atomic bombs could destroy so many things. At the PM, I saw the reality from the video.*

*Again: ..... this video told me things that I did not know before. It is a very important video, I mean, for knowing what happened – and for telling others what happened. I mean, to discuss all this together is very good because we can then do something for peace.*

*Shiro: .....Before I heard Hiroshi’s opinion ... I got the impression of.. ‘sorrow’ and ‘suffering’ from this PM. [Then] Hiroshi said that we got nothing during the wars, not even sorrow and agony. This view impressed me very much. ....my view of the world become broader, I mean.*

*Again: Well..... the Japanese lost the war. As I said before, they got just sorrow and agony from wars. They got nothing. But nobody won from the war. All were losers. Yes, I heard this view during the PM, and my opinion changed a little bit. People who live here have a different view of wars, but I think Britain won the war (WWII), so they don’t know anything about wars. They can have jokes about wars. They have a different view of the war. [But] during the PM, I was thinking everybody knew in their heart that wars*

are wrong. Many people die in wars, and they die in many ways.

*Me:* Oh, you were amazed at the destruction to the city of Hiroshima on the video. You had never seen such destruction?

*Sakura:* No, it was the first time. I was very surprised. My group discussed it a lot. We communicated very well.

### ***About students 'pushed' into thinking for themselves:***

*Me:* The teachers organized this action research and got you students to think about peace. But .... did you think about it voluntarily, for yourself..?

*Shiro:* I never felt I was 'pushed' into thinking about it. But now you ask ...I think you could think of it like that. But (then) I think 'pushing' by the teachers was right in this case. I have no experience of living in Japan, so I did not know so much and it was good to be pushed. I did not know that people who experienced WWII still live today. ... I did not know the sorrow of the people who got the atomic bomb. I did not know some survivors still live. I am very amazed. Maybe I have been 'pushed' by you to learn, but I learned something new!

*Me:* So you think you learned for yourself.

*Shiro:* Yes, I can say so.

*Me:* How about you, Jiro?

*Jiro:* .....I have been learning one theme for a long time and eventually I had a PM (in which) I could hear the opinions of people who have lived here for a long time.

*Me:* So you think you learned a lot?

*Jiro:* Yes.

*Me:* How about you, Hachiro?

*Hachiro:* I never start to think for myself. .... I did not think 'voluntarily' about this action research, either ..... but to make students think is good. ....This PM was not about 'pushing'; rather, it was to share our opinions, to discuss and summarize these opinions, and present them, is not 'pushing'. These opinions are ours already. I think so. We did so. Lots of people never activate themselves unless they are pushed. You can push us to do this, but the thinking itself is not 'being pushed'. A 'push' to some level is necessary, I guess. We thought, anyway. This experience is good, I think.

*Me:* Did you think you were 'pushed' to think?

*Sakura:* Well.... But I think this is a good thing.

### ***Various other 'Merits':***

*Jiro:* The longer research period means ideas can remain in my mind and there are a lot of view-points for the same theme. This is very good, I think.

*Kyoko:* The lengthy learning period was good. I could deepen my understanding of war.

*Me:* And the PM?

*Kyoko:* It was good that we learned what happened during WWII.

*Hachiro: Well..... I think it is better to have time between one discussion (class) and the next. Between discussions, our opinions can develop. I also think it is important to share opinions and pass them on to the next generation. I mean this 'succession' is the process by which everybody can get to think about peace year after year.*

*Shiro: I am impressed by the older students' opinions. They have a lot of knowledge and can have various opinions.*

### **The Teacher Interviews** *(translated transcripts in appendix 4-3(b))*

These took place individually in the afternoon after the PM.

#### **About discussion, learning to think and growing up:**

*I saw some students who are usually very quiet during the class making efforts to join the group discussion. (X, S2B)*

*Usually quiet students were able to present opinions.....my students scattered across the groups, they were all able to cooperate with the other members of their groups. (Y, S2)*

*I think lack of vocabulary is a problem (for many of them); I think it is still very difficult for them to express the opinions which they think of in their minds. (X, S2B) [Me: This would apply especially to the previously England-based students.]*

*I would have liked the students to have more time for free discussion. With more time, probably they could have reached more deeply embedded issues. (X, S2B)*

*Students who are 15-18 years olds will soon graduate from high school and become members of society. When given chances to think, they think very seriously and enthusiastically. Doing this, repeatedly, helps students become adults. I 'recognised' this fact about students again today. ....[Also,] students develop very much from S1 to S3, physically and mentally. Therefore, listening to older students' opinions provides, I think, very good opportunities for S1 and S2. (V, S3)*

*.....today we used a visual method, made students speak in discussions and got them to listen to the teachers' and students' presentations. So I thought this PM is well balanced. Students who are usually very quiet became very active in saying something during the PM. For quiet students, such meetings might provide some motivation to speak up. As I also saw in schools in Japan, students can develop suddenly when they think and present their thoughts on occasions like this PM. (V, S3)*

#### **About the impact of the PM and the A-bomb video – and student insights about war:**

*Doing 'Ambush', the students could not quite 'get' what had happened to the main*

character. I tried to explain: 'maybe there was no 'purpose' to throwing the hand grenade, he just wanted to protect himself and he threw it like a conditioned reflex'. Today we provided students with visual material and this allowed them to understand and imagine exactly what had happened. I think the impact on students was huge. (Y, S2)

Some were very shocked by the video we showed. ...They had not seen a video like that before. Some were shedding tears... [It] made them aware that they have to think of wars seriously. Not only the video, for we also did lots of preparation classes - to understand wars through literature..... but the visual method is much more powerful for getting students to think deeply.....to become more interested in wars. I am not sure if students' way of thinking changed or not, but I think their attitude toward wars definitely changed. (X, 2B)

[NB: I will return later to the relationship between 'thinking deeply' and 'attitude-change'.]

S3 students discussed 'why people cannot kill others?' Seeing the video and seeing that people really are killed, they automatically begin to ask 'why?' – not from their mental world, but from reality! (V, S3)

Their view of the world is striking for me, because they see it as 15-16 year-olds. One said during the PM that there are no winners and no losers between countries. This impressed me. I had imagined some students saying, "Americans think like this, and Japanese think like that." But what this student said was beyond any one country's benefit. From students like that, I can expect a lot! (X, 2B)

As for 'merits': students thinking about wars; developing their understanding of human psychology; humanity being often unable to control things (the atomic bombs symbolise "uncontrolled") – as one student said every individual human being should recognise this problem; human beings can abolish wars. (X, 2B)

What I had been thinking about myself was 'why it is wrong to kill others' and, during the PM, I could develop my own thinking from this to the question 'what does it mean to kill others'. I am very grateful to the PM for this point. When we decide 'it is wrong', there are always some cases to be judged beforehand. We do not decide 'wrong or good' in advance, but after something has happened. Then we can (really) seek the answer to the question 'why is it wrong to kill people?' (V, S3)

### **Integrating the class/literature learning with the PM experience/learning – or not!**

The older students could understand..... the presentation from each class. However, for S1, it must have been quite hard to understand what S2 and S3 did just by hearing the students' presentations. I think it would have been better to do a separate presentation and discussion after the video.....The PM presentations were not enough

to counteract the differences in the materials we used through S1 to S3. We have to address this problem. S2's Viet Nam War had no direct connection with the atomic bomb video. We have to think harder about connections like that. (X, 2B)

I: How well did you think your class material (Ambush) connected to the PM?

Y: I thought we did not need the presentation from teachers and students at the beginning of the PM. None of the groups chose 'invasion of others', the number one suggestion, as one of their group questions! I think we made it difficult for ourselves to connect the class materials with the PM discussions. Maybe, it would have been better to watch the video from the beginning and let them focus on it. However, I also think students should know what other classes had done. So there was a good reason for the presentations too! (Y, S2)

I think for the S3 students, it was quite difficult to understand the connection with the Viet Nam War, which S2 did, and then I wondered about the connections across the S1 to S3 materials. ....(But:) during the discussion, I also 'recognized' some positive things and thoughts from 'After the Bombs' that S1 students offered to other members, and S2 students offered some thoughts from 'Ambush'. (V, S3)

[NB: all of us were questioning the effectiveness and/or the timing on the day of the teacher and student presentations of the literature texts and class approaches. But this was at the level of 'tactics'. No-one questioned the 'strategy' of balancing the literary and the visual in the AR.]

### **My colleagues' developing commitment to the AR idea**

Me: Did you 'commit' yourself (to the project)? Or did you feel you were just pushed by me..... Did you have a purpose of your own for this action research?

My purpose was to make students think more deeply and freely..... (X, S2B)

Me: Did you have some particular aspirations for the PM?

I wanted students to understand the misery of wars. A second aspiration: that students could share their views with students in the other classes.

Thank you very much. I want to have some kind of PM like this again. (Y, S2)

Me: Did you have any purpose of your own for this action research from September?

V: I had told my S3 students that they should create the atmosphere for S1 and S2 students to express their own opinions, and then I saw that they did not become arrogant and were able to interact naturally with S2 and S1 students – that, as S3 students, they tried to take care of the younger students. I need not have worried about them at all! (V, S3)

The biggest 'merit' is that we could carry something off as a single high school unit. We did do what we could do. ....The content was also OK, because we relied on

*Mizushima! Of course, we have to think of 'improvement points', too. I enjoyed it. I was grateful for it. Thank you very much. (V, S3)*

### **Reflection and Looking Forward: Final Meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> January 2005**

This was a meeting of S1-S3 teachers with the Headmaster and Deputy-head after the Christmas break, chaired by Teacher V (S3). The meeting began by viewing the DVD of our PM and, as agreed, I then offered my own evaluations to the meeting. These referred directly to the PM, but indirectly to the AR as a whole. In summary and drawing on my research diary:

#### **My Given Evaluation:**

Regarding the **teacher presentations** of their own year's key text and work, (I said) the video showed that I should have been more composed and spoken more slowly when presenting S1's *After the Bomb*. Teachers Y/X, for the S2 classes, presented *Ambush* like a story-teller and summarised it very well. Teacher V introduced the characters, structure and some historical background in *Judgement*, before describing Jiro's 'private' killings of Chinese people when his mental situation is like 'a vacuum', as the novel's climax. The novel's main theme is 'why it is wrong to kill people'.

I also suggested that our short presentations may not have been enough to give students generally a good understanding of the work of other classes, and that 'handouts' to accompany such presentations might be considered in future.

I moved on to remind the meeting of the follow-up **student presentations** (one student per class). These had highlighted: the S1 text's emphasis on the difference between the child's view and the adults' view of the Manchurian occupation; the S2 text as a response to a daughter's request for her father's war-story in the form of an 'objective work' that still conveys the author's fear (guilt?) regarding his unnecessary ambush-killing – it is not wars that kill people, people kill people; and the S3 text's central question of 'why it is wrong to kill people', even in the world of 'survival of the fittest'.

The presenters had then joined the excellent Student Chair (Takashi, S3) in looking for **the common points** in these materials and had found:

‘the relationship to others’ (Shiro),

‘invaders suffering from their murders after the war’ (Takashi), and

‘the changes wars bring in human beings’ emotions and thoughts’ (Hiroshi).

*But no-one had mentioned the common theme of 'INVASION'!!* (I said) I had found myself wishing for more time to discuss this!

Referring to the **group discussions after the A-bomb video**, I observed that the S1 to S3 students obviously mingled well in each group, the groups were very lively – including students who usually are very quiet – and the discussions were very serious. I noted that lack of time had made it necessary to try – with only partial success – to restrict the number of items on the groups' feedback reports and I mentioned two especially interesting points, one relating to the *process of discussion* and the other

to *the nature of war*:

(Group 7) *We have various opinions about the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima. However, having watched the video, we could express our opinions more easily – we could tell each other what we thought.*

(Group 8) *When two countries go to war, both can only be ‘losers’. Wars cannot be judged by who ‘won’ or ‘lost’. The American soldiers, who dropped the atomic bombs must regret it and suffer for a long time when they see the hell in the city of Hiroshima.*

**(1) The General Discussion** This would not last for very long. (The meeting had already taken some hours on what was a long day). It started from the suggestion of a link between the pair ‘war and killing’ and the pair ‘social studies and literature’. This began from a question to me from V (S3, Chair):

*V (S3 teacher): What do you think, Mizushima?*

*Miwa, S1 teacher: I was teaching social studies in Japan and I taught from the point of view that ‘wars are wrong’. However, teaching Japanese literature here, I came to realise that this idea is not enough. Wars are also issues of person versus person.*

*Deputy Headmaster: Yes, I think this is a very interesting point. From the ethics view, we can think of the fact that ‘people kill people’. The word, ‘war’ is for social studies. Japanese literature can focus more on the issue of ‘people killing people’.*

*Y (S2 teacher): I think we find it difficult when we cannot focus on just one issue (and we could not focus on just one issue). However, after watching the video, we could focus on the issue of ‘hurting others’ and ‘killing others’.*

*(Later) X (S2B): Social studies, ethics, or literature? I think it is good to make them think about the different meaning of these words.*

**(2) Deciding to continue with the ARs** It became clear that the Headmaster and Deputy-Headmaster wanted this (while expressing doubt about it ever being accepted in regular Japanese schools), as did we four teachers:

*Deputy Headmaster: When compared with students in Japan, students here are very active and try to express their opinions very seriously. The video (atomic bomb) content was excellent, too. S1 and S2 must continue this project next year. The students seemed very used to this type of discussion, though I thought that summarising the opinions in each group is quite Japanese-style. The British way is more individualistic, I think.*

*X (S2B teacher): The way of composing the groups was unusual. I think group discussion is quite useful for students, who cannot express their own opinions very easily.*

*Deputy Headmaster: I think this style could not be successful in schools of Japan...*

*Headmaster: I think this is a very interesting project. I have never seen such collaboration with S1 to S3 classes together. The student chairperson organised things very well during PM. Wars and peace relate to the issue of 'human lives'. Watching the DVD, I noticed well-argued points by some (many?) students'. S3 students stimulated S2 and S1 students' ways of thinking, too. I think it is a very good idea to gather all the senior high school students together. All the students attended this PM and, I mean, all were active - this is the most important point. Some students could express their own opinions very seriously. Maybe in Japan students expressing such opinions might be criticised by others: 'Oh, you are speaking too seriously! Not cool!' I think the reason this PM was successful is because they are the Hoshuko (Saturday school) students.*

*V (S3): We should 'succeed' with this project next year, too.*

*X (S2B): We should have further discussion about next year's project. It is better to change the subject.*

*Deputy-Headmaster: It may be better to have the project over a longer time span.*

(The headmaster and deputy headmaster had to leave the meeting at this point.)

### **(3) Preliminary remarks regarding *how* to continue the AR idea.**

*X: Oh, it would be good to relate it to the occupation in Iraq.*

*V: I think it is better.....to decide the main theme for next year first.*

*Y: If we plan from next April, students can get it going it for themselves.*

.....

*X: Some students have difficulty expressing their own opinions in Japanese. So it is good training for them.*

*V: I think the style of presentation by individuals and by groups is good.*

*Me: What do we choose for the theme? From next April, we can plan to have the project through the (academic) year? I can collect information for the next theme.*

*V: Today it is late. Let's talk more later. Thank you.*

*All: Thank you.*

These remarks would quite soon be developed towards AR2 !

#### 4-4. Final Comments on AR1

##### (1) Literature, video, discussion and peace.

The evidence presented in the later parts of chapter 3 and in this chapter shows that this AR project as a whole was worthwhile and successful. It set out first to pursue, investigate and experiment around sustained peace education through literature and then to finish with a – deliberately delayed – powerful video, followed immediately by a novel cross-age form of independent student discussion. On the evidence, this strategy was well-conceived and mostly well executed. This would reflect well on the more general RICE pedagogy that we had been using semi-intuitively, but that my reading of John Elliott would soon be helping me to make explicit.<sup>71</sup>

The **texts**, selected from MEXT-approved collections, permitted good interactions between individual and national contexts (there was a ‘history-education’ benefit) and, just as important, they had characters with whom young people could identify. We saw above that many students expressed appreciation of the length of their class’s engagements with war and peace novels, poems and other materials. They did this even after they had just been shaken, excited and appalled by the faster-acting video. It was true the bridging between the classwork and the video had not gone quite as planned. The unifying and linking theme of ‘invasion’ had not been picked up in the first part of the PM (more time needed? or a fuller handout? or perhaps *some* common texts?). But it still remained that time and empathy with their literary characters’ experiences had quietly built a deeper understanding of many of the tragic effects of war.

Then when the delayed **video** came it had a huge impact on the students (not to mention the teachers), as the teachers clearly perceived. It should be noted that the teachers’ original evidence for this impact, as recorded above at length, was the intensity, participation and quality they observed in the student **discussions** and group presentations that followed the video. Of course, the novelty of inter-age grouping also contributed to this great liveliness.

Teacher X’s distinction between ‘way of thinking’ and ‘attitude’ can be revisited:

---

<sup>71</sup> See p.47-50 above

*But the visual method is much more effective to make pupils think deeply. They can become more interested in wars. I am not sure whether students' 'way of thinking' changed or not, but I think pupils' attitude toward wars definitely changed.*

Pedagogically speaking, video can be used to motivate students. Depending on the video and how it is presented, it can then either be a dangerous tool to manipulate the students' emotions, or it can give them motivation and energy to think seriously and independently of their teachers, counteracting the attitude of 'the passive student' – in that sense 'deeply'. But this is more a change in *attitude* to thinking about peace than a change in the *way* of thinking about it. Perhaps we can say that a powerful video develops *motivation and commitment*, and can do so quite quickly, while powerful literature develops *imagination and understanding*, and tends to do so piecemeal and slowly. What we teachers admired in those student discussions and reports clearly reflected *both* their extended engagement with literature and their hypnotic attention to the video.

A side-benefit of the mixed-age discussions for us teachers was the chance to observe each other's students, alongside our own students. As the S1 teacher, I was very impressed by many of the mature ideas of S2 and S3 students (which often surprised even their own teachers). I could then also observe my own class students more objectively, while also noting the extra vigour and confidence of many of them compared to them in ordinary class. In this way, it is very likely that the PM gave us fresh eyes and ideas for dealing with our classes, though I made no formal study of that aspect.

## **(2) Discussion, Japan and Deep Questions**

*During the PM, the teachers did not require particular answers from students. They looked at issues from their own viewpoints. I can now have confidence in their future!*  
(Teacher X)

Teachers did not prepare 'right answers' for the PM questions. There are no such right answers. During the PM, we facilitated them in learning by themselves, developing their own way of thinking independently and creatively. This leads to democracy in the end.

But there were balances to be kept regarding, for example, whether it is enough to think with comic writer, Yoshinori Kobayashi, that Japan's imperialism was just 'common sense' at a

time when it was ‘developing’ itself to compete with Western countries (2001: 488). On this view, imperialism is just the ‘survival of the fittest’ between countries and, as self-interested animals ourselves, can we not ‘justify’ what Japan did to other Asian countries? And there is the related question of ‘who, anyway, are we to judge?’

For if we were to begin to accuse ourselves, in asking forgiveness, of all the crimes of the past against humanity, there would no longer be an innocent person on earth – and therefore no one in the position to judge or arbitrate. (Derrida, *Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness* p.28)

On the other hand, it is essential to also see history from the present perspective if we are to cultivate some ‘responsibility’ for our crimes and some determination not to repeat them, (whether or not the crimes can be forgiven by other Asian countries).

Another ‘deep’ issue related to the view that attracted many students, and indeed impressed teachers, that in wars there are no ‘winners’, only ‘losers’. On reflection, however, it is ambiguous. It can rightly convey the awfulness of war for all sides. But, in the Japanese context, it can also soften the humiliation of having lost the war and console Japan’s inferiority complex – ‘we are not the only losers’. And, worse, it can encourage the tendency to see ourselves *only* as ‘victims’. It was such a difficult task to get pupils to think of *Japanese responsibility* for WWII. On the other hand, it was such an easy task to let them think of ‘Japanese’ as victims during WWII. It is much easier to see ourselves as ‘poor victims’ rather than ‘horrible invaders’. (This was another reason why I avoided letting pupils watch the atomic-bomb video until the end of the AR, by which time their literature study would have shown them another side.)

‘Victim’ implies some lack of individual responsibility, seeing ourselves as ‘objects’ rather than independent persons with our own voluntary wills and responsibilities. Therefore, it can be said that it is necessary to consider ourselves also as ‘subjects’. And among the responsibilities we subjects can then acknowledge is.... to peace, to take care of it and to work for it. As put by one of my S1 students:

*It is important to pass down the importance of peace from generation to generation. The most important point is to continue to consider peace from generation to generation. (Hachiro)*

## Chapter 5

### The Second Project: About Newspapers

#### 5-1. Rationale and Conceptual Frameworks

From the time AR1 had finished in November 2004, not only I but also my colleagues positively and keenly wanted to continue our pedagogical project, especially having seen how our students had actively discussed and presented their opinions during the recent PM. Our preparations began from the first day of the first term in April 2005. Colleague Y taught S2 again (my S1 of the previous year). Because V had now moved into the JSSL administration, colleague X took over the new S3 class, which included many of her previous S2B students. The new S1 cohort was large enough to be divided into two classes and a new colleague, Z, joined me in teaching these classes.

*How we, as mass media consumers, can analyse the information we receive and what our responsibility is when accessing news.* After some consultation with the students, this was the theme we agreed for AR2, while still pursuing the more general objective of enabling pupils to think voluntarily, independently, creatively and responsibly. Length would be the main difference from AR1. AR2 had to be much shorter, because we were not integrating its theme with our main departmental business of Japanese literature. We planned to compensate partly for this by making the summer and winter holiday assignments a much more significant part of the AR.

Our main materials were newspaper articles. As for AR1, we would analyse materials in the context of a pedagogical theory and strategy (that I would later formalise as ‘RICE’) that involved intensive *teacher and student collaboration* across the three senior year-groups, building our individual classes towards an extended *plenary meeting* – and which now enhanced this strategy by using the same articles across S1-S3. The articles would be mainly about wars, especially the major news topic of the Iraq occupation, but also revisiting WW2. For the PM, we would add articles on other current topics, such as ‘bird flu’ and the young generation’s difficulty getting jobs.

To summarise this ‘action / research’. We designed two structured writing assignments on the Iraq occupation for the summer and winter holidays, to be handed back in September 2005 and January 2006. The understanding gained from these was then deepened in February in two preparatory lessons in the students’ own classes and, again, in the final PM. We teachers discussed, planned and evaluated together every process of AR2: the design and use of assignments, lessons and worksheets across the classes and the final PM. In the PM, we introduced a wider range of newspaper articles, had discussions and reports-back from ten mixed-age groups, and collected evaluations of the occasion. Once again, I constructed and used a more general ‘before and after’ pupil questionnaire across the classes – and I experienced its limitations once again. Later, I would analyse how this AR2 had learnt – and advanced – from the experience of AR1 and reflect on its particular successes and lessons.

This report of AR2 is divided into five main sections: *rationale and conceptual framework; preparations and assignments; two preparatory classes; the plenary meeting; and evaluations.*

### **Newspapers in Education (NIE)**

Teaching newspaper analysis in the Japanese Language and Literature class was not itself an innovation. According to the internet site of The Japan Newspaper Publishers & Editors Association (Nihon Shinbun Kyokai), NIE has been a focus in Japanese education since the Shizuoka conference in 1985. Also, the official teachers’ guidelines, not only for Social Studies but also for Japanese literature, mandate the study of information collection and analysis and the practice of presenting students’ opinions. The newspaper genre and our AR2 processes were both ‘approved’, therefore, which increased AR2’s potential relevance to Japanese schools generally.

It is difficult to nurture and maintain critical and analytical eyes and ears when receiving daily news and information from the internet, newspaper and TV. In Japan, even teachers and adults seem to have difficulty in forming ‘different’ perspectives from those in the news. This makes the mass media possible tools for government to persuade people to join and

continue wars. The extreme example was how most Japanese people were emotionally manipulated to support WWII by government-controlled mass media. In *Japanese and Responsibility for Wars* (published a year after AR2), Tatsuya Mori and Takao Saito observe:

Mass media such as newspaper, magazines and books played big roles in creating hostile feelings. When the Japanese military began to invade China, newspaper companies were suspicious of the military's invasion. Gradually, however, [they] became 'pro-war', as the Asahi and Mainichi companies competed for selling numbers of copies. In the end, their newspapers were full of 'brave' news such as 'The Three Meat Musketeers (肉弾三勇士)' or 'Contest to kill 100 people by the sword (百人斬り)'. (2007: 148)

Saito believes people have not changed very much regarding mass media information:

There is a 'parroting' syndrome. People accept .....what mass media transmit to us and tend to believe it as if they had created these opinions by themselves. We should read 'between lines' or guess at real agendas when we watch TV or read newspapers. Just skimming some articles, however, we are very easily influenced by them. (*ibid*: 149)

Even today, 70 years after WW2, people in Japan seem not to recognise how each person's lack of critical and analytical thinking regarding the war and its causes meant they were manipulated by the government, the military companies such as Mitsubishi which was producing weapons, and the media. Those agencies had a high responsibility for the war, but can we say that the people, individually and collectively – including teachers and educators – did not also have responsibility for it?

Eiji Oguma argues in *Democracy and Patriotism* (2002) that Japanese nationalism just changed from 'fascism' into 'pacifism' after the war. The teachers who had enthusiastically taught how great Japanese soldiers were and how vicious British were during WWII, suddenly changed their own opinions after 15th August 1945. They began to praise the great 'European' democracy and people's attitude to the US changed completely from 'US and British are beasts and devils (鬼畜米英)' to respect for 'democracy'. However, Oguma continues, because they never properly interpreted 'democracy', it has never penetrated deeply into schools and classrooms. We do not nurture truly independent and voluntary thinking students, rather students who are more or less passive, obedient, politically uninvolved and inclined to the 'victim complex'. To the extent that this is true, it increases teachers' responsibility now and into the future to nurture more analytical and critical readers

from childhood. Then as students grow older they may not only ‘refer’ to what mass media transmit but also construct their own independent opinions and be responsible for their own thinking. That is an essential part of citizenship, to attend to current affairs, not because of some outside ‘pressure’, but because of their own genuine interest in being involved.

The Iraq occupation, on which our summer and winter assignments focused, was a different kind of war from the conflicts between countries that we had investigated in AR1, rather one deeply led by US anger at the 9.11 attack and aimed mainly at the Al-Qaeda terrorist group.

Saito: The character of wars has changed. The clear justification became ‘against terrorists’ rather than ‘against certain countries’.....

Mori: When wars happen between countries, there are the ‘inquiry windows’ between them – which terrorists do not have. So this [kind of] war never ends. Before people really noticed it, expelling terrorists from this world became ‘absolute justice’. (2007: 162-3)

The mass media adopted this new view very quickly so that people came easily to believe it and Japan could more easily support the US occupation. Arguably, this immediate support is an example of the Japanese ‘dependence’ on the US that derives partly from its ‘vertical’ or ‘top-down’ society, described in chapter 1.

To nurture democratic thinkers is a long, spiral process, generally without ‘perfect and clear answers’, as also investigating the reasons for the Iraq occupation would prove to be. We would find that we teachers, too, had to organise our own investigations about the occupation – its political, economic, religious and historical factors – and to share them in study meetings.

### **Three Priorities in NIE**

First, we wanted to make students understand when they analyse and criticise articles, not only that mass media transmissions cannot simply be ‘trusted and accepted’, but also that *there are no ‘perfect’ opinions*. There are always ‘go forward’ and ‘go back’ processes to test what they read or hear and consider how appropriate it is. So, when analysing articles during the AR, our students should be seeking, not the ‘right answers that the teacher expects’, but the flexibility to develop their own thinking and form their own opinions.

As I would later discover, Dewey called this searching for the ‘better’ way of thinking ‘meliorism’, and he distinguished it from ‘optimism’ which is seeking ‘absolute goodness’. Democracy cannot reach to absolute goodness and ‘meliorism’ prevents people from supporting extreme fascism. As Satoshi Tanaka puts it:

For Dewey, democracy does not mean to reach for ‘perfection’. The word ‘perfection’ was used after Rousseau and Kant when early modern education described educational purposes. ‘Perfection’ means absolute moralistic perfection which Jesus Christ teaches. However, Dewey describes democracy in relation to the present progressive situation and also constant self renovation. . . . . For Dewey, the constant effort of aiming to establish a more democratic society is what democracy means. (in Yasuo Imai (ed) 2009: 277-278)

A second priority was to *include press coverage of war and peace as an element* in AR2, to further develop the perspectives gained from AR1 by the students now in S2 and S3, while also providing a first peace angle for the new S1 classes. We Japanese easily see ourselves as poor *victims* of the Western Empires. There is a hint of this even in the approach of ‘pacifists’ that having had Hiroshima, Nagasaki, and Daigofukuryumaru, therefore we can and must say to the world: ‘no wars and no nuclear weapons!’ We are growing in our recognition that we have also been ‘invaders’ of many Asian countries, as well as victims, but we need to grow more. AR1 texts had dwelt on the invasion of Manchuria and the occupation of Shanghai, as well as Japanese suffering and defeat, yet only one of the discussion groups included ‘invasion of others’ in their choice of topics. So, we would combine our main theme of ‘information’ with a sub-theme of an up-to-date ‘invasion’, but also include press materials relating to Japan in WW2.

A third priority was to explore the extra benefits of our using *exactly common press materials*. Using differentiated materials had been necessary in AR1, given its large scale and that it was built around our main business of literature, but teachers and some students had commented that mutual understanding at the PM had been time-consuming as a result. Moreover, the anticipated benefits of choosing, creating and using exactly the same materials across S1-S3 for the smaller-scale AR2 were not just for the PM. Doing our class tasks *in parallel* should also automatically mean more sharing and discussion around planning,

implementation and evaluation, and could also result in a deeper understanding of the subject-matter – in fact, we teachers would hold four substantial study meetings to deepen our own understanding of the Iraq occupation.

Another expected benefit was that it would now be easier to get students to engage seriously with their holiday assignments. As a Saturday school, we could not assign much homework in term-time, but our freedom to ask for good holiday work had been hampered by the students' tendency to compare assignments across classes and seek reductions to the lowest level. Now that the holiday assignments would be the same across classes, it should be easier (we hoped) to resist the temptation to indulge 'my students' and to insist on high standards – starting with their assignment on the Iraq occupation in the 5-week summer holiday.

## **5-2. Preparations and Assignments**

### **First and Second Terms**

When in July we finally settled on '*information relating to the Iraq occupation*' as our theme, the decision was strongly influenced by the terrorism in London on 7<sup>th</sup> July 2005. For we assumed this was strongly connected with the British participation in the Iraq occupation – and with the ways in which information about it was being transmitted (and manipulated) in newspapers and the internet in different countries.<sup>72</sup> Meeting around a desk each Saturday, we went on to identify four background dimensions of the Iraq occupation that the students needed to investigate to get a rounded view: *economic, political, religious* and *historical*. We agreed to encourage them to use the languages they understood, in addition to English and Japanese, when investigating press and other media coverage of the occupation. And we confirmed our intention to strengthen the tradition of summer and winter holiday homework by requiring the students to write up their investigations in two carefully structured and sequenced assignments. These would lead up to two preparatory class sessions and the final plenary session in the third term.

Including some refinements that were made later, the programme for AR2 was as below.

---

<sup>72</sup> We were also mindful of the shocking terrorism in a Russian school in which hundreds of children lost their lives.



their assignments [S1:18/19; S1B:14/17; S2:11/17; S3:13/19] and their general quality was agreed to be very high.

Reasons the students had found for the US invasion of Iraq included: to turn Iraq into a democracy (most students); Bush seeing Iraq as part of the ‘axis of evil’ (some students); Iraq not permitting investigation regarding ‘weapons of mass destruction’ (some students); US fear of a strong anti-American leader who might organise middle-eastern countries to unite and attack its ally, Israel (a few students); and the US seeing Iraq as supporting terrorism and as its enemy in the post-9/11 ‘war against terrorism’ (many students). It was good that these analyses were sometimes tinged with student scepticism, e.g.

It looks as if the US is a ‘super-hero’. However, this is the superficial reason; there must be some hidden reason behind.

Editing and combining them into ‘*a book*’, for the students’ own use at the next stages had to deal with the variety of student styles – and languages. Those who could write English more easily had used English sources mainly and those who were more comfortable with Japanese had used Japanese sources, and some had engaged briefly with sources in Arabic, Spanish or French. We agreed that each teacher would organise her own students’ assignments according to the same four dimensions in which the students had been asked to organise their work. Beyond that, there were differences in our teacher-editing. I underlined the ‘important parts’ in my S1 students’ work and added short comments (which would prove helpful with the winter essay assignment). The S1B teacher was encouraged by her students to attach their names to their contributions. The S2 and S3 teachers selected several ‘good’ essays for each category rather than including parts of all their students’ essays. Then these different class products were combined into the ‘book’ and distributed to all the students.

### **A Teacher Study-Group**

As we were learning a lot from the students, we teachers began to feel obliged to deepen our own knowledge of the Iraqi situation. We formed a study group and agreed that we should each research one of the students’ four dimensions – political, economic, religious and historical – and present it to our teacher group during the term. On October 15<sup>th</sup>, I presented on the *political* dimension, summarising for colleagues the main themes the students had just

found in their media research, before then drawing on impressive Amartya Sen lectures that I had recently attended. These lectures emphasised democracy's base in discussion and challenged the standard belief that democracy is quintessentially 'western' or 'European' – he referred to the history of tolerance in Muslim countries. On November 12<sup>th</sup>, colleague Z presented on the *economic* dimension, focusing on the oil questions, and colleague Y presented on the *religious* dimension, developing a strong contrast between the historic approaches to law in Christian and Islamic countries. On Nov 19<sup>th</sup>, colleague X addressed the *historical* dimension, starting from the huge influence of British imperialism on the Middle-East.<sup>73</sup>

These study meetings and our individual preparations for them certainly increased our appreciation of the deep complexities in the Iraq occupation, which was our students' principal media 'case-study', and we were also usefully reminded that our own favoured theories could be corrected and/or supplemented by other theories. Of course, learning from each other in this way had additional bonding benefits.

### **Official and Unofficial Reasons - the Winter Assignments**

Preparing the Winter Holiday Assignment in December was a chance to stop and reflect. We reminded ourselves that our theme, 'media information', includes 'how the information is being transmitted and how it should be interpreted'. Both students and teachers had by now acquired a variety of 'angles' and a volume of information regarding the Iraq occupation, but from now on we should connect all this to close scrutiny of the ways in which it was reaching us.

To what extent might this flow of information be controlled? In WWII Japan, the authorities were still giving out the message to Japanese people in 1945 that we were winning the war. Since this could happen today, we needed in principle to suppose a gap between the truth and what we get from mass media, *a distinction between the real reasons and the official reasons*. Wherever there is government media control, the truth, if it is available, will come as 'unofficial information', but it will not come from the controlled media.

---

<sup>73</sup> There are fuller accounts of these study sessions in [Appendix 5-2](#).

Consider the Iraq invasion in this light. In war, governments more or less force some people to the battlefield and those people have families and friends who are concerned for them. Nobody wants to die for no reasons and the reasons have to be seen as quite powerful ones. Certain key reasons for the Iraq invasion were presented by the USA and UK governments, but many doubted that those reasons were enough to justify the invasion and war. Also, many doubted that those were the real, or the main, reasons. Now a distinction arises, in the context of a reasonably free mass media, *between official and unofficial (but reported) reasons*.<sup>74</sup> For example, I had been able in our study meeting to draw on *Asahi* (the Japanese ‘Guardian’!) for its report of Cindy Sheehan’s demonstration at the entrance to George Bush’s ranch:

I voted for President Bush in the election of 2000. For 6 months since my son died in Iraq, I tried to believe what the president said. However, the purpose of the war to destroy ‘weapons of mass destruction’ changed halfway. I don’t know what I can believe. The president never phones me for any condolence (*Asahi* newspaper, 13<sup>th</sup> August 2005).

And in the same article, another parent who had lost a son in Iraq:

I believed it was the right war when the war began. But our role is not to broaden democracy to the world. I still support the military, but I cannot support this war anymore. (ibid.)

These parents first believed what the government declared; for them ‘the official’ reasons had been very effective. As they came to have doubts, they might look for ‘unofficial’ reasons for the war, but in any case their doubts are reported in the press.<sup>75</sup>

It is reasonable to presume that governments in their public statements will emphasize the reasons they believe will be most convincing for their Congress/Parliament and their citizens generally, and that some operative reasons will be either unacknowledged or downplayed. It

---

<sup>74</sup> More analytically, a first distinction is in terms of *truth*, between ‘truly alleged’ and ‘falsely alleged’ reasons, and a second distinction is in terms of *source*, between ‘official: publicly acknowledged or claimed’ and ‘unofficial: independently discovered or claimed’.

<sup>75</sup> Later I reflected on *Fahrenheit 9/11*, in which Michael Moore, the film director, observed that no sons and daughters whose parents were working in the American Congress went to Iraq. The young men who went to war were generally from poor backgrounds. They could get good money when they become soldiers – their ‘good reason’ for being available for war in Iraq.

is a job for the free press to speculate about these ‘unofficial’ reasons and to look for some *evidence* for their speculations. (We teachers needed to be aware that some or many ‘unofficial’ reasons suggested in the media, especially in the blog-sphere, will not have been operative at all and it seemed quite likely that the relatively inexperienced students would be over-impressed by them.)

For the **winter assignment**, we simply defined ‘official’ as ‘given by the government’ and ‘unofficial’ as ‘given by media and their experts’. This risked confusion, since official reasons are also broadcast through the mass media; also, governments will be at pains through their press offices to try to win sympathy from the media. However, the students would show in their work and discussion a reasonably good practical grasp of the distinction.

#### WINTER HOLIDAYS ASSIGNMENT

*Read ‘the book’ [of the Summer essays] edited by the teacher, and consider:*

#### **Why did the Iraq occupation happen?**

- 1) Summarise the **official** reasons which countries presented.
- 2) Summarise the **unofficial** reasons that organisations such as mass media and experts have presented. Where you can find differences between official and unofficial reasons, suggest reasons for the differences and provide evidence for your view.
- 3) Summarise **your own** opinion about the reasons for the Iraq Occupation’.

This exercise focused strongly on the information *processes*, while also letting students think more critically about their previous work. However, the return rate was limited. We had to accept the view of the S2 and S3 teachers that their students should be exempt this time, because many of them were now very busy preparing for AS, A2 or IB examinations. That left just the two S1 classes, of whom only 15 out of 36 students actually submitted assignments in January. However, these 15 assignments would provide teachers with useful information when organising the next steps.

The main point of the assignment was to get students to distinguish ‘official’ and ‘unofficial’ reasons. The great majority of their ‘official reasons’ fell into three categories – and, as it

happened, all of these were ‘political’, in the terms of their previous assignments: to destroy weapons of mass destruction; to democratise Iraq and release the Iraqi people from Saddam Hussein’s tyranny; and to decrease the chance of terrorism in the US and destroy terrorists in the world. We then further noticed that the students had tended – with some plausibility – to categorise as ‘*unofficial reasons*’ their previously identified economic, religious and historic factors, while also including domestic politics in this category:

.....One [unofficial] reason lies in the oil. The US’s purpose is to seize the oil to destroy the Saddam Hussein government. Many think that Bush wanted to prevent the export of oil [from Iraq] to China, Russia and France, which have been against the US occupation.

.....There have been a lot of conflicts over the sacred place between Muslims, Jews, and Christians; and recently the severe conflict between Palestinians and Israelis. The US supports Israel, which antagonises Iraq. In another expression, this is the conflict between Islam and Christianity. Hussein himself called this war a ‘jihad’ ....To occupy Iraq is indirectly to support Israel.

Because the US economy had a crisis, not many supported Bush before the Sept.11<sup>th</sup> terrorism. The terrorism was timely..... he could turn Americans eyes away from the stock and dollar crisis. After occupying Iraq, the polls showed American people’s support of Bush reached 90+ %.

Given examples like these, it seemed reasonable to work with this spontaneous association of ‘unofficial’ with ‘economic, religious, and historical’ in our next stage.

### **5-3 Two Preparation Classes for the PM (4<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> Feb)**

We teachers had long discussions (total 6 hours) on Jan 21<sup>st</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> regarding this final term’s three sessions. First, we agreed to give the students another opportunity to read their own and other students’ work in the summer ‘books’ of holiday essays and, at the same time, to consolidate their understanding of the official/unofficial distinction. We knew that only a minority of students had really read through their ‘book’ and submitted a winter assignment relating to that distinction. Knowing also that students will read more efficiently if they are given some task while reading, we provided a worksheet, based on the S1 students’ winter essays. (*Appendix 5-3*)

**The first preparatory classes** Because Z, my S1B colleague, had lost her voice, she and her class joined my S1 class that day. We divided this double-class into groups and began by recalling for them what the summer and winter holiday essays were, and reading with them some of the points I had underlined in the summer holiday ‘book’. Then they discussed the worksheet items in groups and began to fill in the blanks in a single worksheet per group, while consulting the summer holiday essay books they had brought with them. This took quite a lot of time, partly because of the long intervals involved. The S2 and S3 teachers conducted their classes in much the same way, though they made students complete individual worksheets.

We collected 7 group worksheets and 24 individual<sup>76</sup> worksheets at the end of classes and made copies of them all for each of us. In then immediately looking analytically at them, it was noticeable that almost half the entries in a significant ‘*other unofficial reasons*’ box referred to US indirect support for Israel and/or the more general Arab antagonism to the US associated with this alliance, e.g:

The US wanted to support Israel indirectly, because the people around President Bush are pro-Israel. Also, [the occupation] can prevent terrorism.

The US supports Israel indirectly, because key members of the Bush regime think like this.<sup>77 78</sup>

Also striking were some S2 references to the ‘domino democracy effect’, e.g:

Americanising Iraq can have a ‘domino democratisation effect’ to other anti-American countries such as Iran and Syria.

(Re-reading that comment during the later ‘Arab-spring’, and after the death of Osama bin Laden and the withdrawal of the US army from Iraq, I could wonder, at least for a while, if the US occupation in Iraq *might* really have been about ‘justice’ and ‘democracy’ and, even, *might* have achieved some progress with these purposes.)

---

<sup>76</sup> Quite a lot of S3 students were missing that day, attending to their final-year English school business.

<sup>77</sup> I believe we teachers never emphasised or ‘taught’ this line to these students, but that they found it in their media investigations.

<sup>78</sup> It was also noticeable that S2 students had written far more entries than other classes into that box. They had been my very cooperative S1 students during AR1 and I was pleased to observe the further development in their creative and analytical thinking.

**The second preparatory classes: ‘consumer side’ and ‘media side’ responsibilities.** With the students, we had found differences between official and unofficial information. Why are there such gaps? What was the purpose and interest of the media side? We had also discussed ‘consumer responsibility’: we consumers should identify and know our real interest when receiving information. It is certainly not just to pile and stock information in our brains. We should analyse and criticise information, and consciously believe or doubt it accordingly.

We teachers had agreed to direct our second preparatory session along these lines, to lead the students to the concepts of ‘media responsibility’ and – especially – ‘consumer responsibility’. We designed a more open worksheet for this purpose.

-----  
**Feb.11th Group Record Worksheet in Preparation for PM at JSSL (tr.)**

Presenter (                    )

Secretary (                    )

Names of all group members.....

Please discuss and consider why the gap emerged between ‘official’ and ‘unofficial’ reasons for the Iraq occupation.

1. What is the intention /interest of the mass media?
2. What is the intention/interest of media consumers (receivers)?
3. If you find a difference of intention/interest between mass media and consumers, what is the reason for it?

-----  
This time the S2 teacher was absent and the substitute teacher brought the class (my AR1 class in the previous year) to join my S1 class. It was an opportunity for cross-age work before the PM and I made nine joint groups of S1 and S2 students.<sup>79</sup>

---

<sup>79</sup> My analysis does not include the S3 class.

To stimulate the group discussions, we read through together a sheet of extracts on journalism and peace from a Johan Galtung booklet. One extract suggests a contrast between peace journalism and war journalism.

The mass media like to portray the violence. A Belgian professor at Hawaii University .....found that more than 98% of the news [about the Northern Ireland conflict] was about the violence itself and just 1% about what the conflict is about. ....Peace journalism is the one that sets out to broadcast content which is useful for peace. ... peace & conflict, true evidence, the reality of people, and solutions. However, war journalism sets out to broadcast wars & violence, advertisements, the reality of elites, and victory. (2003: 47).

Other extracts offered useful acronyms for analysing subconscious cultures that favour conflicts and wars. Thus 'C' for 'CHOSEN', e.g. Powell, American Secretary of State and assumed to be next President, declaring that the US was CHOSEN by God to lead other countries and to teach them freedom and democracy, and Japanese who believe that various Japanese massacres were 'necessary actions' by the Japanese, who are CHOSEN by the Japanese Shinto God. 'G' and 'T' can stand for GLORY and TRAUMA, which 'shape the mass memory of historical incidents'. For the US, G is the WW2 victory and T includes the Pearl Harbour attack and 9/11. For Japan, which has a long history, G includes many victories in war, the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere and economic progress after WWII, while T is 'the failed Invasion of Korea in the 16<sup>th</sup> Century, the Perry Expedition, losing WWII and atomic bombs, and economic depression'. Other countries have their own G. and T. 'The main issue is how certain people view and consider these Gs and Ts'. (*ibid*: 23-24)

The reading and discussion seemed more focused because the two classes were together. Each group summarised their opinions into their group worksheet. In preparation for the PM, I collected the 9 group responses from our joint classes and analysed them in relation to each of the worksheet's three questions.

**(1) The intention/interest of mass media.** Some groups did not get beyond the first Galtung excerpt above and did not really achieve a developed idea of their own e.g.

The mass media likes to transmit violence. However, they do not mention the content of wars or solutions at all. Therefore, people are more inclined to misunderstand and to believe false information. (Group 4)

Other groups, went on to include the relationship between government and mass media:

*Governments hide the truths that are inconvenient* for them and they need public agreement when they occupy countries. Therefore, they needed to justify the occupation. .... On the other hand, mass media tell the facts to people, but, at the same time, they need to attract consumer attention. (Group 9)

Bush persuaded people about the reasons that made invasion necessary. On the other hand, the mass media often speculate about other government reasons – to attract many readers. Profit is their first priority – they can even invent information ... for their own profit. (Group 6)

Other groups also noted that, though mass media may well try to transmit the truth, they also can easily manipulate consumers. Also, because some mass media ('the quality press') carry 'deeper' analyses than others, we can too easily believe they must be more reliable. What we should say is that *every* organ of the mass media can transmit true or false information.

**(2) The intention/interest of consumers.** Many groups mentioned the need to read and watch news more objectively. A good example:

Consumers can be categorised into two groups....those who believe all news ....[and] those who try to form their own opinions.....for the first group, Bush is 'justice' and Hussein is 'evil', depending on their mass media.... In the latter group..... they try to find the [particular] medium's intention/interest and they always seek for the true reasons – which may be unofficial ones. (Group 1)

There is perhaps a hint here of Dewey's 'meliorism': no 'perfect' or 'final' analysis of newspaper information; an open mind to receive information from many sources and from there to create our own independent opinions; to hear and consider *both* 'unofficial' and '*official*' reasons for wars.

**(3) Explaining the different intentions/interests of mass media and consumers.** Responses here overlapped with previous responses. There was sensitivity to differences in situations. So one report observed that if we are invaded by other countries, 'pro-war' can be just and what TV transmits is not 'propaganda' anymore. Another interesting response:

There is some difference between ‘public’ and ‘individual’ and, therefore, justice may differ between ‘public’ and ‘individual’. During wars, justice can vary depending where the particular individual stands. (Group 9)

I suspected the influence in this group of an S2 student, who had studied the poem *Trees*, relating to justice, as part of her AR1 and had written then:

In this world, there are 63 billion. This means that there are 63 billion types of justice. Therefore, we cannot unify these justices into one; however, we can make constant efforts to understand each other with love and peace.

Indeed, the meaning of justice varies according to people and their circumstance. We always should make efforts to analyse ‘the justice’ in each situation, however, there is not ‘perfect’ justice, either.

Ideas like these from the second preparatory class would be repeated and developed further in the PM itself. However, we would assist this process by inserting a wider variety of newspaper stories and articles.

#### **5-4. The Plenary Meeting (18<sup>th</sup> Feb 2006)**

##### **Structure of the PM**

1. Opening: *we will be working in mixed-age discussion groups*
2. An historic press story (Iwo Jima) – *discussing the interests of the media side and the responsibilities of the readership (citizens) side*
3. Reading articles in reflective stages: *how do the press construct stories and how do readers construct a reading?*
  - a. A recent article about the bird flu panic
  - b. A recent article about ‘NEET’ young people in England and Japan
- 15 minutes break
4. A recent article about teachers and the National Flag and Anthem Act: *how may we understand information more precisely?*
5. Group discussions and plenary presentations
6. Students write brief structured compositions about *what they had thought and learnt in the PM and how they could use it.*
7. Closing

### **Final Preparations and New Materials**

We had agreed 1) that *consumer responsibility for how to receive and respond to media information* should be the PM's main emphasis and (2) to introduce *four new newspaper stories* in succession *during* the PM, and to structure the PM around these introductions. In the event, all four articles were taken from the Asahi newspaper (known in Japan as a 'Guardian' type of paper, intellectual and a little bit left wing)<sup>80</sup>, but they were otherwise quite varied. The first story was from two articles covering the battle for Iwo Jima island in the last days of WW2, the other three were up-to-date and focused in turn on the bird-flu scare, young people who are 'NEET' i.e. Not in Education, Employment or Training (whether in England or Japan), and a controversy around the unwillingness of some Japanese teachers to fall in with the National Flag and Anthem Act by joining in the singing of the Anthem in their school Assemblies. I used my alumnus status at the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS) to obtain copies of the first pair of articles, but as a regular subscriber to the Asahi I was able to provide copies of the other three articles from my own resources.

We also agreed to vary *the ways in which we introduced* these articles. For the second and third stories, we used the strategy of introducing the new articles in a series of stages, with the students recording and reporting their changing impressions of what the article was about at each stage. This was to enhance their appreciation of the combination of ways by which newspapers communicate their messages and by which we may understand, or misunderstand, these messages.

### **Using the New Materials**

**(1) The historic articles** The invasion and occupation of Iraq had already introduced the students to some issues relating to control of the media. These two articles would introduce them to the Japanese government's particularly tight control of the press in WW2, especially towards the end of the war, and to the acceptance of this control by the Japanese press, even

---

<sup>80</sup> Asahi began in 1879, Along with Mainichi and Yomiuri, seen as 'right-wing', it is one of the three biggest newspapers in Japan. Many subscribe to Asahi, as I do, largely for its book coverage and influential reviews.

by the Asahi paper (which became temporarily ‘right-wing’ – and increased its sales – during WW2).

The battle for Iwo Jima island was understood to be crucial by many of the Japanese public. Victory for US army would give them a base to attack the mainland of Japan from a distance of 1000km, whereas their previous base on the Mariana islands was more than 2000 km from the mainland. After the US had already seized Iwo Jima on 1<sup>st</sup> March 1945, the Japanese newspapers continued to report how the brave Japanese army were protecting it. The Asahi article of 4<sup>th</sup> March reported continuing Japanese bravery, a front page headline stating *Ten times more US soldiers died than ours*. On 9<sup>th</sup> March another Asahi front page article reported:

We attacked 2000 enemies in the North area. The Japanese Garrison for Iwo Jima made a brave attack against the US. We were slightly damaged but not defeated.

We circled the important parts of these two articles and gave them to the mixed-age student groups, along with a detailed chronological table of Japan’s war history from 1894 to 1945 and the map of the Pacific wars between Japan and US. We also gave them a worksheet inviting group discussions and written comments on three questions:

- 1) What is the difference between these articles and the chronological table?
- 2) What was the mass media’s purpose?
- 3) How did people react to these articles?

Most groups responded to the factual question 1) as would be expected, e.g:

*The fact:* Japanese army is already hugely damaged and lost at the beginning of March.

*The article:* It is claimed that the damage of the enemy is ten times more than of the Japanese side. The article tries to give the wrong information to the consumers.

In responding to the more opinion-seeking questions 2) and 3), most groups referred to the relationship between press reports and the people’s morale, e.g:

Saying that Japan is winning gives mental security to Japanese people. If the mass media tell the truth (their loss), the Japanese do not do their best anymore. To raise their morale, the media keeps telling lies to the people.

One group felt an underlying threat:

Many people believed what the mass media reported as true. Some doubted these mass media, however, it was impossible to insist on this aloud. If they insisted, they could have been tortured or killed.

**(2) Introducing two articles in reflective stages** The *bird flu* article came next. It was picked up from the Asahi newspaper of 21<sup>st</sup> January 2006. Its general tone is ‘alarmist’. Though the World Health Organisation is cited as predicting that the flu incidence would decrease, the article worries that bird flu is spreading from Turkey, where a lot of birds had already been killed, to all over Europe. It also fears that migratory birds will carry the flu to Japan. In Turkey, 21 farmers and their children had contracted the flu from eggs and contact with dead birds. For the Turkish people, chicken is a very important protein source, used for example in kebabs. They also gain \$35,000,000 per year from exports of eggs to Europe, but now it is predicted that 120,000 people will lose jobs due to this flu. In an ‘objective’ way, this article is quite sympathetic with Turkey and its economy. Its double line is an ‘alert’ to Japan and the economic damage in Turkey.

For the students to observe their own gradually changing and growing understanding, and then to think about it, we released the information little by little, in six stages:

1. A part of the map of Turkey
2. Whole map + date of the article + taken from ‘the international section’ + newspaper name (Asahi)
3. 2 + photo of two people putting a chicken into a bag
4. 3 + the title (headline) and subtitles
5. 4 + leading part of the article
6. Complete article

The NEET (young people Not in Education, Employment or Training) article was from the Asahi newspaper of 10<sup>th</sup> September 2005. NEET is relatively similar to the Japanese Hikikomori (‘acute social withdrawal’) phenomenon, except Hikikomori prevents its victims from even going out to seek jobs; they withdraw from society and stay home all day. Some NEET and many Hikikomori young people in Japan come from rich and highly educated urban families. Our students also worry about getting jobs in the future.

The article’s line was to blame the society, especially the employment conditions in the large companies with 1000+ employees. Though national job vacancies in 2006 greatly exceeded the number of new university graduates who wanted to work in private companies, the large companies were employing just a core of full time workers and many more part-time workers for peripheral jobs. Of the 2005 graduates, 20% (98,000 people) did not get jobs nor go to graduate schools. Professor Sato’s *Unequal Society in Japan* is quoted as alerting that many young people were ‘giving up’ and warning that if the government did not establish a policy for this, inequality would become widespread in Japanese society.

We released this article to the student groups in three stages:

1. A photo of a woman counselling a young man
2. A graph charting the increasing numbers of ‘NEET’ students
3. The complete article

Photographs stimulate the imagination and are influential in guiding people’s interpretations (though, quite often, they misinform, or partly misinform, the reader/viewer).

The group worksheets relating to both these ‘slow-release’ articles distinguished what was clear at each stage from what was guessed:

When adding information in order (such as adding photo, graph, and body), what kind of difference of understanding occurred? Why did this difference occur?			
article	information	What you can find clearly	What you can guess
<b>Bird Flu</b>	1		
	2		
	3		
	4		
	5		
	6		
<b>NEET</b>	1		
	2		
	3		

Lack of time prevented groups from completing this exercise for the NEET article, though, interestingly, most guessed that it was about NEET from the first item released, the photo.

For the bird-flu article, the ‘what you can guess’ column displayed interesting shifts in the students’ thinking – and displayed them to the students themselves. From the map section they guessed imaginatively, e.g: ‘the land won by the Turkish army during WW2’, ‘the division of power’, ‘a distribution map of religions’ and ‘suggesting the problem between Iraq and US’. From the photo of two people putting a chicken in a bag, they recognised that the topic was connected to bird flu, but not the main theme. From the combination of title, sub title and leading part, many groups wrongly guessed the article was about the danger of infection. Only when they had read the complete article, did they identify the central theme as the economic impact of the flu, for this was not mentioned in the titles and leading part. (Experienced adults might sooner have included this theme in their guesses.)

**(3) A newspaper reader writes...** This was a short text picked up from the Asahi’s ‘readers opinions’ section, 9<sup>th</sup> Feb 2006.

In some Tokyo schools, the teachers who did not sing the national anthem will be arrested and punished this year as well. Do people who encourage us to sing national anthem really respect this anthem? When we sing a song, we should sing from the bottom of our heart. Singing is not forced by others. What will children learn when they watch teachers being forced to sing? A playwright called Ai Nagai made this problem into a drama and some people proposed to stage it in Britain. However, the British declined this proposal, because they don’t understand this problem.

As a liberal newspaper, the Asahi line is to support this reader’s opinion: forcing teachers to sing the national anthem violates article 21 of their basic human rights. This reader would never be published in the right-wing Sankei newspaper – whose stated position is that singing the national anthem in schools to nurture pupils’ patriotism is ‘natural’. This discussion arose from the National Flag and Anthem Act (1999) and it recurs regularly, especially in the season of graduation and entrance ceremonies in March and April.<sup>81</sup> Most JSSL students, however, would probably not have been aware of this background.

---

<sup>81</sup> Discussion of this issue was still continuing in 2012. An article in Asahi 4<sup>th</sup> April 2012 comments on an Osaka 2011 regulation which obliged heads of government schools to check teachers’ mouths closely to see if they are really singing the national anthem with the students. A barrister’s appeal for flexibility is added: ‘Ultimately, this is for the students. What do students think when they see this mutual checking surveillance system?’

A question for the students accompanied the article: *what kind of information should be added to understand this article more precisely?* Because this text was both one-sided and short (omitting background information), we teachers expected it would be a good stimulus for student argument and imagination. Like the literature in AR1, by not specifying precisely ‘how things are’ or ‘what we should do’, it could be more effective in encouraging imaginative thinking – the first step to voluntary and independent thinking. Indeed this short text did attract more student discussion and argument than the others. Most of the group discussions and presentations that followed the exercises focused principally on it.

The groups identified very well what was missing in the text: *the reasons for introducing singing of the national anthem in government schools; why this became a duty in 1999; what the national anthem is about; and the meaning of the lyrics.*

Some groups also identified other ‘voices’ they would like to hear. An example:

If this article had included more opinions – primary, secondary and high school students’ opinions – we could have a fairer view of this problem. We could consider all opinions. Also it would be better to have the results of a questionnaire survey. It is particularly important to show the reasons of those who do not want to sing. The government’s view should also be included.

The strong interest shown in this final article, including the insistence on hearing all opinions on the issue, surely expressed the students’ developing democratic instincts.

## **Reflection**

One group’s response to the articles collectively succeeded in relating the matter of ‘limited information’ to the plenary’s more general aim:

Information influences people a lot. During WWII, the people, the consumers of information, received only the information that the government wanted them to know and think about. Dealing with [the two ‘slow-release’ articles], there was the relationship between the parts of these articles and what we guessed. We consumers tend to think in the wrong way anyway, so it will become worse if the information is ‘processed’ (as during WWII). Limited information causes misunderstanding. Before judging something, we should get a lot of information from different areas. We should check the source of information before deciding our own opinion.

The Iwo Jima story and articles had given the students another opportunity to be aware of their own and everyone's tendency *to readily believe texts*, particularly from respectable or official sources. Then the bird-flu article gave them an opportunity to be aware of a different tendency, *to misinterpret texts* on the basis of hurried or incomplete readings. When this is sometimes necessary we should at least recognise what we are doing. It was a little disturbing, however, to see the students stop thinking about the article when they had finally understood its theme. It did not occur to them to *question* its central line – as though it had almost instantly become 'their own idea'. The lesson is that we need a lot of practice in querying *both* our interpretations of what we read *and* what we read itself – as well as in developing our democratic openness to engaging with others' opinions. In these regards the forms of practice provided by the PM exercise seemed meaningful to teachers.

But how did the students themselves see the PM?

## **5-5. Evaluations**

### **Student Views of the PM**

#### **Three Evaluation Questions**

- 1) What did you learn from this plenary meeting? Please write in detail.
- 2) What did you think was the purpose of this plenary meeting? Please write in detail and academically.
- 3) What can you do as an individual after this meeting?

As is characteristic of the RICE pedagogical approach, this final PM exercise combined pedagogical purposes – to reinforce the learning of the students and to give the teachers feedback for future PMs – with its research purpose.

We had learnt to build the student evaluation of the PM into its timetable and the quantity and quality of the student responses to the three questions was pleasing. Almost all of those

in attendance returned responses: 59 students [30 S1, 15 S2, and 14 S3], of whom half, 29 students, wrote at some length, in some cases shifting from imperfect Japanese to more natural English to express their view better – which indicated some excitement. It was helping them that they could refer to a wealth of materials and worksheets through which they had already established some thinking of their own.

*What did you learn ....? What was the purpose .... ? What can you now do....?* The three questions form a set. Responses to the first two more or less repeated each other in a large majority of cases and were generally quite decisive influences on their choices of what they could now do. The focus here, then, will be on the range of the *dominant themes* in student's answers.

For two thirds (40) of the students '*learning the importance of how we receive information*' was their identified main theme. Two examples chosen from a great many:

I try to read the newspaper every day and try to understand what is happening in the world. However, I think I would probably have tended to the wrong opinion when the mass media twisted the truth [about Iwo Jima]. To prevent this possibility, I should collect information from various sources. What I can do at this moment is to consult not only a Japanese newspaper and internet articles, but also British ones. (S2)

The aim was to learn the disjunction between [the interests of] mass media and consumers and why it happens. We cannot just 'believe' what the mass media reports. We have to investigate and think for ourselves and we should compare with other people's opinions (S1).

For 6 of the 30 S1 students, who had just had their *first* experience of a PM, its main purpose and benefit was to bring students from different classes together in discussion. In the immediate 'afterglow', 'process' had completely eclipsed the newspaper theme! Examples:

I thought that we discussed very well because I could get not only my opinion, but also others' opinions. I learned the importance of listening to others' opinions, while defending my opinion at the same time. I enjoyed so much the variety of people's opinions. I felt shy about presenting my own opinion in front of many people. I need some courage and some consideration from others, so I can present more in future. (S1)

I think the purpose of the PM was to defend our own opinions in the group and consider others' opinions. Furthermore, another purpose is to develop my own opinion by referring mine to others..... (S1).

...I would like to have a plenary meeting next year again. (I would like to have this at least three times a year.) (S1)

Some 13 students explicitly combined these two purposes, seeing the aim of the PM as to let students realise the importance of how we receive information *by* discussing it with fellow students. Typical examples:

I gained a valuable insight into the different ways newspapers present their sources... As well as reading and learning new information from the extracts I could communicate constructively with other people of different ages. (S2)

When we discussed an issue together in group, I could get various opinions and aspects that I could not hit upon by myself; I could learn other aspects of the articles. (S2)

Finally, 3 students focussed mainly on what was also a minor theme for some others, that 'incomplete' information can provide space that nurtures more independent and active thought:

If the information is limited, we can guess more and have our own opinion... (S2)

The point had sometimes arisen in the classes and the PM that 'perfect' articles, those that convey no need for further reader exploration can still be deceiving or wrong, while articles that are free from fixed ideas and 'ideology', and admit implicitly or explicitly to being inconclusive or incomplete, encourage the reader to explore further – in the way that we had seen war literature leaving spaces for readers to reflect for themselves in AR1.

Especially in important matters, it is wise to discuss our opinions, including our interpretations of media information, with others. But when students 'learn' only from teachers 'teaching', thinking is unlikely to develop. When they work and learn together across age-groups in a structured way, the learning is shared and it is not passive and – beyond that – it may *nurture democracy inside the students, teachers and JSSL*, which, it might be said, was the ultimate purpose of the PM.

## The 'Before and After' Questionnaire (4<sup>th</sup> Feb / 25<sup>th</sup> Feb 2006)

### Questionnaire (tr.)

- 1) What do newspaper, books and internet articles etc. try to tell us?
- 2) When you read newspaper, books and internet articles, what do you pay particular attention to?

This year I divided the response sheets into two columns, the left hand column for *before* the preparatory classes and the PM, and the right hand column for responses a week *after* the PM. I had considered that this would assist the students in estimating their own development and assist me when I analysed the questionnaires, student by student. As indicated in 2-3 above, it backfired. Some 18 of the 60 respondents had not 'played the game', indicating this with such 'after' responses as: *'The same description as I wrote in the left hand side'*. This included more than half the S3 respondents, reminding me that it was the public examinations season in their English schools! But mostly it was those who had some difficulty keeping up in Japanese.<sup>82</sup> (How many of these might have shown more development in a short interview, especially if we could have permitted them to express themselves in English?)

Though the brevity of answers was again frustrating, it was possible to detect *movement in a large majority* of the other 42 responses. An S1 example:

*To Q1*

*Before:* The truth

*After:* I think Mass Media transmit what they want consumers to consider and to think – in other words, not only the truth, but also fake information if it catches the consumers' attention.

*To Q2*

*Before:* I try not to believe in fake information.

*After:* I can believe more in what newspapers or books say than in internet articles. I would like it if the internet articles gave the writer's background in detail.

Distinguishing kinds of media and recognising the unreliability of internet articles are the new features.

---

<sup>82</sup> In AR2, their participation had been facilitated by our keeping the top-down, lecture style to a minimum and letting students help each other to contribute voluntarily in their groups. Teacher eyes and the DVD of the PM suggested this had generally worked well for these students.

And an S2example:

*To Q1*

*Before:* The mass media try to transmit news about events and affairs without bias. If the article is biased, they will be pressurised to stop sending such articles.

*After:* Many newspaper companies in the world try to report important information to us. Some companies try to send the correct information to the countries which have censorships. [However], there is a possibility that the news includes some lies to catch the readers' attention.

*To Q2*

*Before:* I try to read articles from different newspaper companies, also.....other people's opinions relating to the issue in the internet. Internet articles do not have [editorial] 'censorship', so I should be more careful with them than with newspaper articles.

*After:* I would like to check the news that is not thought worth placing in the article. Also I can try never to swallow all the information and to consider articles from various angles. (S2)

There is now a growing, if reluctant, awareness that media intentions are not always good.

It represents large progress for students to recognise that the media have 'agendas'. Even knowing this in general, we can be easily manipulated by them. Living in an officially 'democratic' country, Japanese people believe their media situation is very 'healthy', compared with communist China. We Japanese should note that Japan did not win 'democracy' for itself, but was 'given' it, and be always careful about believing what our Mass Media tells us.

### **How AR2 differed from AR1**

Watching the DVD record of the AR2 PM, the difference between the two ARs was instantly clear to me and to others. The PM of AR1 had begun with an *input* of information, mainly from teachers, about the different literature texts used by each class, and another *input* was the video about atomic bomb victims in Nagasaki. This was the basis for students to get thinking and discussing for themselves. In AR2, however, because we had unified the materials of all grades and had carefully chosen materials to get students thinking actively, the first step was already a student *output*, and 'facilitation' was already our role as teachers.

Therefore, the impression of the new DVD was totally different from the previous one. This is the most outstanding difference between the two PMs.

Another difference was in the ways we took to engage and sustain student interest. In AR1, the video about the A-bomb victims did this, after we teachers had worked through our anxieties about balancing emotion (empathy) and logical thinking. In AR2, we did this by maintaining some suspense about what was coming next. For example, during the ‘slow release’ of some articles, students were really interested in what coming next, even crying out ‘what is this?’, ‘what is coming next?’.

What the videos revealed about the two PMs can be applied to the two ARs as wholes. AR1 was more about the teachers’ performance and AR2 was more directly focused on students’ understanding and improvement, on whether or not they were developing ideas about information independently and voluntarily, with teachers acting more as facilitators. Having constructed a programme for the three sessions, our most important job during the sessions was to check and improve the students’ understanding and progress.

This in itself is not a criticism of AR1. Literature has to be taught in relation to the students’ levels of maturity and competence in Japanese. Therefore, AR1’s different rhythm was inevitable, given that its ‘peace vehicle’ was literature – which also permitted it to have a longer period of time. Also, politically (e.g. in terms of parent support), what looked like a ‘social studies theme’ was best done first, and successfully, through literature, before doing another one through the less traditional newspaper articles. We might almost say that the success of AR1 was necessary if AR2 was to be successful.

### **Successes and Lessons Learnt**

The first successful point, then, is in the area of *curriculum development*. We were able to integrate a media critique element into our traditional teaching and learning of Japanese literature and language. In JSSL, we teach only literature and language classes. When some parents or students ask for other subjects – history, math, etc – our position is that the most effective use of our weekly 2 hours and 25 minutes is to concentrate on language, which is

the base of all subjects. However, in AR2 we were able to show that this second social studies' element of media critique could fit right into a language and literature curriculum. It was important for this that we did not give it too much class time – just three sessions including the PM – while preparing it carefully (for almost a year) and using advance holiday essays to get students interested in the topic. If we had used more sessions, some parents and students might have complained that that we were neglecting literature.

The second successful point is that AR2 kept *a good connection with AR1* for the S2 and S3 classes. The work relating to the Iraq occupation extended AR1's 'invasion' theme, though in a different way. The AR1 texts had focused students on how the main characters had acted, reacted, thought, and felt in wars and invasions, but not much on why those wars happened, how societies reacted to them, what kind of information ordinary people get during wars, and how we can examine this information. If it seemed that S2 students generally achieved better than S1 students in AR2, it can be presumed that they were helped by having experienced AR1 previously.

A third successful point was that AR2 could both continue and enhance *the cross-age experience* of AR1. We have just seen how positively the two S1 classes, in particular, responded to this. The 'enhancement' in AR2 was because it was possible and appropriate to use the same materials, assignments and session format for all the class levels.

A fourth successful point was the *parallel enhanced sharing among teachers* – even compared to AR1. We shared a lot and improved together. We strengthened our own knowledge of the Iraq occupation through study meetings that were very naturally suggested and very willingly undertaken. We strengthened our 'friendship' when we studied together. We also made a book together out of our students' summer holiday assignments, developed common worksheets, and met regularly to plan the sessions. If I had managed AR2 alone, I could not have hit upon many fabulous ideas which my colleagues suggested.

A fifth successful point relates to *my own pedagogical education*. The workshops for students to develop their own ideas made me reflect more on what 'teaching' means. When

teaching social studies in Japan, I had used ‘techniques’ such as showing videos, supplying worksheets, bringing students to courts and stock markets, but without linking them *spirally* to develop students’ thinking. I understood this logic theoretically, however, it was not reflected in my actual teaching. Similarly with the word *‘facilitator’*. I heard this word first in 1997 at a ‘Development Studies’ workshop before going to Pakistan for JICA and it impressed me. I understood then that the ‘facilitator’ is the person who does not ‘teach’ students but organises activities to let students think. However, I did not reflect deeply on why one-way ‘teaching’ hinders the development of students’ thinking and, so, came to think the facilitator is the person to organise activities and amuse students.

AR2 taught me again what ‘facilitators’ truly means, organisers who use activities in a spiral succession to develop students’ thinking towards some understanding, who, therefore, communicate with students and fellow teachers, rather than push their own idea on students. In AR2, we were always trying to check to what degree students’ thought had developed and then organising the next steps for them.

**A Lesson Learnt** was that AR2 was spread out over *too long a period*. Colleague teachers were more or less occupied with it all the time and the time between the assignments and the three sessions seemed too long to the students as well. Especially for S3 students, the January to March term is not good for AR or PM work, because they are concentrating on other matters such as university entrance. Therefore, for AR3 we agreed to have classes and PMs before and just after the summer holidays, in June / July and again in September (and we would follow this timetable for many years after).

## Chapter 6

### AR3: Pedagogy as Sharing Personal Experience

Meeting each other on the first day of the new Japanese academic year in April 2006, our memory was fresh of how pupils had discussed actively and presented opinions freely during the AR2 plenary in February. We knew and accepted that a third AR was fully expected from us and we began discussing how it might proceed. The one newly appointed teacher ('W') was easily persuaded to join us and we would again be a team of five enthusiastic teachers for AR3.<sup>83</sup>

We began by reflecting back on AR2 and its final plenary session, all of us having already watched and discussed the headmaster's DVD of that PM. A criticism that stood out among the many positive reflections concerned the long period over which AR2 had been stretched. This had caused some loss of student and staff concentration along the way. Accordingly, our first decision was to concentrate AR3 into the period between July and September and to allocate to it two July sessions, the summer holiday essay-exercise, and two September sessions. This would also avoid the public examination season in English schools.

Our choice of theme evolved more gradually from the deputy headmaster's suggestion that a Mr. Masao Hirakubo could suitably be invited to speak to the senior school staff and students as part of the new AR. Mr. Hirakubo, since sadly deceased, was a survivor of the WW2 Battle of Imphal (North-East India, 8<sup>th</sup> March to 4<sup>th</sup> July 1944) and the author of *My Own Imphal Campaign*. He was also the founding director of the Burma Campaign Society that aims to develop reconciliation between Britain and Japan. This was an appealing suggestion. In the two previous ARs our themes had investigated wars and peace from different angles, war literature in AR1 and the critical role of mass media in AR2. Now for AR3, we could have a person who had actually *experienced* the severe mass media control in Japan before and during WWII, had then gone to the battle and *experienced* and survived the horrors of

---

<sup>83</sup> Z and I continued to teach S1 classes, W joined Y to teach the two S2 classes, and X continued to teach the sole S3 class.

the war, and had later reflected deeply on those *experiences* with other veterans. It seemed, and it turned out to be, a very fortunate opportunity. We agreed to invite him to give a lecture, possibly as early as July. This would be a ‘plenary’ session, but we decided we would also still hold our usual end-of-AR plenary in September.

## **6-1. Imphal, Mr Hirakubo and other Resources**

### **The theme: international understanding**

We teachers knew little about the Imphal Campaign or Mr Hirakubo’s work, but through reading and discussion, we began to understand its significance – and notoriety. Imphal, the main British army base in ‘occupied’ India, was close to the Burmese border, which made it a threat to Japan’s control of Burma in 1943-45. Defending occupied Burma from Imphal, the ‘Imphal Campaign’, was therefore an important task. It did not necessarily involve attacking the British army and most Japanese army leaders were against such an attack, because the many 2000+m mountains around this area would make food supply-lines impossibly difficult. However, Lieutenant General (Army) Renya Mutaguchi disastrously decided on an attack, during which the Japanese attack force decreased from around 60,000 to 20,000 soldiers. As well as starvation, diseases took hold in the wet season and, in addition, the British were able to attack them from the air, as well as to fly in their own soldiers, weapons and supplies. In terms of military history, we learnt, this was a campaign to show how the Japanese army does not plan well.

Gaining some understanding also of Mr Hirakubo’s work of reconciliation, and as the class sessions drew nearer, we decided (June 24<sup>th</sup>) on *international understanding* as an appropriate theme. First, the reconciliations between British and Japanese veterans had clearly involved transcending the language and mentality embedded in each culture to reach some real mutual understanding and, second, our JSSL students would bring their own considerable experience of the two cultures to the theme. Our aim was, therefore:

*that students should analyse the differences of thinking between Britain and Japan, around the wartime and at present, using the Imphal Campaign as the starting point.*

And they would research this campaign for their summer holiday assignment, which would take the form of a *mock newspaper article* (thus, for S2 and S3 students, building on their work in AR2). A programme would soon unfold:

### ***Programme for AR3***

Date (2006)	Class style	Content
8 <sup>th</sup> July	First Preparatory Session (Individual Classes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading and understanding materials about the Imphal Campaign.</li> <li>• Considering the ‘definition’ of the Campaign and filling in a prepared worksheet</li> </ul>
15 <sup>th</sup> July	First <b>Plenary Meeting</b> (parents also invited)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Watching a video about the veterans , on both sides, of the Imphal Campaign</li> <li>• Listening to Mr. Hirakubo’s story</li> <li>• Writing a comment after his story</li> </ul>
Summer Holiday	Summer Holiday Assignment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Referring to the previous two sessions, make a newspaper article, using the template supplied.</li> </ul>
9 <sup>th</sup> Sept.	Second Preparatory Session (Individual Classes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Based on their summer holiday assignment, students to summarise the purpose of the Imphal Campaign.</li> <li>• Visualising the situation if Britain were in the Japanese shoes, how they would deal with the Campaign</li> <li>• Understanding the differences in ways of thinking between Japan and Britain</li> <li>• Filling in the provided worksheet.</li> </ul>
16 <sup>th</sup> Sept.	Second <b>Plenary Meeting</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considering the difference of thinking between both countries.</li> <li>• Analysing the conflict between them.</li> <li>• How we can prevent such conflict.</li> <li>• ‘Guessing’ the general theme of AR3 as a whole</li> </ul>

In the 8<sup>th</sup> July preparatory session, gaining some knowledge of the Imphal Campaign would prepare the students for Mr. Hirakubo’s lecture a week later. Also, the students would listen to him more carefully because we made that campaign the subject of the subsequent summer holiday assignment.

Seeing a fortunate opportunity also for the parents of our senior students, the school invited them to attend Mr. Hirakubo’s lecture and to write comments immediately after it that we teachers could read and feedback to Mr. Hirakubo. The Headmaster’s invitation included this observation:

...Recently in Japan, there have been many attempts to tell the story to the young generation to prevent the war memory from fading. In London, some of you see the scars of wars of over 60 years ago on VJ Day. I would like to consider this an opportunity to think together about war. Therefore, I am sending this invitation.<sup>84</sup>

### **Resources and preparations**

We had agreed (17<sup>th</sup> June) to supply the students with five advance reading texts for the preparatory session on the 8<sup>th</sup> July. It is important to offer some analysis of these readings and other resources here.

The first three texts were short and could broadly be described as critically factual:

- (1) The 'Imphal Campaign' entry in the *Japonica Encyclopaedia*, Shogakkan, 1980, which depicts it in a generally objective way, though it observes that Mutaguchi's decision to attack Imphal was at odds with the original purpose of protecting Burma.
- (2) The *Wikipedia* internet entry on the 'Imphal Campaign', which is more outspokenly critical. It includes the observation that 'Imphal Campaign' is a synonym for 'unreasonable campaign by an incompetent and irresponsible commander'.
- (3) An article from a recent edition of the *Yomiuri Newspaper* (26<sup>th</sup> May 2006) that focuses especially on the thoughtless and reckless nature of Mutaguchi's leadership. Headquarters saw no need for the Campaign and were against it, because of the difficulty of supplying food, the disease hazards, the lack of good roads and the British control of the air. However, Mutaguchi successfully appealed to Hideki Tojo (prime minister at that time), claiming that defeat of the enemy, acquisition of their food stores, and the capture of Imphal would be achieved in three weeks – 'they will surrender if we fire three times in the air'.

The final two texts were more philosophically reflective:

- (4) *Criticism*, a short survivor's article written by Mr. Masao Hirakubo himself in May 1998 (in Japanese).<sup>85</sup> In it he dwells on the survivor's anguish regarding comrades who did not

---

<sup>84</sup> The full text, translated, is in *Appendix 6-1(a)*

<sup>85</sup> Mr Hirakubo gave a copy of this article to us teachers on his preliminary visit to the school on 3<sup>rd</sup> June. However, he could no longer remember its publications details.

survive, as well as insisting on the shared responsibility for wars of all the countries involved in them. He describes how he began to think like this:

When I could return to Japan finally after I survived in India, I swore to my dead fellow soldiers that I would devote myself to reconstruct Japan and recover the relationship between Japan and Britain. In London on business in 1955, I heard some British prisoners had received horrible treatment from the Japanese army. .... I said to British colleagues, 'I want to apologise because I am a Japanese person, if it is a true story'. They replied, 'you don't have to apologise as the guilty ones were punished'. By the (Tokyo) Trial after WWII, 1065 Japanese were punished by death because of their treatment of prisoners. In addition, Japan had paid reparations by the Treaty of San Francisco. The matter had been dealt with.

However, a trend (opinion) developed later that *all* Japanese should apologise. Why did this happen? More than 40 years after WWII, the Japanese government had not considered the prisoners issue more seriously and now fury was exploding as a result of mass media coverage. [However]when I visited ex-prisoners one by one, I felt strongly that they were suffering from the agony of not being able to do something for their dead fellow prisoners; they did not have so much grudge toward Japanese generally. This feeling is the same as the one I have.

And in more particular reference to 'responsibility':

.... we should distinguish the responsibility for causing wars from the responsibility for individual incidents of killing war prisoners and non-combatants. The cause of war is not as simple as 'you attacked me first'. It lies in the long relationships among countries; therefore I think all countries involved in wars have shared responsibility. I think there was no justice in the Tokyo Trial's decision to put all responsibility for WWII on the losing countries... I wonder whether or not we can really feel responsible for our own actual 'crime against humanity' when the war itself includes inhumanity.

The point, for him, is not 'responsibility' leading to 'apology', but 'responsibility' to reflect on causes and to construct mutual understanding.

(5) To bring literature into the mix, we chose a 20 page part of a well-known novel for the teen age-group, *The Burmese Harp* (ビルマの壺琴) by Michio Takeyama<sup>86</sup>, 1947 (which became a film in 1985). We were confident that it would be within the linguistic (Japanese) and the emotional range of our three class levels. The extract consisted mainly of a letter at

---

<sup>86</sup> Takeyama was a First Higher School teacher who had seen a lot of his students go to the battlefield during WWII. He had never been to Burma himself, but he explains in an epilogue that the inspiration for the book was hearing about a military unit noted for its morale and energy and for taking special care to protect their captain under attack, because – as its soldiers said – 'our captain was the music teacher'. (Another possible influence was Kazuo Nakamura, who, as a prisoner of the British in Burma, organized a prisoners' choir and who later became a Buddhist priest in Japan.)

the end of the novel that Mizushima, a recently released prisoner of the British in Burma (and a skilled harpist), writes to his comrade ex-prisoners, who are reading it on a ship that is realising their dream of returning them to Japan. Part of the letter reads:

I am not going back to Japan. I decided on this. I will walk around [in Burma]....to collect Japanese bones and bury them properly. I want to make their tombs, bury them and give their souls peaceful rest. Thousands of young fellows were forced to become soldiers, surrender, run away and die. Most of their bodies are still abandoned here. This is a terrible situation. I cannot leave them like this. I cannot leave this land until I do something for them.

The resonance between this and Mr. Hirakubo's continuing reconciliation efforts would be obvious to the students, we thought, and it would help them to understand why veterans suffer anguish over the fate of their dead comrades. We hoped they might also be struck by the book's example of spiritual learning in and from a different culture and country. In reference to Burmese Buddhism, though without telling his comrades directly that he had become a Buddhist 'priest', Mizushima says:

I realised [these things] while practicing asceticism. From ancient times, they have continued considering the relationship between the world and men. They... endure austerities. Their courage is as great as soldiers.... However, we have not put so much effort into this. We did not think it important. What we considered most was.... what we can do. We did not consider what kind of person we were and what kind of attitude we took toward the world and our life. We were not taught about 'human completion', 'peace', 'endurance' and 'thoughtfulness'. ....I am always surprised to observe Burmese people. Yes they are lazy, playful and carefree; however, they are also cheerful, reserved and happy. They are always smiling. They are not greedy and assertive. I realised that these are the most important things for human beings.

**Mr Hirakubo in person** was obviously another of our 'resources'. We decided at a long meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> May to invite him to address just us teachers on 3<sup>rd</sup> June, so we could better prepare ourselves for his later lecture to students and, perhaps, also help him prepare for that occasion. We also agreed on the questions we would put to him: *how he came to be in the Campaign, what he actually did, what he learnt from it, whether and how his reflections 60 years later differed from his feelings and thoughts at that time, and how, in his role as director of the Burma Campaign Society (BCS), he develops reconciliation between Britain and Japan.* He accepted our invitation and, together with the Deputy Headmaster who organised the meeting, we met him after lessons (from 14.00) on the 3<sup>rd</sup> June. We listened to

him and then put our prepared questions to him. His style in delivery and in addressing our questions was informal, but more thoughtful than charismatic – as it would also be when he returned to face the students and parents.

This meeting itself, followed by the exercise of writing up my quite detailed notes afterwards and consulting some materials he left with us, permitted a fuller understanding of Mr. Hirakubo's experience and work, as well as a better anticipation of how he would address the students and parents.

The full account of his talk to us is in *Appendix 6-1(b)*. The most salient points are that his earlier, school-induced, enthusiasm for the war and his confidence about victory were gradually demolished by his father's consistent preference for negotiation and compromise, coupled with his own experience as an army conscript in Japanese-occupied Burma – especially his experience of the Imphal Campaign. It had been clear to him in advance, as it was to many comrades, that the Campaign would be a disaster. Many soldiers lost their lives already during the extremely difficult three day and night march over the mountains to Imphal. Though they battled successfully to seize both the Imphal and Kohima bases, they had to abandon them after a few weeks because of air attacks, the predicted food shortages and diseases like cholera and malaria brought on by the rainy season. Throughout, Mr. Hirakubo had responsibility for organising and maintaining the food supply for 1000 comrades and he focussed his efforts on saving as many as possible of them. But, leaving their dead comrades behind when the remnants of the army pulled out affected him deeply. He remains of the opinion that the Campaign was very wrong and he never forgets his dead comrades of that time. After his retirement, meetings with sometimes angry British veterans of Imphal and Kohima in the 1980s fostered his desire to work for reconciliation between the two sets of veterans, and between Britain and Japan. He founded the Burma Campaign Society [BCS] and one of its achievements was a visit of British veterans to pray in the Yasukuni Shrine, which is dedicated to the Japanese dead soldiers of WWII.

The epilogue of his book, *My Own Imphal Campaign* details other exchanges.

Since 1989, after the Japanese Showa Emperor (1901-1989) passed away, British veterans visited Japan six times and Japanese veterans visited Britain twice up to 1995, supported by the Sasakawa Foundation. Each trip consisted of around 20 war veterans and two weeks stay. I think I achieved some dialogue and mutual understanding between them. I understand that our thoughts and considerations towards dead war comrades are common and agreed 'the enemy in the past, the friend at present'. We agreed to hold a joint memorial service for the dead. In 1991, in Kohima, the reconciliation between British and Japanese veterans began in the newly built Catholic Cathedral. Since 1995, we continue to hold a joint memorial service in Canterbury Cathedral, Coventry Cathedral, Westminster Abbey and Three Wheels (Shin Buddhist House) in London, around 15<sup>th</sup> August every year.

*'Dear Grandfather, I am in England'*, a video, was a final significant resource that Mr. Hirakubo drew to our attention at this preparatory meeting. It would be integral to his later presentation to the students and he allowed me to make copies of it for colleagues. Twenty eight minutes long, in English with Japanese subtitles, the film was made by Yuki Sunada while studying at Royal Holloway College, University of London and it won the 2003 prize at the Imperial War Museum Student Film Festival. She made it to commemorate her deceased grandfather, a survivor of the Imphal Campaign who had consistently refused to answer his family's questions about it. After visiting and meeting Mr. Hirakubo at the Burma Campaign Society in 2003, the idea came to her of a film consisting of interviews with Japanese and British veterans, depicting their changing conceptions of 'the enemy'.

Our common experience in JSSL would be that this film is a deeply moving, minor masterpiece. It begins with interviews of contemporary British and Japanese young people that expose how very little they know about Britain and Japan during WWII. In the next scenes, Yuki interviews a British veteran who had been sent to India in the 1940s – in *his* youth – and then Mr. Hirakubo himself, who describes his experience of Imphal and the suffering of Japanese soldiers in Kohima, India. Then British and Japanese veterans talk alternately.

One striking account was of a British captive given a chance to avoid becoming a prisoner of war by opting to go to 'beautiful Japan in cherry blossoms' to broadcast propaganda: yes or no? When he said 'no', the 'nice' Japanese intelligence interpreter (a graduate of Tokyo

University) begged him to say yes, because he might be killed. When he said ‘no’ again, Burmese collaborators set about hitting other British captives. In the end, he said yes, but he was in a fury and felt hatred toward the Japanese.

Another British veteran explained why he was holding a statue of the Buddha in his hand. At a pagoda in India that was being used for first aid for Japanese soldiers, he came upon a lot of dead soldiers, their bodies surrounded by flies. As he returned to his vehicle, he heard a shot, by which an Indian priest was ‘mercy-killing’ one of the Japanese. When challenged, the priest said that it was better to shoot him because there is no way in agony, and he gave him the statue of Buddha that he keeps to the present. In this experience he first found fellow-feeling for ‘the enemy’. Later, he came to respect what the Japanese achieved after WWII and was happy to join the Burma Campaign Society when invited and, through BCS, he came to like the Japanese. He emphasized strongly the pointlessness of carrying on hatred toward Japanese.

In watching this film together, we teachers had picked up such key words as ‘mutual understanding’, ‘reconciliation’, and ‘joint memorial service’, and it was then that we set *international understanding* as the overall theme of AR3. But rather than announce the theme, we wanted it to emerge from the movement of the AR: *from using Mr. Hirakubo’s experience and reflections to stimulate a good understanding of the Imphal Campaign, to consolidating this understanding in the summer assignment, to using it as a basis for comparing Japanese and British ways of thinking and values in a second Plenary Meeting in September*. How truly coherent was this plan? This would become a matter of debate in our final evaluations.

## **6-2. Teaching, Learning and Evaluation**

### **The class session preparing for the first plenary meeting (8<sup>th</sup> July 2006)**

To clarify and build on the students’ advance reading of materials 1-5 and to prepare them for their summer assignment, we agreed to use the ‘definition sentences’ technique. In Japanese pedagogical discourse, this refers to the technique of working towards a compact

analysis of what something is in sentences. I articulated it into a four-item worksheet for the students:

1. To whom are you explaining the Imphal Campaign?
2. For what purpose do you explain it?
3. What is your order of explanation?
4. The sentences of your ‘definition’:

A preliminary with my own class was to remind them that there are no ‘absolute definitions’ in the world. As the worksheet implies, definitions can be changed all the time according to 1. Readership/Audience and 2. Purpose, and they can change also according to the times.<sup>87</sup> We checked the positions of Burma and India on the map and I posed the question which country colonised India, before then reading together the short current newspaper article from the Yomiuri Newspaper,<sup>88</sup> while dealing with some students’ linguistic difficulties. I posed questions like which country commanded the air, whether Japan could fly their airplanes in Imphal / Burma, how Japanese soldiers travelled to Imphal and what they did in Imphal and I invited them, as necessary, to re-read the article and to read parts of their other texts to secure their understanding of these matters. I noted their surprise that the Japanese soldiers (including Mr. Hirakubo) had to walk 230+km from Pankokku to Imphal, negotiating steep mountains such as Patkal Range (one of the Himalayas) – also, that some had worked out the rate of Japanese casualties as 84%,<sup>89</sup> enhancing Mr. Hirakubo’s survivor status in their eyes.

I collected completed worksheets from the 14 students in attendance and analysed them by reference to the four worksheet items:

- (1) The various visualised *readerships* included family, parents, friends, their own young generation, future high school students, future human beings and Imphal Campaign investigators.

---

<sup>87</sup> We considered textbook examples of how authors define ‘film’, ‘myself’, and ‘love’. E.g.: *Film*: The screen is the limited space where people next to each other can have ‘the same dream’. The film is the sleep which invites the dream entrance (Shuji Terayama); *Myself*: What is myself? It is the mysterious spirit which wants to become ‘not myself’ by the leap or walk (Yutaka Haniya); *Love*: ‘The happiest love is the moment when I hold the woman’s hand whom I love’ (Stendhal).

<sup>88</sup> Resource (3) above.

<sup>89</sup> Wikipedia gave the total number of soldiers in the Imphal Campaign as 86,000, and the Yomiuri newspaper article numbered the casualties at 72,500.

(2) A generally shared *purpose* was to inform their audience of the true history of the ‘Imphal Campaign’. Some more particular expressions of this intention:

I explain this Campaign to those who do not know the truth of the war.

Not to repeat the same mistake, I expose the truth and the victims of this Campaign.

I let people recognise how the Imphal Campaign was reckless.

I explain this campaign to inform future human beings of its history.

To inform future high school students about the Campaign, especially the history as related to both Japan and Britain.

For 11 students, their purpose stopped at informing their particular audience about this Campaign, while for the other 3 their purpose included deepening their own knowledge by informing somebody. E.g.

In providing the audience with an accurate and balanced true account, I deepen my own knowledge and find my own translation for this Campaign.

(3) Regarding *order of explanation*, a common format was:

what ‘Imphal Campaign’ means / reasons and summary / what we should do in future

(4) In their *definition section*, many wrote passionately and emotionally (more obviously emotional in their original Japanese). An example:

.....Lieutenant General Mutaguchi thought the Japanese could capture Imphal within three weeks....that Britain might surrender quickly if the Japanese fired three times in the air. It shows how incapable Mutaguchi was. In the result, there were 72,500 casualties, which was 84 % of all the solders involved..... A lot of soldiers lost fighting power due to heavy rain, illness and hunger. Mutaguchi alone was responsible for this.

‘Mutaguchi alone was responsible’ would be imbalanced in a newspaper article when considered against the ideal of investigating the facts in as neutral way as possible. I corrected the students’ definitions with this in mind and returned them on the morning of the 15<sup>th</sup> July before the first PM started.

## **The First Plenary Meeting (15<sup>th</sup> July 2006)**

A programme was distributed to students and parents:

- 1) Opening 9.40
- 2) Video - *Dear Grandfather, I am in England* 9.45-10.15
- 3) Introducing Mr. Hirakubo and listening to his story 10.15-11.15
- 4) Questions and answers with Mr. Hirakubo 11.15-11.40
- 5) Short Break 11.40-11.50
- 6) Filling in the comment sheet 11.50-12.15 (parents as well as students)
- 7) Closing

The headmaster's DVD, as usual helpfully supplementing the evidence of my notes and the observations of colleagues, confirms how seriously attentive the students remained through all the phases.

After the moving video (described earlier), Mr. Hirakubo talked about his history: it would be hard for students to imagine his youth because their situation was so different from his; his generation did not have TV, cars, and even could not go to school enough. Having generally introduced himself, he described his experience of the Imphal Campaign, how miserable and terrible walking toward Imphal in the rainy season with scarce food was, how he saw young Japanese dead or dying on the road, variously still looking alive, or rotting, or already reduced to bone. He then moved on to talk about his reconciliation work.

Question time for students and parents allowed him to elaborate on his opening account. For example:

*Q: What did you feel and think when you heard the war was over?*

*A: I heard this news at 2.00 in the morning of 16<sup>th</sup> August 1945. All of us felt nothing for around 2 hours. We could not think or consider.....then, gradually, we realised the war was over. On the 25<sup>th</sup> September, we were taken by British army to Mudon to become prisoners.*

*Q: Do you have the reflection that Japan did horrible (bad) things?*

*A: After WWII, the Japanese people became masochistic about blaming themselves for the bad things we did to other Asian peoples. I think we sometimes exaggerated too much.*

*Q: If you think we have war responsibility, to whom are we responsible?*

*A: Wars are caused when we cannot solve matters in diplomatic ways. Before WWII, Japan was impeded from importing oil by four countries, like the U.S. I think both sides were wrong in some way. However, in the Tokyo Trial, only Japan was 'wrong' and U.S. became 'winner' to 'punish Japan'..... We don't have responsibility to foreign*

*countries anymore, because we compensated [them] enough. However, the Japanese government still has the responsibility to construct Japan to a better way.*

*Q: Our generation does not know wars. What should we do?*

*A: I keep giving lectures because I would like you to inherit this thought, 'wars do not produce "winners" and "losers" once they begin'.*

Students and some parents then filled in the **comment sheets**, mostly in Japanese, which we collected and, later, read – which we also sent on to Mr. Hirakubo, who declared himself delighted with them.<sup>90</sup> They contained no negative comments towards him – students and parents generally expressed their thanks for his visit and lecture, which they thought extremely useful, and many specified their respect for his experience of the Imphal Campaign. Two typical student examples:

*Even though I read a lot of books and watch films regarding wars, in the past wars seemed to be other people's affairs. However, I can sympathise with them deeply when I listen to people who actually experienced wars.*

*I am really glad to have learnt a lot about the Imphal Campaign. I gradually realised that we cannot gain anything through wars and get only harm from them. Those who can teach this thought are those who actually went to wars and experienced them. This lecture could not have been given by others, only by Mr. Hirakubo. I hope he will give more lectures to let others gain what I experienced.*

In many such comments, we can see students' self-awareness of the connection between the speaker's personal experience and his impact on them – that their thinking about the Imphal Campaign was now based on 'feeling close' to it. Good videos, novels (stories), current affairs and lectures based on personal experience can also bring students to feel close to issues. Mr. Hirakubo's lecture paralleled AR1's literature and the currency of AR2's Iraq invasion.

Secondly, many students commented on Mr. Hirakubo's thought and action after WWII:

*In his extreme circumstance, I can understand that he could not bury his friends' bodies. I think I could not do so either.... After the confusion, Mr. Hirakubo purposed to make a reconciliation between Japan and Britain. In our own generation, we should also do something that we can do.*

---

<sup>90</sup> Actually, he responded on 16<sup>th</sup> August by inviting the headmaster, the students and our teaching team to the *British-Japanese Reconciliation through Joint Memorials* occasion on 14<sup>th</sup> October in St. Ethelburga's Church near Liverpool Street Station, supported by the Burma Campaign Society. All colleagues and some students went there on that day.

*I was most impressed watching the people who made efforts to have better relationship after WWII, even though Britain and Japan were against each other during the war. I can guess it was very difficult to establish relationships with the WWII enemy, leaving the sad memories in the past. I respect Mr. Hirakubo who accomplished this.*

Understanding and analysing the Imphal Campaign was now more clearly moving in the direction of understanding the habits of thought and values embedded in both cultures – and the meaning of ‘international understanding’. Just as Mr. Hirakubo’s reconciliation work began and continued in actually *experiencing and mingling* with a lot of British, so, more generally, *intercultural experience is a most important factor in ‘international understanding’*. Students in JSSL are well placed in this regard. The ‘dualism’ of English schools on weekdays and JSSL on Saturdays had brought real confusion and suffering to some students, as I knew, but I could see that their daily experience of this dualism had helped them respect and sympathize with Mr. Hirakubo’s project of establishing good relations with the past enemy.

### **The Summer Holiday Assignment (Summer 2006)**

The assignment was to design and write a newspaper article regarding the Imphal Campaign (for which S2 and S3 classes could draw upon, and reinforce, what they had learnt in AR2). We gave the students a format that indicated spaces for the title of their chosen newspaper, the headline, a drawing in lieu of photograph and the body of the article. In the last, they were to address in order who, when and where, why, and how it went and – in the process – to draw on class materials, the session with Mr Hirakubo, and their own investigations. (*See Appendix 6-2*).

Students had to submit the assignment on the first day of the new term, 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2006, to allow the teachers to see how well they now understood the Imphal Campaign before proceeding to the next step a week later. The submitted work was generally well presented, with many good touches (and I retained for my later research purposes a sample of 16 assignments from across S1-S3).

To take just one example, an S1 student used the headline *The Acute Remorse Caused by a Sloppy Plan*. For her mock photo, she drew the scene of Mr. Hirakubo's lecture, including a life-like drawing of Mr. Hirakubo himself, accompanied by the caption:

*Mr. Masao Hirakubo (age 86) on Sat.15th July at JSSL with students of the High School division, 'Every day was like hell.'*

In the body of her article, she referred to Mr. Hirakubo's boyhood dream to become a soldier for Japan and his enlisting at the age of 22 and, in then referring to his many suffering experiences of the Imphal Campaign, she singled out one particular memory:

...when he visited one village to \*supply food for Japanese soldiers ..... Mr. Hirakubo asked the village mayor to prepare rice for 1000 people for a week's survival by 4.00 in the morning. He employed 10 people and prepared. However, what worried them most was that the British Air Force might come. That was some tension! Finally, the rice was prepared and paid for at 7.00 in the evening, but before they could even thank the mayor, the British Air Force attacked them. Mr. Hirakubo hid himself thinking 'I want to become smaller (to hide well)'.

Her 'definition' section included, for example:

\*supply food – The Sloppy Plan caused many problems. The Japanese army's surrounding geography, such as jungles, was unfavourable, [increasing] the difficulty in supplying food.... Despite this, Mutaguchi enforced the Campaign.

A part-example from another S1 student that also demonstrated a growing student understanding of the differences of opinion between soldiers and generals/government:

Who hit upon this Campaign? In summer 1943, the person called Mutaguchi Lieutenant General (Army) suggested the Campaign. Was there nobody against it? As a matter of fact, some people were against the Campaign. They thought it would be much more appropriate to live peacefully in the small land rather than have many people dying meaninglessly. However, most of them could not insist on anything because they were ranked low. Even though they thought the Campaign was meaningless, they could not insist. (S1)

Many articles like these encouraged us to proceed with our plan for the next week's classes and the final Plenary Meeting.

### 6-3. Being Japanese in Britain

#### The Preparatory Class before the Second Plenary Meeting (9<sup>th</sup> Sep 2006)

Students had begun to face up to the question why the Japanese – leaders and followers – had acted like they did in the Imphal Campaign and they could now consider it further by doing an exercise on how the British might have acted if they had been in the Japanese shoes. How might their purposes and actions have been different? And would there have been similar differences between the government side and the ordinary soldiers? This would bring into focus the kinds of *deference* embedded in both cultures and let students think about the reason why there might have been differences of thinking and attitude between British and Japanese. In turn, that would prepare them smoothly for a more general and contemporary consideration of differences in the final PM, and how we can nevertheless understand each other – as our main example for the big AR theme of ‘international understanding’.

Our worksheet for the 9<sup>th</sup> Sept. class was, therefore, as below:

#### For Preparatory Class on 9<sup>th</sup> Sep 2006

<i>1. What was the aim of the Imphal Campaign?</i>	
<i>For Government</i>	<i>For the Individual</i>
<i>2. If we swap situations, how do you think the British people would behave? Please write what you can imagine from your experience.</i>	
<i>The Government</i>	<i>The Individual</i>
<i>3. If 1 and 2 above are different, what do you think causes the difference? If 1 and 2 above are the same, why do you think they are the same?</i>	

We began by returning the summer assignments so the students could then refer to them, as well as to materials supplied in the first term, as they engaged with the worksheet questions.

*In my own class:* discussion began in four groups; representatives of each group made a class presentation structured on the worksheet; and this led on to a whole-class discussion. At the end, each group submitted their worksheet. *See Appendix 6-3(a)*

The tape-record I made of my class's discussion confirms that it was particularly vigorous. Where usually some students were very quiet and did not present their opinions, on that day nearly all participated and often very enthusiastically. This became especially evident when the discussion moved on to comparisons of culture and ways of thinking, reflecting the students' everyday experience and interest in this topic.

Question by question analysis follows of the *range* of responses to the questions above. (Some may surprise the British reader!)

### ***1. What was the aim of the Imphal Campaign?***

*For the Government:*

- to spread Japanese power by invading Imphal;
- Japan kept losing around that period, therefore army commanders were under particular pressure to gain a victory;
- to get other countries to acknowledge Japan as a leading world power;
- to establish a Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere;
- to help India (oppressed by Britain) ... to liberate India from British colonization;
- to capture Asian resources, because Japan lacked resources.

*For the Individual:*

- They had to protect their Japanese families from the enemy;
- Their pride as Japanese meant they wanted to win the war;
- They had some patriotism for Japan;
- Japan was fighting Europeans who discriminated against Asians;
- The soldiers were *forced* to participate in the Campaign....*forced* to believe it could be victorious. .. but great insecurity and frustration spread as they realised the army could not supply enough food.

### ***2. If we swap situations, how do you think the British people would behave?***

*The Government:*

- basically, in the same way as the Japanese government in the desperate situation – if they were the ones to lack resources;
- however, it would consider much more seriously and objectively what would best benefit the nation, whether or not the campaign would be effective;

- Britain would never implement so unreasonable a campaign, because it could see it would lose and it would be meaningless;
- the British did not only ‘help’ India; they also stole resources from them.

*The Individual:*

- British people would oppose this Campaign, when they understand what it was;
- The British cannot be against their ‘boss’, therefore, they would do it if they were ordered – but they would hesitate over it;
- British people do not consider ‘patriotism’; rather, they consider their security.

An interesting point is that the students perceived the differences as individuals to be less marked than those between governments. It is as though, for them, human beings operating individually have the same emotions – and broadly similar reasons for becoming angry, glad, or sad – but differences are more marked when they act as members of their social groups. As described in chapter one, Nakane (1970) defines Japan’s ‘informal structure’ as people’s invisible and subconscious relationships in a top-down society and argues that this informal structure is the source of the energy of Japanese society and creates the unique character of Japan. Japanese people tend to follow what the top tells them, therefore government decisions also depend on what top people consider and implement. It is then extremely important to recognise what kind of people (informally) construct and instruct the Japanese government. In the students’ more down-to-earth discussion, some saw the British as tending to distinguish ‘government opinion’ and ‘individual opinion’ quite sharply, and some criticised the Japanese for not being able to do this – for the tendency for ‘government opinion’ to become ‘personal opinion’.

### *3. Causes of differences and/or similarities?*

(Discussion here did not lend itself to bullet point summary.) Most students focused mainly on differences – especially between governments. For some, the British government would be more careful about acting in its national interest. Considering Japan’s own benefit, the Imphal Campaign was extremely absurd, as Mr. Hirakubo and others recognised at the time – but the General’s will prevailed.

Students discussed the possibility that the British would have implemented the Campaign if there had been some ‘clear aim’ for it, such as capturing an essential resource – but then

noticed that getting a resource was not the Japanese direct objective. (As one student then observed, Japan lacked a clear aim for the Campaign.)

A thoughtful final comment from one student was that Britain might not have started the war in the first place, if it were in Japan's shoes; it might have sought the solution in a different way. Considering the good of the nation and people, would they not avoid the war?

When we teachers compared notes after the classes, we found some *significant differences in the ways the classes responded*. In discussing 'group-culture' and 'individualism', some S2 students had insisted that, as Japanese, they could not really understand what 'individual' meant. It seemed to them that while 'individualistic' consciousness is natural and original in Britain, in Japan there is group-consciousness – people tend to make groups and to act together; for example, some Japanese people go to toilets together, when one person wants to go. By contrast, the older S3 class considered that such different ways of thinking came down more to individuals than to national types. They questioned the tendency to generalise 'what Japanese are' or 'what British are' and they saw the differences as more personal.

### **Further Preparations for the 2<sup>nd</sup> PM**

We teachers discussed by ourselves the difference between 'understanding' and 'empathy'. Is it possible to understand each other when we have, not just different opinions, but different ways of thinking? 'Understanding' is the measure of how close we can approach to someone's heart. When we 'understand' others, it means not only 'understand objectively', but also subjectively. Efforts to understand others simply by their words will not succeed. Particularly in Japanese, 'I understand you' *means* 'I empathise with your heart'. We truly understand others when we actually experience their situation ('put on their shoes'). In other words, we understand them with objective information and an empathetic heart.

We agreed that this PM should centre on *students discussing among themselves* the relevant differences in ways of thinking. All of them could draw on their everyday 'dual' life and experience to present and analyse examples, then discuss how differences sometimes caused 'uncomfortable feelings' and conflict, finally, how they could avoid or dissolve such

conflicts effectively. We constructed nine *cross-class* groups and a timetabled worksheet of the questions. As a postscript, they should identify the PM's theme in a single sentence.

Three S3 students (now experiencing their third AR) were selected to be chairpersons, to control meetings and sub-meetings, and manage the time. Finally, we designed a short student evaluation form to be filled in at the end of the meeting – which would prove to be informative. Once again, the Headmaster would kindly record the whole meeting, which would give me more freedom to watch and observe its development – as well as making a DVD available for later analysis.

### **The 2<sup>nd</sup> Plenary Meeting (16<sup>th</sup> Sept. 2006)**

---

#### **Programme**

*Chairpersons: Taro, Hachiro, Kuro*

9.45-9.48	Opening
	<i>In groups:</i>
9.48-10.15	Examples of the different ways of thinking between Britain and Japan
10.15-10.40	Examples of conflicts caused by different ways of thinking Examples where different ways of thinking do not cause conflicts
	[ Break ]
10.55-11.20	Analysing how we avoid conflicts
11.20-12.00	Presentations of the group representatives
12.00-12.15	Writing what you learnt from this PM
12.15	Closing

---

As it happened, the group work and presentations would take less time than planned and there would be time for an unscheduled but very lively and useful *plenary discussion*.

That DVD confirms my observation notes and memory that the meeting ‘buzzed’ in the way it maintained students’ interest and participation and the teachers, who had also lived a long time in Britain, are seen to be offering a lot of comments and advice to students. The Headmaster, too, appears in discussion with the students (who are listening attentively).

The account below is based on the 9 responses to the group worksheet, supplemented by the DVD.<sup>91</sup>

*(i) Different ways of thinking*

In this phase, most groups referred to the seniority relationships – superior/inferior; senior/junior – in Japanese society and they were inclined to see this as fundamental to many other perceived differences. Sometimes the difference in question is seen as favouring the British:

British students have much more responsibility for their own actions. Because Japanese students can depend on their teachers and parents in many ways, they push their own responsibility on to seniors when something happens. At the same time, Japanese are concerned about seniority, so they can be very modest to seniors. Also they are concerned about what the world is saying about them.

Japanese can easily slip in with the prevailing atmosphere. However, the British are very good at insisting on their own opinions in front of people because they learn how to assert themselves in the schools. In their curriculum, they spare a lot of time for debate.

Japanese make efforts to coordinate with their context. They are always aware of others' eyes.

Tatsuru Uchida, a professor of Kobe College University, analysed this trait further in *Japan on the Frontier*. He argues that we Japanese make much of people's intimacy [connection] with the situation, as opposed to the consistency of our own thoughts and actions. We acknowledge 'defeat' before authority – we display passivity – to send a message of obedience and intimacy, as also mentioned in Masao Maruyama's book, *The Mentality of the Ultra Nationalist*. Japanese soldiers did not have a consistent political ideology, but they had a competitive awareness of their intimacy with the ultimate valuable existence, the emperor. [2009: 44-5]

Other student perceptions can be interpreted as favouring the Japanese, particularly that Japanese people respect and expect a high level of courtesy (manners) – and 'courtesy'

---

<sup>91</sup> Worksheet Responses in *Appendix 6-3(b)*.

extends to the ethical. For example, most of us never steal; a high percentage of things that are left behind in the train or bus (including wallets) get returned to the owners.

A perhaps more neutral comparison that some groups picked out was that the Japanese are very tight for time and very punctual – are ‘bound’ by time – whereas the British seem more easygoing and not to mind train delays and cancellations very much.<sup>92</sup>

*(ii) Differences as Conflicts*

Now the DVD shows the groups increasingly active in the discussion and seeming to enjoy it – and the subsequent presentations. The subject was after all close to their daily lives. The many examples of ‘conflicts’ that they found included the following concrete examples of how Japanese tend to assume hierarchy – and may get angry in its absence:

In Britain, we don’t attach ‘respect words’ to names. We address senior students as ‘Tom’ or ‘Alice’, never ‘Mr. Tom’ or ‘Miss Alice’. We are equal friends in the English school. However, in the Japanese school, senior students become really angry if we don’t attach ‘san’ or ‘senpai’ after their names.

British people are not punctual, while Japanese are very punctual. Japanese people become very angry about the tube, because they are often late or are suddenly suspended.

Japanese people cannot insist on their own opinions straight and do not get straight to the point. British people get straight to the point.<sup>93</sup>

The service in various British shops is very bad. When Japanese people come to Britain from Japan, they become angry at their attitude to the customers.....In any Japanese shop, the shop assistants will treat customers very politely; they behave as if their position is lower than the customer’s and this attitude makes customers feel better.

I can personally relate to the last observation. When waiters and waitresses served me very politely in restaurants in Japan, I felt very comfortable and I took it for granted when I lived there. So in Britain I had many ‘terrible’ customer experiences at first. The shop assistants’ attitude seemed conceited, as though they looked down on the customers. They would talk back and make excuses if we complained about something. In time I would learn that in

---

<sup>92</sup> This, too, can be related to our ‘seniority system’, inasmuch as relatively junior people are much more ‘bound’ than relatively senior people.

<sup>93</sup> How this could lead to resentment and conflict was left implicit, but it is not difficult to imagine.

Britain, shop assistants and customers are indeed equal. The shop assistant's role is to 'kindly' serve the customer. If customers behave rudely or complain, the shop assistant can chase them away. Customers even say 'thank you' to shop assistants for serving them. (I was very surprised the first time I heard my husband do this.) In Japan, customers are seen as 'king'. Because they pay money and give benefit to shops, they are seen as 'superior' to the shop assistants. To add a 'thank you' would be inappropriate; it is for the shop assistants to feel very grateful to the customers. The frustration I felt over this for a long time made it easy to understand the students' opinions (and it was noticeable that the other teachers also seemed to sympathise with them).

Because this hierarchical thinking is embedded in Japan, when people meet each other for the first time they automatically judge their relative 'status' and how to act accordingly. The Japanese language easily shows shades of 'superiority' and 'inferiority'. Over time, I have come to recognise that the British also automatically register 'class' and how to respond to it when they first meet each other. However, they are much more subtle in their behaviour and the distinctions between 'respect' words and 'normal' words are much less obvious in English.

### *(iii) Preventing and Dissolving Conflicts*

One group expressed very well a viewpoint that was widespread across the groups:

We should *understand* each other's differences and prejudices. For understanding the difference, we should actually *experience* and *think*. We have to be prepared to understand the difference. (*italics added*)

In reference to the different attitudes to time, the Deputy Headmaster would later point to the gradual impact on sympathy and understanding of actually *living* in the new culture:

In Japan, a one minute late train becomes a big problem. I take it for granted in Japan. However, after I have lived in Britain for a long time: 'buses will come whenever they would like to come'. The degree of understanding the different culture relates to our own way of living.

In the time to spare after the group presentations students returned to all these matters and freely – and often excitedly – expressed their own individual opinions. Some comments that seem particularly interesting.

I think this plenary meeting is a very valuable opportunity to consider the importance of 'international understanding'. However, I really think that only the Japanese try to understand and make efforts. I cannot imagine that English schools would have such a good plenary meeting [on this topic]. For the English, their basic thinking is 'oh, you live in Britain, so of course you should totally get used to British culture'. Their thinking is one-sided and does not really try to understand different cultures in their deep-down thinking.

This is a perceptive observation, though we missed an opportunity to refer to the similar (or worse?) complaint that minority groups in Japan might be able to make. Another comment could similarly rely on these students' good cross-cultural understanding, while pointing in a different direction to the previous one:

After WWII, Japanese thought that only Japanese were 'victims' of the war. However, the 'victims' were on both sides. In the Japanese mind, top-down thinking is deeply embedded, therefore, they just apply this thought to the 'victim' complex. It is very important to discuss international understanding; however, we could not have so much 'excitement' if we all are 'genuine' Japanese. [*i.e. stereotypes*]

It can be analysed that the most important element of 'cross-cultural understanding' is not something taught in school. Teachers may indicate, for example, 'Oh, this is a cultural difference. Please recognise it!', but students have to experience and think it for themselves. The personal change in each person's own mind is the most important factor for cross-cultural understanding. However, given the accumulated experience of these students, the school's role in facilitating that personal change by 'research', discussion and reflection can be truly rewarding.

(iv) *In a sentence, what was the meeting's Main Theme?*

For most groups it was simply *the cultural difference (between Britain and Japan)*. Just one group identified *international understanding*. Another chose *how to reduce conflicts*, which may have been meant to include international as well as intercultural conflicts.<sup>94</sup>

---

<sup>94</sup> Had we asked for the main theme *of the whole AR*, more groups might have identified international understanding.

## 6-4. Student and Teacher Evaluations

### The Student Evaluation of the second PM

Answering three prepared questions about their learning, the PM's purpose and how they can now act was the student's last act of the Plenary Meeting. The DVD shows them generally thinking about the issues, concentrating on the task, many still looking excited – and the purpose, indeed, was to extend their learning, as well as to give feedback to teachers.

*(1) What did you learn in the Plenary Meeting (...in detail and logically...)?*

Just about every student identifies the importance of understanding the different cultures. However, their comments approach this from different contexts and views.

*(i) Living Together:*

What I learned mainly .....is that there are big differences between the British and Japanese. From the Japanese point of view, it seems that British lack common sense. However, in Britain it is their common sense for them. This difference of recognition causes the friction.

And an original solution to problems:

I was thinking that 'understanding a different culture' is impossible. It takes a long time to properly understand those who are different from me, and even when there is no 'cultural' difference between us I cannot understand them completely. However, I thought the most important thing is not to recognise the inordinate word 'cultural difference' when we live together.

*(ii) Social Structure Roots*

Some responses referred cultural difference to social structure and were clearly influenced by the analysis that the Japanese way of thought comes from our deeply hierarchical mind, so that, seeing Western countries (particularly US and Britain) as 'masters', we blindly fall in with their culture, but can become very cold to some countries once we think they are 'inferior' to us. An excellent response to this:

Every student has their own opinion about 'which is superior'. Some students think that British are superior, some think Japanese are superior, or some think they are same. How can we relate to those who have a different culture? How can we diminish the friction? We should throw away 'which is superior' and make up for each other's unevenness.

*(iii) What students can do*

I understand again the cultural difference and the conflicts caused by this. Through discussion, I understand more deeply what I can do now to make people understand Japan.

It is very difficult for Japanese people to live as 'Japanese' with the British in Britain..... to survive, they should be passive, accept British culture, and learn to understand British 'common sense'.

The latter student understands Japanese culture and has 'Japanese' identity, since his parents are Japanese and they live as a Japanese family in Britain. But he may have suffered from the cultural difference and have thought his way through to this rather 'unhappy' solution.

*(2) What was the Purpose of this Plenary Meeting (... in detail and logically..)?*

*(i) Understanding the cultural difference between the two countries – or countries more generally*

In my group, we concluded the main theme of this plenary meeting is recognition of the cultural difference between Britain and Japan. The meeting made people aware of the difference and got them seeking for the solution.

To discuss how to solve the friction caused by the cultural differences between countries. ....with reference to the difference between Japan and Britain.

*(ii) Some emphasised the importance of action to follow the understanding:*

The purpose ....was to locate the cultural difference and [then] work for the advantage of both countries. We should achieve something in practice.

What we can do is not just 'put up' with British people [but]... 'live together' with them and learn to do this pleasantly.

*(iii) For some students the significance of the plenary process itself – exchanging opinions with people of different classes and ages – overshadowed larger considerations:*

The purpose of the plenary meeting is to mingle with students from other classes, exchange our opinions and discuss the same theme. We can learn a lot of new facts in sharing opinions with those whom I did not know well before.

I don't have so many opportunities to express my opinions in front of the people from different classes. This plenary meeting gave me these opportunities to express myself.

(3) *What can you do individually after the Plenary Meeting?*

Adding to what some had already said about this, I can guess that some students felt encouraged to be more ‘confident’ about their Japanese culture, inasmuch as several were enthusiastic about introducing Japanese culture to English people (and, in some cases, vice-versa).

I can tell English friends about Japanese culture and, also, what English culture is to Japanese friends. Not so many foreigners live in Japan, so they really do not know different cultures.

When I have an opportunity, I can introduce Japanese culture to friends. I can begin from small things.....

I would like to introduce Japanese culture, such as manga (comic books), music and magazines, to friends more frequently.

However, understanding cultural differences is more than making our own culture ‘appealing’ to others. The goal is understanding *each other*, so we can establish a more beneficial context for us all. Some students clearly understood the two-way nature of this process. Two final comments that are impressive:

The important thing is not to insist on our own culture. We should always be interested in other cultures and [seek] to understand them better.

First, we listen to others and try to understand them. Then we should make efforts to be understood by them.

### **The Teacher Evaluations**

Directly after the PM, I interviewed three colleagues.<sup>95</sup> (I was happy to see that the recordings and transcripts show that, compared to my interviews after AR1, I avoided talking too much and was better at posing follow-up questions to keep colleagues talking.) Four main areas were addressed.

1) *Placing this AR and others in the subject ‘Japanese literature’?* We teachers had already thought a lot about this and by now, for us all, ARs designed to let students think

---

<sup>95</sup> Teacher W did not wish to be interviewed.

independently, voluntarily and purposefully were already placed within 'Literature and Language' in a broad sense. Y speaks for this consensus:

*Y: Thinking of problems and finding solutions by themselves is 'Japanese literature'. Japanese literature consists of listening, reading, writing and speaking. Understanding what others say and making our own opinions is 'Japanese literature' – whether the theme is 'international understanding' or another.*

2) *Comparing AR3 with AR2:* Teacher Z thought the more structured PM in AR2 had given students more 'rhythm' and protection from boredom, but the AR3 compact timetable was an improvement on the 'stretched' AR2 timetable. Teacher Y's class, however, had preferred AR3, probably because it had provided enough discussion time. She herself preferred it for this reason, as did Teacher X who remembered AR2 as 'too busy' by comparison.

3) *Their individual purposes for the PM and AR3:* Of course, getting students to think freely through class and cross-year discussion was an objective for all, but interesting differences of emphasis emerged from closer analysis. So for Z, group work should not be at the expense of individual initiative:

*What I really want students to realise is that it is possible to find our own solutions by ourselves. I do not want them to be just passive. Group work itself is quite useful, but not when some members in the same group insist on answering for others. It is important to listen, but also important to make their own opinions ..... I want them to be resourceful, to solve problems by themselves.*

Y emphasised the value of the students' dual experience and understanding for avoiding and resolving conflict, but X questioned whether the students are really aware of the cultural gap between Britain and Japan? Those brought up mainly in the UK (the majority) are conditioned by their relatively easy dual experience to *underestimate* this difference. She had challenged students to acknowledge this.

*X: I think that the purpose of AR3 was to let students think. The ultimate purpose was to avoid conflict, but in the first place students should be aware of the differences between British and Japanese culture..... I am very impressed that some students are saying, 'we never understand each other!' I think it is important that they realise this. We never can put ourselves in other shoes. We say 'understanding is important', but we cannot do anything. If we are aware of this [the magnitude of the difference] then we have a chance to think what we can do.*

*I: Do you mean that we should not be just aware of difference, but should think of our possible action .... that AR3 should have provided some base for students' voluntary action?*

*X: That's it!*

X's final purpose here is exactly my ultimate aspiration for the ARs, that they would motivate students towards 'activism'— beyond discussion, awareness of difference, and knowing how to avoid conflict. This makes the theme 'international understanding' especially suitable for JSSL students, in my view. They experience the intercultural challenge in their daily lives (even if mostly subconsciously) and they more or less actively respond to it. Their opportunities for 'action' are greater than those directly associated with AR1 and AR2.

4) *Thoughts on the structure of AR3:* All of us felt *some* discontinuity between the two parts of this AR, the 'Imphal Campaign' and 'international understanding'. Connecting Mr. Hiramkubo's precious lecture to 'international understanding' was tricky and, for Y, better to have separated them and given more time to the students' experience of cultural friction. X focussed on the 'huge gap' between Mr. Hiramkubo and us – true to her very demanding standard for real intercultural understanding. Even after his lecture and the video, we never truly 'understood' his experience in the way we can understand our own daily-life experience, though our experience can indeed lead us to our own diluted 'international understanding'. We had 'mixed up' two different kinds of 'international understanding' in AR3, X thought. However, for Z the felt discontinuity was a matter of mismanagement. The students we had appointed as MCs for AR2 were not sufficiently briefed to cope with the range of questions that arose from this relatively open-structured PM.

For me, the AR3 structure was excellent *in principle*. We needed the return to wartime that Mr Hiramkubo provided to keep 'peace' in our sights. Imagining and understanding his experience by empathy was the key to keep thinking independently and voluntarily about peace. To then add some element of 'action' we needed the students to reflect on their own experience of, and their own greater potential for, intercultural living. The two kinds of 'international understanding' were complementary. *In practice*, we could have articulated

this more clearly, both for ourselves and the students – but it can be hoped that students ‘got it’, if only subconsciously. Their formal feedback had not included it as an issue.

Listening to these interviews reminded me that I was at all times supported by very smart, intelligent and thoughtful colleagues. I am sincerely grateful for their tremendous collaboration.

### **6-5. Conclusion: Progression in the ARs**

To accept and understand those who are completely different from us is a very difficult process, no matter how appealing they make their own culture. However, there are ways to begin to nurture understanding ‘from the bottom of our hearts’ and they begin with sympathetic sharing of experience. *One way of seeing the progression in our ARs is as follows.* A main purpose in AR1 was to enter sympathetically into the lives of the chosen literary characters in their WWII times, very different times from anything any of us had experienced in our lives. However, sympathy and imagination alone can be easily manipulated by mass media, as happened during WWII, so in AR2 we examined the interaction of mass media and government and how we can nurture our analytic and critical thinking in their regard. Harmonising sympathy / imagination with analysis / critical thinking, we can hope to understand others and to properly communicate with them. This tends towards real ‘democracy’ and peace in the world. AR3 displayed the potentiality of *intercultural experience* for facilitating this tendency.

## Chapter 7 Comparable Research Studies

This chapter will discuss nine research studies relating to education for peace / international understanding / democracy. All but one of these nine self-identified as ‘action research’. Because JSSL is part of the Japanese system, six of the chosen nine are Japanese. Five belong to the same period as our JSSL ARs. The sixth is the only one I could find from the post-2006 period and the possible reasons for that later shortage will be considered. These studies are followed by a brief discussion of some of Michael Apple’s ideas that I found were attracting Japanese attention in the later period, followed in turn by analysis of an earlier, very ambitious, American AR that also seemed to be attracting some Japanese interest at this time. The chapter concludes with two British studies, one based on workshop analysis and one final AR.

### 7-1. Action Researches in Japanese Classes 2003-2006

Five studies published between 2003 and 2006 will be mentioned in this section, all relating to the themes of peace education and international understanding and all identifying themselves as action research, though it will be seen that they varied significantly in approach, contextual features, duration and findings. Because they were becoming available at the time when ARs 1-3 were being planned and conducted in London, they could have stimulated and helped my colleagues and me if I had discovered them at the time.<sup>96</sup> It remains fruitful to consider them for two reasons. One is to show the state of ‘the field’ in Japan at that time, remembering that JSSL is a part of Japanese education. The other is to note the different ways in which they ‘resonate with’ – support, contrast, challenge – one or more of our ARs.

The first three appeared in a collection published by the Association for International Understanding in Education in 2006<sup>97</sup>, the fourth as part of a 2003 research report from

---

<sup>96</sup> Why this main literature survey did not take place in advance of our ARs is explained in the final section of chapter 1 above.

<sup>97</sup> *Theoretical and Practical Research for Curriculum Development for International Understanding in Education for the Global Age* 「グローバル時代に対応した国際理解教育のカリキュラム開発に関する理論的・実践的研究」：(1)

Hokkaido University of Education,<sup>98</sup> and the fifth, in 2004, in a journal published from Tomakomai National College of Technology<sup>99</sup>. Internal evidence suggests that the first collection is ‘professional’, intended mainly for teacher-readers, while the other two reports are notably more ‘academic’ in tone.

1) *Japanese History in the Senior 2 Social Studies Class in Kawadana High School in April-December 2004* (publ. in ...*International Understanding in Education* ..., (2006)

In this ‘professional’ report, teacher Takeshi Araki describes and analyses an 8-hour action investigation with his students of *the songs, especially the war-songs*, which were being sung during the Meiji, Taisho and Showa periods. An overview of the historical background in each period helped and encouraged the students to look for and to identify the ‘messages’ behind songs; also to realise the complexity of those messages since each song can be analysed from different standpoints, such as those of politicians, the ordinary Japanese people, and the Korean or Chinese people. War songs, especially, were used both to nurture Japanese people’s positive will and preparedness to join in wars and, on the other hand, to intimidate the peoples of ‘the colonies’. They promoted both Japanese self-pride and prejudicial fear in the others. Araki made students question the ethics of both these propaganda effects.

He summarised what students learned from this investigation. They were positively engaged from the beginning, though many did not immediately understand the meaning of songs – for instance, from before and during WWII – until they had filled out their historical knowledge of the period in question. By the end, however, many were insisting, for example, that ‘we Japanese’ needed to reflect on what ‘we’ had done to Asian peoples during WWII.

Araki’s analysis included a risk-assessment of introducing students to such songs. Might they appeal directly to students’ emotions and promote a nationalist and war-like fervour in

---

pp176-180; (2) pp162-165; (3) pp 181-183. [I will refer to it as ‘...*International Understanding in Education*...’]

<sup>98</sup>The Japan-United States Educational Research Project 2002-2003, pp 75-84

<sup>99</sup> *Records of the Tomakomai Technical College* [世紀から見た20世紀の歴史に関する研究—シンガポールの視点から見た「太平洋戦争」と学生の意識—] vol. 39, pp 173-183

them? However, obviously, everything depends on how they are introduced. And he reminds his readers that songs are also used in social movements and anti-government movements. As to their place in history education, it should *not* be a matter of ‘teaching history’ by songs, but of using songs to *illustrate* aspects of history.

The historical contextualizing and decoding of songs in this study have obvious similarities with our work in AR2 and AR3 on WW2 press cuttings – as well as being conducted with one of the age-groups (S2) that we used in our ARs.

2) *World Peace as a theme in the Junior 2 Integrated Study and Social Studies Classes of the Secondary School of Joetsu Educational University in September-October 2004 (publ. in ...International Understanding in Education..., 2006)*

In this report, also ‘professional’, a Social Study teacher, Kazuki Yanagisawa, argues for the importance of having Japanese citizens who willingly appeal to the world for peace and he describes how he organised a 25 hour-AR to nurture younger students *who would grow up to hope, and to work, for ‘world peace’ independently and voluntarily*. He distinguishes three phases in the AR:

In the first 5 hours, students worked and reported in groups on newspaper cuttings regarding wars and conflicts. They had been assigned to collect these during the summer holidays, and now they categorised them by regions. Also, those who had attended the Hiroshima A-bomb memorial ceremony presented reports. Then they examined photographs of the 9.11 incidents and discussed the difference between wars and terrorism.

In the following 7 hour-phase, students used various materials to find the reasons why peoples have joined battle from the 17<sup>th</sup> century until now. What did peoples want from these wars? Then students investigated a number of constitutions of different countries.

In the final 13 hour-phase, the students focused on, and summarised, issues around a question that was particularly topical at the time. This was whether or not article 9 of the present Japanese constitution, which prohibits Japan from ever having military forces, should be

changed. The students observed and interviewed some members of the Japanese Ground Self-Defence Force in Takada about their experience and their views of article 9. They also listened to the stories of some WWII survivors and discussed with them whether or not Japanese defence forces should be joining the invasion of Iraq. Finally, the class worked together to produce a 'Peace Charter on the Earth'.

Pedagogically, Yanagisawa tried to make students do research as much as possible, to evaluate their data by themselves, and to do their own summarising and presenting when creating their final peace charter. He also insisted that the topics they chose for the assignment accompanying the project should (i) be topical, (ii) be based wholly or partly on what they had learned from experience, (iii) include some experience that had been particularly 'influential' in developing their thought, and (iv) cite different kinds of data. To illustrate the impact of his approach, he tracked the changing views of one girl student, 'A', at each stage, from her initial dislike of social studies as a 'memory subject' to her final comment: *What we can do is to know the world from a range of information-sources, to have our own idea, and feel responsible for it.*

Our AR2 and AR3 also involved getting students to collect newspaper articles regarding conflicts and wars, though where the J2 students used these for information about war, our older students could analyse how wars can distort press reporting. AR3 also interviewed a soldier, Mr Hirakubo, but a retired soldier who had actually experienced WWII and had a mission to reveal and to heal the horrors of war.

3) *Structural Violence – an action-study in a first year (U1) English Conversation class at Tedukayama University in September-October 2004 (publ. in ...International Understanding in Education..., 2006)*

In this third 'professional' study, an English teacher, Yasuko Omi, reports on 12 hours of classes in which she aimed to get her university students to understand 'structural violence in societies', through attending to the story of one celebrated Vietnam War returnee. This was Allen Nelson (1947-2009) and the story was as told in his best-known account, *Mr. Nelson*,

*did you kill people? – the real war story by a Vietnam veteran.*<sup>100</sup> She did not start in the common way of reading from ‘the textbook’ and translating the English into Japanese. Rather, as is especially appropriate when trying to promote international understanding in the English class, she used questioning to facilitate the students in articulating their own views and values relating to war and peace. (As students expressed their own thoughts in English, they could also internalise some English phrases and idioms, making them their own.)

In the first stage, she questioned what ‘war victims’ are to students and wrote up their answers on the blackboard, before then raising the question of whether or not soldiers, such as the US soldiers in the Vietnam War, are also ‘war victims’. In the next step, students read newspaper accounts and watched a video about Allen Nelson to open up the question of what structural violence in a society looks like. Finally, she got the students in groups to create short dramas (‘skits’) in English – from the starter line: *‘I learned about an American soldier, Allen Nelson at school. And that made me consider who the victims of war are.....’* She reports that most students seemed to enjoy the classes, though one student was embarrassed by the style and may not have gained anything from the AR.

Omi describes the facilitator’s job as helping the students to formulate honest opinions, rather than to push her own opinions. She is clearer and more definite in this respect than some of the other researchers being reviewed here.

Omi insists that her first year University project could easily be modified and adapted for high school students. And, indeed, its theme of structural violence was echoed in our AR1 emphasis on the violence of invasion and war, and the kickback effects of this violence on soldiers themselves. These effects were manifested in many of the literature texts we used in our S1-S3 classes in AR1 – and not only in the one text that also focused on a returnee from the Vietnam War. There is indeed a strong resemblance between Omi’s action study and our AR1 – both used ‘story’ to analyse and broaden the concept of ‘war victim’.

---

<sup>100</sup> I met Nelson once at a party in Kobe College, where I worked in the 1990s. Actually, he is fairly famous in Japan, having gone there several times to tell parts of his life story, which were recorded and then published in Japanese. (<http://www.peaceboat.org/english/voyg/49/lob/050524a/index.html> includes articles about him in English).

4) *Japanese and American views of peace*<sup>101</sup>; a study conducted in the Junior 1 Social Studies Class at Higashi Yonesato Secondary School in December 2002 – January 2003 (publ. in Hokkaido University of Education, 2003)

This project, though published in an ‘academic’ journal, was the shortest in my sample and it involved the youngest class. It was led by a Social Studies teacher, Kazunori Abiko, in his own school and it set out to investigate and compare how Japanese and American students considered ‘peace’, and to do this in just 2 hours of work with his young Japanese students.

Abiko had observed classes for thinking about ‘peace’ in Richard Montgomery High School in Washington DC and had noted that peace there was being conceived as ‘mutual understanding across different cultures’. The lessons had not referred to the Pearl Harbour Attack or the A-bombs disaster in Hiroshima / Nagasaki, whereas those references and showing photos of A-bombs victims were normal in Japanese peace education.

In the short action study with his Japanese class, having first introduced his students to the American high school with the aid of photographs, Abiko went on to present the results of a public opinion poll on how US people were responding to the invasion in Iraq and, also, to list the main wars since WWII in which the US had participated. These were background items to two tasks that he then set his students, tasks that he had previously set the American students:

- (i) for all the students, to demonstrate what they knew about wars between Japan and US;
- (ii) for those students who thought wars were wrong whatever happens, to articulate the reasons why they thought this.

After students had presented their opinions, Abiko summarised them on the blackboard and then explained their main difference from those of the US students: the American young people had tended to think that military action is often necessary to ‘make peace’, whereas most of the Japanese class members seemed committed to ‘absolute peace’. Abiko then required his students to think *why* students in US and Japan might thus think differently about ‘peace’.

---

<sup>101</sup> Educational Research for understanding United States- Peace for US and peace for Japan- Report of AR (＊ 国理解教育授業「アメリカの平和・日本の平和」実践報告)

That many Japanese insisted on this ‘absolute peace’ mainly reflected the constitutional regulation (Article 9) that prohibits Japanese from having arms and wars. So, the Japanese students were not surprised that the American students were not against wars ‘in any circumstances’, *because* they did not have a similar constitutional regulation. Furthermore, they themselves would easily change their opinions if faced with a new ‘reality’. When Abiko gave them the challenge ‘but what will you do when Japan is attacked?’, all but one of the majority who had chosen ‘absolute peace’ changed their view to ‘pro-war’.

For the author himself, ‘absolute peace’ remains an important ideal and one that teachers should explain and promote with students. ‘Shallow’ peace education in Japan was the reason for his students’ weak concept of peace. Japanese textbooks for peace education, though generally of high standard, are not enough by themselves to counteract even an imaginary or hypothetical attack. In reality, most students in Japan never think about wars (they are fortunate in never having been exposed to war). Nor have they lived in other countries where they could have experienced other views to challenge their own. (The author acknowledges that he himself had rethought peace when he investigated the US schools.)

However, *actions for peace* that are practical, and can be quite transformational, include introducing students to *international* views and perspectives on peace and peace education (as he had just done in his action research). Such indirect experiences could and should, be facilitated for students and (we could add), might be extended into some forms of more direct communication and discussion. The key is trying to understand opinions that are in varying degrees different, including totally different, from the views that the students are taking for granted.

This is surely a proper conclusion. We could say that peace and democracy education are intrinsically international. Our London students, as well as being older, were in a very advantageous position to realise this international dimension in their learning. We teachers could see how it was almost second nature for them to compare their Japanese and their

British ‘lives’, and our ARs could draw on this double-experience. Of course, we were the *Japanese* School and our job was to teach *Japanese* language and literature. However, our recurring theme of ‘invasion’, especially, was designed to facilitate multi-perspective and self-critical thinking and in AR1 we chose our Japanese writers and texts with this in mind.

5) *Understanding the Singaporean View of the Pacific War*<sup>102</sup> – a study in English Literature S1 Classes at the Private High School in Hokkaido in January-April 2001 (publ. in *Records of the Tomakomai National College of Technology*, 2004)

English teacher Toshihiko Yamanishi’s main focus for this action research were the 115 S1 students at this private school.<sup>103</sup> These students were scheduled for a school trip to Pearl Harbour and the USS Arizona Memorial, leading to participation in a programme of group learning and communication with ‘Brothers and Sisters’ studying at Hawaii University. Later in the year, they would also spend a week in a Language Centre in Canada. To prepare them for these trips, since they had been basically educated in the Japanese view of history, Yamanishi planned to improve their understanding of other countries’ views of the Pacific wars. His central ‘research action’ was to use *an English-language Singaporean textbook* with the students for this purpose. The textbook had been designed for a younger Singaporean age-group (=J2), who were presumably bi-lingual, but its level of English was suitable for his mono-lingual Japanese students.<sup>104</sup>

Yamanishi seems to have dealt with his 115 students in classes of 20-25.<sup>105</sup> In each class he created four groups to take charge of the four main content areas in the textbook:

- War and the Japanese Conquest of Southeast Asia
- Attack on Pearl Harbour, Japan’s Conquest of Southeast Asia

---

<sup>102</sup> ‘On the History of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century through to the 21<sup>st</sup> Century – How Students became aware of the Pacific War from the Singaporean Point of View’ (21世紀から見た20世紀の歴史に関する研究—シンガポールの視点から見た「太平洋戦争」と学生の意識—)

<sup>103</sup> He had also, in September 2000, supplied the pre-questionnaire to 90 J2 students in a nearby government junior high school. As well, perhaps, as being a useful pilot for the questionnaire, this enabled him to include some comparisons between older and younger students. That theme, however, was not really part of his action research.

<sup>104</sup> Actually, however, the English level of these students was high – the content they studied was from the S2 curriculum and 20 of them had already got Grade 2 English Proficiency, which is the norm for S3 students in Japan.

<sup>105</sup> He is clear that he repeated the AR for ‘each class’, but does not mention how many S1 classes this school had. (And it seems he did not bring the classes together for any plenary style meeting, as in our London ARs)

- The defeat of Japan
- The final drive towards victory, the end of the war

The Singaporean point of view on these areas was then addressed in 5 hours of classes, as follows:

- 1) Pre-questionnaire about the Pacific War and A-bombing, supplying reading materials, making groups, understanding the textbook structure, beginning to read materials;
- 2) In-group investigation and careful reading, to prepare materials for presentation to the class;
- 3-4) Presentations in English, each followed by a question and answer session;
- 5) Post-questionnaire on what students thought after the classes, supplying supplementary materials with explanations, writing letters to ‘Big Brothers and Sisters’ prior to the student visit to USS Arizona Memorial in Pearl Harbour.

As indicated above, Yamanishi used the strategy of pre- and post- questionnaires (9-10 closed questions) to investigate how the classes changed and developed the students’ thinking about the pacific wars and the use of A-bombs.<sup>106</sup>

Regarding whether the use of the A-bombs had been right or wrong, none of the minority of students who had previously thought it ‘right’ had changed their opinion to ‘wrong’, but some had changed their opinion from ‘wrong’ to ‘right’. This and other answers showed that a better understanding of the Singaporean view had increased the numbers of students who felt the Japanese responsibility for the pacific war, and their own. More of them now recognised that it was an invasion, not a ‘sacred war’. Therefore, too, most students gave positive responses to the overall question ‘Did you broaden your knowledge of the world and nurture an international view?’

---

<sup>106</sup> Unlike my accounts of our London ARs, his paper does not detail how he analysed returns, or what difficulties he might have had in his analysis.

Yamanishi notes that teachers are often called ‘masochistic’ when they present their students with the Japanese responsibility for those invasions of Asian countries, but, as he adds, this historical misunderstanding and non-reflection about Japanese history is still causing problems in the contemporary world. So, as a reflection from his study, he suggests using more English textbooks describing other countries’ viewpoints in the schools. For example, in Integrated Study classes, students could draw on such textbooks to combine research and presentation through English literature, Japanese literature and Japanese / World history.

This study has many of the same elements as in our ARs: the language-teaching context; the strong focus on the wars and invasions in the Pacific and letting students investigate these from different angles (as in our ARs 1 and 3 especially); the emphasis on international understanding (as in our ARs 2 and 3) and the actual experiential links with people or organisations working in that field (as in AR 3); and the use of the pre and post questionnaire technique to investigate the changes in students’ views and awareness during the AR (as in our ARs 1 and 2).

## **7-2. After 2006**

I could find just one action-study in the area of peace/democratic education in the secondary school age-groups. It was ‘academic’, published in the Japanese language *Journal of Social Studies*.<sup>107</sup> This scarcity may reflect a more general move back in these recent times to more ‘contents-driven’ curricula and more teacher-centred pedagogy in Japan. This move follows MEXT’s introduction from 2007 of National Academic Tests (全国的な学力調査) in Japanese Language and Mathematics for the highest classes in both Primary and Junior High Schools (P6 and J3 students). Such tests had been abolished in Japan in the 1960s, because they stimulated cramming schools and excessive student competition. Later, however, the introduction of the relatively unregulated subject Integrated Study, accompanied by reductions in class hours (from 33 hours to 29 hours per week for P4, for example), became associated with the catch-phrase ‘yutori kyoiku’= ‘pressure-free education’. Some researchers then led a reaction against this movement. For example, already in 2003 Keiichiro Kobori insisted that it would lead to a decline in Japanese literature performance,

---

<sup>107</sup> In Japanese: 社会科教育研究

for which nurturing basic skills such as remembering Chinese characters is most important.<sup>108</sup> Later Hideo Kageyama observed that students do not naturally want to memorise Chinese characters or to repeat calculating practice, because these are simple and painful tasks and, therefore, diminish their individuality and independence – and, yet, if teachers really want to improve their students’ academic abilities, they must educate them hard!<sup>109</sup> Such critiques surely paved the way for the reintroduction of the national tests – and also, perhaps, for reducing teacher enthusiasm for action research relating to peace and democracy.

*6) Thinking independently about conflicts and conflict resolution in the Modern World, an action study conducted in Social Studies at Koiwa High School, Tokyo in 2010 (publ. in Journal of Social Studies No.114, 2011)*

Toshifumi Atsumi describes and evaluates a packed 3-hour project he organised for his Social Study class.<sup>110</sup> This was one of six action researches reported in a special issue of the Journal of Social Studies, but the only one that is relevant to peace/democracy education in the secondary school.

In the first hour, students read about a selection of recent international conflicts in their textbook, and were then asked to ‘solve’ a fictional dispute between two countries regarding fishery boundaries. Each student completed a worksheet outlining their own plan for an agreement, while learning what terms like ‘territory’ ‘territorial waters’ and ‘Exclusive Economic Zone’ mean. They submitted these individual worksheets to Atsumi at the end of the hour.

In the second hour, Atsumi supplied copies of some students’ plans for discussion. The other students compared their own plans with these, shared points arising with other students, and put questions to the authors of those plans. As a result of these discussions, they made

---

<sup>108</sup> in Takashi Kimura (2003) *Responsible Adults* (PHP pub.)

<sup>109</sup> in Takahiro Yamaguchi (ed. 2007) *The Education in This Country* (Alc pub.)

<sup>110</sup> The full title of Atsumi’s study translates as *Classes for High School students to think independently about Modern Society: Through an Analysis of Subjects for “A Decade of Law-Related Education in Japan”*. The reference to law relates the study to a Japanese project for the first decade of the new millennium: to introduce jury service and encourage schools to engage their pupils with legal proceedings e.g. by observing trials.

revisions to their own plans, before working towards producing a bigger plan of the class as a whole. From among the plans then proposed, they chose the best one and, together, tried to make it better still. At the end of class, they read newspaper articles regarding a real fisheries agreement between Japan and Korea.

In the third hour, the class reflected more generally on what peace means. It was proposed that the most important process in solving conflicts is discussion and consensus-building. However, in the previous class some students had said ‘discussion is useless; we should use force for a solution.’ Atsumi now asks the class, ‘is it right to use force to protect peace for our own countries?’ Many students understand that peace is important and wars are not right, while also having heard the justification of war ‘to protect peace by removing weapons of mass destruction’. After discussion, students wrote their opinions about what peace is.

Atsumi’s objective was to get students to recognise that the main characters for building peace are ‘us’, not some ‘shadowy’ governmental people, to realise that, as citizens in a democratic society, they can voluntarily and independently choose to act for peace. There are definite similarities here with the objective and the ‘building’ pedagogy of my AR2. It, too, was organised to improve students’ voluntary and independent thinking around peace and the issues involved in the invasion of Iraq. Also, it too, built up gradually: from preparatory essay assignments, to class reflection on ‘book’ collections of these essays, to further discussion of the civic responsibilities of both the mass media and media consumers.

7) In addition to this single study, it is worth referring to Japanese interest of this post-2006 period in the work of the American sociologist, *Michael Apple*. Minoru Sawada<sup>111</sup> describes how Apple promotes the ‘new sociology’ approach of undertaking theoretical analysis of what happens ‘inside’ school and of what knowledge is included in the school curriculum.

Apple tried to investigate what kind of knowledge should be dealt in priority and who will get benefit from placing knowledge in this or that particular way. (p.62)

---

<sup>111</sup> ‘Some Aspects of the Critical Educational Studies in the United States of America for the Critical Re-examination of Michael Apple’, in *Nagoya Women’s University Bulletin* 55, 2009.

The school does not have to be the 'black box' which always produces inequality, as Neo-Marxists claim. That 'black box' involves a mechanistic picture of children as 'input' to schools, being 'put-through' an unexamined process, and eventually 'produced' (=output) as a structurally unequal labour force. However, that picture remains theoretically inadequate until the school's internal curriculum process is itself examined.

Apple clarified how the content of the curriculum suits ruling class people's needs. Apple also pointed out that the system – teachers systematically make children acquire the knowledge divided by subject to some certain level – is similar to industrialised and commercialised theory. This type of .....theory can be applied to teachers' work. They use already packaged curriculum to improve educational efficiency, thus they tend to lose their original skills to design their own curriculum for students, schools and the local area with which they are directly involved. ... Teachers lose their independence to create their own curriculum and then they become 'proletarians'. (p.62)

However, as Apple and Beane themselves insist in the first chapter of their edited volume *Democratic Schools: Lessons in Powerful Education* (2007),<sup>112</sup> it does not have to be this way. Democratic schools can focus on cooperation and collaboration rather than competition. Such attitudes can be nurtured by changing curriculum and creating community together among the students attending their school classes every day. They insist that the democratic mind can be nurtured through democratic experience. It will, however, be difficult:

While democracy depends on caring for the common good, too many schools have emphasized individuality, based almost entirely on self-interest as students, and their families become "consumers" of credits and credentials rather than citizens in a collaborative community. While democracy prizes diversity, too many schools have largely catered to the interests and aspirations of the most powerful groups and ignored those of the less powerful. (p.13).

Most Japanese schools have become more seriously competitive, and therefore less democratic. Returning to work in my own Kobe College from last year (after a 12-year gap), I gained a strong impression that more students and their parents now are inclined to choose schools as 'consumers' and to use the criterion: "*good*" schools are those that send students to "*good*" universities. They often seem just to care about how many students went to Tokyo University or Kyoto University and to pay little attention to what kind of students the

---

<sup>112</sup> First published in the mid-1990s, second edition 2007, and translated into Japanese as 『デモクラティック・スクール』

schools want to nurture. Especially considering the College's traditions of critical independence, Apple and Beane's comment rings true:

The frustrations involved in creating democratic schools are only exceeded by the more ambitious task of maintaining them in the face of nondemocratic currents in public opinion and educational policy (p.14).

Schools and teachers need great efforts to understand this difficulty but to maintain their passion to create democratic classes for students. Apple and Beane state well the important points of democratic curriculum:

...democratic curriculum emphasizes access to a wide range of information and the right of those of varied opinions to have their viewpoints heard. Educators in a democratic society have an obligation to help young people seek out a range of ideas and to voice their own.

### **7-3. Three Non-Japanese Studies**

What are truly democratic classes? This older American AR, which appears in the same Apple and Beane book, offers a very good example. It has points both of interesting similarity and interesting difference with the JSSL ARs and it requires a more extended discussion.

8) *The Situation Made Us Special, an action study conducted over a year in a 7th grade (=J1) class in Marquette Middle School, Madison, Wisconsin (before 1995).*

Barbara L. Brodhagen' experience had led her (like many other teachers) to question the usual routines of the standard school day:

A lot of what happened....didn't seem to make sense to students, and teachers rarely tried to connect what students were learning from one class to the next. Students' usual routine was to sit and listen for 45 minutes and then go to the next class and do the same. When young people asked, "Why do we have to learn this?" or "Is this going to be on the test?" or "Do we have to remember this?" I was sometimes not really sure how to answer them. The students, both learning disabled and not, were frustrated, and so was I..... I began talking to colleagues and friends, trying to create another view of school.

She also had taught learning disabled students using an integrated curriculum that she ‘made’ with the students and in which they could learn what really interested them.<sup>113</sup> Drawing on that experience, and supported by her school principal and by a math and science teacher who ‘happily accepted her invitation’ to collaborate, she conducted a year-long AR with her class of young students. It would be not just about improving the class’s academic performance, but about transforming its whole ethos and, even, the style of its Parent-Teacher Association.

Brodhagen reasoned first that to follow school and class rules in a positive spirit, students had to become **a cooperative community** rather than just competing individuals. The way to get to know each other very well was, first, each student to investigate himself or herself and, then, to interview one another and make introductions of each other to the entire group:

The theme (selected by the teachers) for the first two weeks was *who are we? who am I?*. Students and teachers together decided that a survey to which everyone contributed questions would help us find out more about one another. The groups wanted to know where everyone had come from, so we designed a family history form, and each person went home, and recorded all the countries their ancestors had come from. The information from the forms was used to make maps identifying these countries and to compute each country’s distance from Madison (p.87).

From there the students proceeded to suggest some class rules and one student’s idea was adopted that these rules should be called their ‘constitution’. Rather than being forced to follow this constitution, they proved willing to do so because they had made it. Brodhagen observes quite strikingly that they never made light of it.

Further bonding came from a ‘sharing time’ on Monday mornings, another suggestion by students:

---

<sup>113</sup>Minoru Sawada, the translator of *Democratic Schools*, called this approach ‘constructivist’ and explained it in a footnote:

The constructivist approach is not just the passive intake of learning, memorising, knowledge and understanding from outside information, but the recognised subject goes through the process of voluntarily reconstructing the outside information by experiencing, reflecting and linking it to their knowledge / understanding. This theory is rooted in Jean Piaget (1896-1980), Lev Semenovitch Vygotsky (1896-1934) and John Dewey (1859-1952). In the US, people began to focus on this theory from the 1970s to the beginning of the 1980s and it gained more attention when portfolio and performance assessment were introduced in the 1980s and 1990s (tr. p.135).

Any student or students could share something they had done, something that had happened, or something they had heard about. On most Mondays, a time limit was necessary because so many students wanted to participate. We heard about many wonderful experiences and about the many stresses some young people lived under (p.88).

Having become a community and made their own constitution, the students were next invited to join the teachers in **making their curriculum**. The generic format was, first, each student to come up with a relevant item in the form of a question, then common themes among the questions to be identified in group and whole class sessions, then each student to rediscover their own theme in the group/class theme. In this way, it was felt, curriculum was being made together on the basis of the students' real interests.

Broadhagen trained students to have critical eyes and to understand things 'from various viewpoints' and, at least in many cases, different 'subjects' seem to have become different 'viewpoints'. An example from the 'viewpoint of History' was an activity designed to raise questions about the relative anonymity of women who had invented things or spearheaded important social movements:

Students studied women who have made notable contributions toward the improvement of humankind and then tried to locate information about these women in a huge stack of the school's social studies and history textbooks. Students were surprised to find little mention of the women in the textbooks and immediately wanted to know why they had been left out of these chronicles of history. (p.91)

A Science ('Environment Unit') example involved making their classroom into a Museum with a rain forest, woodland forest, desert and other areas, and students being trained to become 'tour guides', before then conducting tours of students in other classes. The students had to 'prepare' (learn) a lot of things, from each other as well as from teachers and in groups of different sizes:

First, students had to decide what biome they wanted to study. Then the large group, including the teachers, had to determine the requirements to be met by each small group. Group members had to decide who was going to do what research. Research had to be completed before any construction could begin. Decisions had to be made about where biomes would be built. Maps needed to be drawn, reports written, speeches practised, and on and on. The guided museum tour was each group's final evaluation for the

“Environment” unit. The tour was videotaped by a teacher, the list of requirements checked by the teachers, and the tour evaluated by students. (p.94)

How did students respond to this responsibility for their curriculum? There was some initial resistance to be overcome:

Some students initially said the work of planning the curriculum was too difficult and asked, “Why don’t you teachers just do all of it?” We were asking them to become active learners who participate in all aspects of their education, from planning to evaluation and most had never been asked to do anything like that before (p.99-100).

Also, academically advanced students had initial difficulty in adapting to this system, until they experienced gradually that collaborative work did not hinder their academic learning. Indeed, all came to see that because the curriculum was planned collaboratively there was less temptation to become lazy or fall asleep. Also, because they had become ‘teachers’ of each other, and could even be involved in inviting specialists of various professions to the class, they depended less heavily on their official teachers – whose job, as Brodhagen mentions, had changed from ‘disseminators of information’ to ‘facilitators of learning’.

She even changed the **parent-teacher conference** to include the students (previously, ‘the absent main topic of discussion’!), who were given tasks such as introducing their parents and teacher to each other and selecting in advance ‘some best work’ to explain to them.

In the truly democratic classes, we can find some ‘power shift’. Like the ARs in JSSL, this AR depended both on colleague collaboration and strong support from the Principal.<sup>114</sup> Like them it was a ‘large’ AR, involving a whole class over a whole year, and in fact a lot ‘larger’ and more intensive in including *all* the classwork of the year across *all* the curriculum.<sup>115</sup> It brought in the knowledge and experience of outside people when appropriate, as we drew on Mr. Hirakubo’s experience of the WWII Imphal Campaign in AR3. Most strikingly,

---

<sup>114</sup> In an epilogue to the second edition, she refers to the essential role of support from the school principal: ‘... the principals in the schools where I had been [previously] did little to actively support or promote democratic practices. It wasn’t that they didn’t believe it was the right thing to do, rather I think it was because they had not experienced such a school and hadn’t been “trained” in where or how to begin.... My current principal has many of the same democratic education goals as my own, and it has become amazingly clear how much easier it is to do this difficult work when the principal and assistant principal are committed to the same goals’ (p.102).

<sup>115</sup> AR1, the ‘largest’ of our ARs, was roughly 25% of the year’s once-a-week work for teachers and students.

however, it was willing to go where the students would lead, given suitable consideration and consensus, as in AR3 we JSSL teachers found ourselves ‘catching up’ on the students’ excitement in sharing their own day-to-day experience of ‘international understanding’ in an AR3 Plenary Session. Then we saw in front of us how when students are truly interested in some matters from their own experience they can engage deeply in the work and how, through exchanging ideas with similarly experienced students, they can truly develop their own thinking. This was a good example of a power shift from teacher-student to student-student. However, the Brodhagen AR was *more radical and consistent* in making students use their own interests in the daily basis to help select and develop the themes for study.<sup>116</sup> Our deliberate choice of generally ‘horizontal’ teaching did not go that far. We teachers selected the themes and constructed the curriculum and pedagogy – though, certainly, we had quite careful attention to what should be interesting for students and to how students were responding! It remains that our pedagogy *for* democracy can itself be considered significantly democratic in our different context.<sup>117</sup>

9) *Workshops exploring Community and Identity for 10-18 year olds in four schools in Leicester, UK, conducted in early 2000. (publ. in Osler and Starkey, Changing Citizenship, 2005)*

Osler and Starkey’s special focus was the particular experience and strengths of young people *in minority communities* and the relevance of this to the citizenship education programmes that were starting in England at the time. Rather than assume that young people with immigrant roots would need ‘extra’ citizenship education, the authors considered ‘they are likely to have experience of emancipatory politics and life politics’ (p.96) in their families and communities, and more sensitivity, for example, to human rights. (The research would test this expectation – and in fact provide a lot of support for it.) Furthermore: ‘If the school curriculum is to be effective it needs to be aware of and to build on young people’s learning in families and communities.’ (p.2)

---

<sup>116</sup> It seems to be the classic progressive approach, especially Dewey’s approach, which I also referred to in AR3.

<sup>117</sup> We can suppose that Brodhagen’s ‘total’ approach was *partly* facilitated by the *age* of her class. An integrated approach to curriculum is less controversial at J1 (7<sup>th</sup> grade) than in senior secondary classes – though Brodhagen went beyond some integrated curricula in insisting on students joining in planning the integration processes – and her young students were not yet faced with high-consequences examinations.

Leicester schools were chosen for the research because of the city's well-known demography.

The demography of Leicester changed considerably during the 1970s as the city began to experience the migration of families from East Africa. The 1990s also saw changes in the population as refugees and asylum-seekers arrived. Many children in the city's schools have a family history of migration, their grandparents or parents having moved to Leicester from a range of other countries (p. 94).

As one of the student participants would say: 'Leicester is called the "multicultural capital" as a lot of communities live together' (p.102).

The participating schools were a primary school, two (contrasting) secondary schools and a 16-19 college. White British students were a minority in the four schools and in some cases a very small minority.<sup>118</sup> In each school, two workshops were conducted with a group of around eight students, including boys and girls and students of different abilities, who were selected by the school from volunteers. The groups were 10-year-olds in the primary school, two groups of 13/14 year-olds in the secondary schools, and older students in the 16-19 college.<sup>119</sup> The same general approach and the same materials were used with all the groups, whatever their age.

In approaching the schools the authors stated their overall purpose and methodology in broad terms:

We explained that we would be conducting two workshops with the group, the purpose of which was to explore their understanding and experience of citizenship, justice/injustice and inclusion/exclusion. We also asked to administer a questionnaire to a whole year group. This covered questions of community, participation, identity and citizenship. (p.97-98)<sup>120</sup>

---

<sup>118</sup> In one of the selected secondary schools there was a significant number of children who had themselves entered Britain as refugees and asylum-seekers; in the selected primary school, on the other hand, there was a significant number of mixed-race children, indicating a trend to inter-community marriages. In general, Asian, and especially Indian, children were the largest number.

<sup>119</sup> In two of the schools, some or all of the group were on their school's Student Council.

<sup>120</sup> From this it is clear that the workshops were part of a wider investigation by Osler and Starkey. However, only the workshops may usefully be compared with our ARs because of their direct interaction with students.

The workshops were designed to research how the young participants understood and experienced rules, rights and responsibilities in the communities, drawing on Parekh's (2000) identification of three factors in community cohesion: a feeling of belonging; gratitude towards and responsibility for the well-being of the community; and a shared symbolism.

The layout of the two workshops is instructive.

The First Workshop. Students made pairs and introduced each other to the group and the visiting researchers: names, particular interests, and what they strongly want to do in future.

This look to the future was then complemented by a consideration of their past and their background. They were invited to make notes about their own background and origins, in terms of geography and place; ethnicity and culture; and their experience, such as key events in their lives (p. 98).

Then in the workshop, students were facilitated to have a discussion about two contrasting newspaper articles. *'Hundreds demonstrate against asylum system'* covered 'a march through the city centre organised by the Leicester Civil Rights Movement following the death by suicide of an asylum-seeker who was due to be deported to Iran'. The second article covered 'the success of a three-year campaign mounted by a young local skateboarder to gain specialised facilities in his local park'. The discussion focussed on their responses to the articles, their involvement in any similar campaigns, and how they can make a difference for others, by involvement in such campaigns.

Finally, each student was given a disposable camera to take photos regarding 'me and my community' to be in time for the second workshop.

### The Second Workshop

Each student now made a poster titled 'me and my community', out of photographs, captions and commentaries, and any other suitable graphic material. In turn, the students presented their posters to the group 'with opportunities for clarification, commentary and discussion'. Finally, they agreed to leave the posters with the researcher, as a source of data and – courteously – the researchers gave them in return their own set of the photographs.

What the researchers found out from this is very interesting. Most students described Leicester as their ‘community’ and their city.

I like living in Leicester because it is multicultural. I like the fact that even though we live in Britain our culture is kept alive. (Asha, 15-year-old girl) (p.114)

The authors draw out the implication:

Since citizenship is a feeling of belonging, these young people are acutely aware of themselves as citizens. The greatest source of pride in their city is the fact that it is a multicultural community and they are firmly committed to a diverse society composed of a variety of religious and ethnic communities (p.102).

The pupils also had a sense of responsibility toward society. For example:

The reason I am bald in this picture is because I was raising money for Comic Relief (Mohan, 10 year-old boy).

Thirdly, they mostly take a pride in their varying cultures and religions, while – in many cases – joining this with a freedom to criticise some traditional elements such as gender roles and the caste system in Hinduism:

It is also clear that religion remains a strong influence for many, but that where traditional religion is perceived as conflicting with ideas of equality and freedoms, it is challenged (p.110-111).

These workshops suggest quite instructively both a contrast and a parallel with our ARs. The *contrast* is in methodology. Clearly, the workshops were pedagogically responsible and interesting and the students are likely to have learnt much from them. However, their main purpose was to *discover* the student views and attitudes, rather than to educate and develop them. Therefore, their analytic focus on student responses is not wrapped up in also evaluating student progress and the effectiveness of the pedagogy in making students think more democratically. In short, unlike our ARs, the workshops were not constructed as action research.

The *parallel* is the shared interest in intercultural understanding. Particularly, AR3’s focus on ‘international understanding’ naturally extended into student realisation and reflection about their own intercultural experience and how much this facilitated them in thinking critically about parts of Japanese history and culture. All our students had mixed

backgrounds, from those born in Japan and living in the UK for as little as a year, to those born and brought up in the UK, but in a partially Japanese context. Interestingly, almost all of them regarded the UK as multicultural and Japan as mono-cultural. One reason for this connects with their own belongingness to the UK, and London in particular, like the Leicester young people above. The other reason is the difficulty they hear about, or may have experienced, that mixed heritage children, and even those being educated outside Japan, have in being accepted as Japanese, or ‘proper’ Japanese. So our students were inclined to the theory that Japanese colonial ventures and related military campaigns, like the Imphal Campaign, were systematically undermined by their unwillingness to think of their ‘colonials’ as ‘Chinese’ or ‘Korean’, rather than as (second-class) Japanese, or to mingle with them or learn from them. Perhaps naively, they also tended to think the British would not have made that mistake!

*10) Citizenship education and students’ identities: a school-based action research project – for pupils aged 11-16, conducted in South Docks Secondary School, London, UK, in 2001 to 2003 [publ. by Hudson in Osler (ed) 2005 and also reported in Osler and Starkey 2005]*

Anne Hudson conceived and led this action research project, with the strong support of her head-teacher and many colleagues (similar to me in JSSL). The context was the imminent introduction of Citizenship Education as a National Curriculum subject in England and Wales from 2002. South Docks School had been selected to be a ‘pilot’ school for this and had been resourced to appoint a youth and community worker as an additional member of staff, who would support the author in her role of ‘citizenship coordinator’. The school was diverse ethnically and linguistically – the first language of 55% of the students was not English. More relevant to the project, the area that most students came from was ‘socially and economically deprived’.

The *disempowerment* resulting from these forms of deprivation became a main ‘target’, first, for the new citizenship curriculum and, second, for the ‘pilot’ research dimension built into it. Much of the planning and then the extensive surveying and analysis of student work and writing, phased interviewing of large student samples, staff interviews and discussions, and thoughtful theorising, focussed on the students’ developing *sense of agency*. Regarding

feedback to practice, findings were certainly fed back into the school's practice at the end of the 2/3year pilot, though the relatively short reports cited above do not state how regularly feedback was occurring during the pilot.

The 14-16 year olds were studying for a new national examination in Citizenship. Most 'units of work' for this ended with some *change-oriented* activity. Furthermore, when doing the assessed course-work that the examination required, most students chose to research a local issue that concerned them directly, or one that had emerged from their own surveys of local people's main issues. Meanwhile, the younger children had two mornings a term of focused citizenship learning – sometimes in the community, for example, investigating local leisure facilities and making recommendations for their improvement. This was indeed 'fieldwork ...including photography and interviews, and developed presentations which were delivered to people with power locally' (Hudson 2005). A relaunched 'School Council', with elected representatives from all the age-groups, also joined the drive for 'engagement', by encouraging themselves and fellow students to investigate issues they thought important, whether in the school, or the community, or both. Osler and Starkey catch the general spirit:

Students wrote to the Sun and the Mirror newspapers commenting on their coverage of the Iraq war and designed posters for the staffroom on fair trade and ethical consumption. For their assessed work they investigated issues of personal concern, such as mobile phone theft, the improvement of local leisure facilities, bullying and making local streets safer. They presented their findings to a range of people with influence and power, including police officers and their Member of Parliament (p.149-150).

The reference here to the police is significant. Community engagement improved the image of the police with these often mistrustful young people, who were now learning the advantages of *cooperating* with the police, rather than *confronting* them. (Presumably, the police's image of young people was also improved!)

In the next step, when students returned with feedback to their classes and teachers, the focus remained on what they could clarify by themselves through discussions, thus reinforcing the development started by their initiatives. Thinking that they can now change somethings in the school – and beyond – they begin to act voluntarily and to participate more positively in the classes.

Another part of the curriculum was two whole-school ‘Citizenship Days’ each year, in which students mingled and worked with students across age-groups, getting some sense of belongingness to the school from the experience. Hudson’s surveys found that this mingling was the *most* popular feature of these days, which agrees with our JSSL experience of the interest and excitement associated with our ‘plenary meetings’. As Hudson states, such cross-age experiences, if well managed, can undoubtedly promote a sense of community in a school. Indeed, in South Docks:

The term ‘community’ had become a new kind of artefact in the life of the school. It was used not only to denote the school itself as a community, but also to refer to the wider community of the locality and the school’s catchment area (p.121).

Drawing on Bradley (2003), Hudson theorises the individual student’s development of *a sense of agency in community* as fluctuating movement along a continuum from ‘passive identity’, to ‘active identity’, to (in some cases) ‘politicized identity’. One of her quoted examples of ‘active identity’ was 16-year old Joshua responding to a question about ‘making a difference’ by referring to his group’s presentation of their research on mobile phone theft to their Member of Parliament, and then adding:

...we made this difference by bringing up important issues which everyone knew about to present to people in power who can make that change which we desire ... many people agreeing means power and power means making changes. (p.123)

An example of ‘politicised identity’ was 12-year old Luke, one of four students who had been elected to a local democratic forum, the ‘Council of Champions’, set up by local community organizations:

I chose to stand for the Council of Champions because I felt I could make a difference by putting my views and other people’s views into action. Like issues to do with education and safety and housing issues ... I actually feel encouraged to do more things for the community ... I’ve learned how to go into the world to make a stand for myself. (p.126).

Through curriculum projects like this, students’ ‘passive identity’ can be developed and they begin to believe that they can change society. However, interviews with teachers in the later stages of the pilot revealed ‘significant unease’ that the enhanced insistence of the student

voices was not always matched by enhanced student implementation and responsibility. One head of department:

I think the difficulty's been the balance between rights and responsibilities. Because I do think from the point of view of the staff they see certain pupils that have been very, very assertive but still don't have an understanding that there has to be a payback or there has to be some sort of balancing out. (p.129)

Hudson sees this concern as pointing towards a better integration of the 'engagement' strand of citizenship education with the 'political literacy' (knowledge and understanding) strand, including a shared focus on the human rights and responsibilities of both staff and students. This is one of the lessons for other schools to take from the pilot in her school:

Sharing learning of this kind across schools could bring enormous benefits. Were the South Docks project to begin again, an important starting point would be to develop the whole community's understanding of human rights, including the relationship between rights and responsibilities. Clarity about the importance of active citizenship learning and political literacy would be high on the agenda too (p.131).

#### **7-4. Conclusion**

I focus here on comparisons with our ARs for democratic education, which aimed to enhance students to think independently, voluntarily, creatively, critically and analytically.

At JSSL, as a Saturday school, and as a school concerned with Language and Literature rather than Social Studies, our ARs could not have included the impressive kinds of community action in the South Docks project. Perhaps, when planning 'inter-cultural understanding' in AR3, we could have included some student engagement with local people – most of our students spoke English fluently – or with the London-Japanese community, but such engagement would surely have been for 'enquiry' rather than 'change' purposes. It would not have been focused directly on developing student 'agency'. Therefore, the South Dock's AR is a reminder that our ARs could not be *full* citizenship education. However, through cultural curriculum, they worked to deepen the students' intelligent and responsible care for peace and democracy. Therefore, they are examples of how language and literature curriculum can *contribute* to citizenship education.

In addition, the ‘plenary’ mingling across ages in our ARs, as in South Docks, seemed to contribute indirectly to a more united and inter-active Senior Division community than before. There was even a view that this improved the Division’s reputation so that aspiring entrants in the Junior-High Division worked harder to reach the required level of Japanese. Such impressions, however, were not formally evaluated in my research.

Considering the scale of the ARs, I can see that the JSSL research, involving all the Senior Division classes over three years, is one of the big 3, along with the American school and South Docks. Of course, size is not everything. I could also learn from the ‘smaller’ studies.

In terms of getting students to think independently, voluntarily, creatively, critically and analytically – and collaboratively – the American school ‘wins’ inasmuch as the students constructed their own whole curriculum. However, JSSL colleagues and I also found ourselves learning from the students, perhaps especially in the Plenary Meetings – and, more generally, my general stance towards the students was one in which I *invited* their contributions. Perhaps, not necessary to go so far as the American school for this!

My ARs are similar to the Leicester workshops in drawing on existing inter-cultural experience. In both cases, inter-cultural circumstance and opportunity were used to advantage. South Docks, like us in our JSSL, used inter-age mingling to re-enthusiast students and build a sense of community (they even got students interacting with workers in communities). In both cases, students were seen to become more able to think and act independently.

In terms of its use of culture, literature, music and song, the first AR of this chapter (Kawadana High School) is closest to my ARs. Both got students reading selected literature (including songs), as part of language teaching more generally, and a part that helps students to appreciate the value and significance of language learning. In terms of historical examples (and older people with a past), and because of its reference to the Japanese past, the Singaporean history book used in teaching a Japanese English class – and, again, the ‘song’ study are close to my ARs.

My literature search and comparisons, also encourages me to believe that my JSSL action research is itself a good addition to the field of peace and democracy education and, perhaps also, an encouragement to others to re-embark on action research in this area.

## Chapter 8

### Final Evaluation of ARs 1-3

#### 8-1 Summary of ARs

In **AR1**, I investigated with the help of my colleagues how we can teach peace and war through Japanese literature. Could students be taught independent and creative ways of thinking about this ‘social studies’ topic through literature, which is what we mainly teach in JSSL? We chose literary items, appropriate to the topic and to the three different class levels, from the lists approved for use in Language and Literature classes in Japanese schools. The items included a short novel or an extended novel excerpt for each class, complemented in my S1 class by poems and letters relating to WW2. The selected novels reflected the authors’ experiences during WWII or the Viet Nam war. Students can ‘experience’ the world written in novels and it was intended that these novels would allow them to imagine vividly the ‘reality’ of what wars are, to engage with the authors’ analyses of the wars and the tragic *invasions* associated with the wars, and to begin to make *their own analyses* of these realities. While the novel itself includes emotion (compared to the newspaper articles that became the medium in AR2), at the same time it spontaneously stimulates students to good visualisation and creative thinking. Good novels and literature, we believed, could be an important support to democracy in Japan.

Through 10 Saturday sessions, the S1 to S3 students worked in their own classes with their own teacher and their own materials, but on the 11<sup>th</sup> Saturday, they and their opinions came together in a carefully planned plenary meeting. This involved our novel cross-age form of independent student discussion. It also included a video about the A-bomb in Nagasaki, postponed until now because of its potentially over-strong impact. We knew that videos, like certain popular comic books, could be used for the emotional manipulation of students, even towards fascism and a hierarchical society, but this video experience was agreed to have been a positive complement to the literature. Our AR experience led to a suggested broad contrast: video tends to impact on *motivation and commitment*, and can do so quite quickly,

while literature develops *imagination and understanding*, and tends to do so piecemeal and slowly.

Evaluation of the AR was constant and varied: informal and formal, formative and summative, collaborative (usually with colleagues, sometimes with students) and personal (e.g. my research diary; this thesis). The most revealing summative evaluations, as reported in chapter 4, were ‘conversational’: semi-structured interviews with students and colleagues, and a final review meeting attended by the Headmaster and Deputy-Head. Their main focus was the PM, as the innovative heart of the whole AR, and particularly the discussions and presentations of the nine mixed-age student groups (observed again in DVD form in the final review meeting). Two things stood out. One was the generally *deep level* of the students’ engagement with peace and war issues. The other was how much this engagement was being facilitated by the PM’s cross-age *discussion*. This became clear to the students themselves as well as to teachers.

A ‘before and after’ questionnaire, despite its limitations, added some further evidence of student development. Where, before, some had responded as if ‘Japanese benefit’ was an adequate reason for its expansionism, after the AR they were more likely to make a more impartial and ethical analysis of Japanese responsibility and imperialism, so, to see colonising invasions of other countries as cruel – whether it was the Japanese invasion of Manchuria or the British colonialism of Africa and India.

How did we teachers develop? When I first suggested the AR, my colleagues had some hesitations, before agreeing to use approved Japanese texts dealing with wars and peace in their classes, too. I had been in no position to ‘command’ them and it was clear that they were doing me a favour. Reflecting this, I did the ‘donkey work’ during this AR, printing out the materials used in all the classes. Also, while general satisfaction was being expressed at how it was going at our almost weekly meetings, none of us had done much to change our pedagogy. We were using the set exercises, questions and model answers that came with the texts or were suggested in our teacher guides, and still expecting the ‘good’ or ‘right’ answers from students.

The PM changed both these things. As one teacher remarked in her post-AR interview, it showed students could consider and create their own opinions. Indeed, we teachers also found ourselves learning and developing our own opinions as we listened to them. So, afterwards, colleagues and students alike were suggesting that we should repeat the AR and PM strategy in the next academic year. Then, colleagues would become much more actively and creatively involved with me in their design and evolution, e.g. by participating in study-meetings and editing ‘books’ of students’ works. They would also make their own worksheets! A favour for me had now become a commitment for them – both to give curriculum time to collaboration on peace and democracy issues and to build a pedagogy for this around discussion.

I was able at the end of chapter 4 to present and agree with the general consensus that AR1 had been well-conceived and mostly well executed. Later, I would realise that its success also supported the more general RICE theory of pedagogy that we had been feeling our way towards, and that my reading of John Elliott would soon be helping me to make explicit.<sup>121</sup>

We moved to **AR2** with a more shared appreciation of the AR-idea and a better understanding of its pedagogy, but we had to reduce the number of dedicated AR sessions significantly because the choice of our literature texts could not always be around war, peace and democracy. So AR2’s non-literary theme of **newspapers** was allocated just three Saturday sessions, including a final plenary session, though now with two preparatory writing assignments in the summer and winter holidays. It focused mainly on the occupation in Iraq as an on-going *contemporary conflict* and on how newspapers and the internet ‘construct’ such conflicts and other emergencies. Students followed the teachers in using political, economic, historical and religious lenses while investigating the occupation of Iraq through media reports (mainly newspapers accessed through the internet). They learnt to distinguish and sort out official and unofficial reasons for the invasions and, like their teachers, they gained some realisation of how mass media can influence people’s opinions. Crucially, we discussed the important responsibility that consumers have to analyse what the

---

<sup>121</sup> See pp.46-9 above

news would like to tell us. We often ‘understand’ what the media say but do not analyse and criticise the news. Through deeper analysis and criticism, we perhaps can be more democratic – a particularly important consideration for contemporary Japan.

The PM of this AR included short student compositions on what they had learnt in the PM and how they could use it. These especially supported the teacher impression of a positive gain for most students from the AR. To a smaller degree, responses to another ‘before and after’ questionnaire also supported this, despite the ambiguous elements noted in them. The students had developed their awareness of how they should read and analyse news reports. Where many had been previously aware that they ‘should read news carefully’, they had not expressed or inspired confidence that they could figure out *how* to read carefully. Afterwards, students gave evidence of having the skills to analyse the news from various angles – official and unofficial, historical, economic, political, and religious – and of being aware of the need to pay attention to the sources of news items. Some were themselves explicit about having made this critical development.

Specific successes claimed for AR2 at the end of chapter 5 included broadening our conception of language and literature curriculum to include media critique, maintaining continuity with AR1, further enhancement of both the student cross-age experience and the teacher collaboration by using *common* materials and exercises and, for me personally, my first really profound experience of teaching as ‘facilitation’. A lesson learnt was to contain our next AR within a shorter time-span.

During the period of high economic growth in the 1960s, the Japanese educational system was fixed on memorising information and inputting words and diligent work habits into our minds. However, is just ‘tossing’ the information from teachers to students going to be effective in the Japanese present and future? If not, then what kind of new educational style is suggested? During AR2, as we four teaching colleagues branched out from our standard focus on literature, we all began to see ourselves as investigating this ‘new style’ through a lot of trial and error. This was not an easy task for us, because though we all now lived in London, we were not educated in the British style as children. However, when completing

the second AR, we found ourselves pleasantly and spontaneously looking forward to a third AR, in which we would continue with this (to us) ‘new style’.

The main distinguishing feature of **AR3** was the fortunate availability of an impressive **living witness** to war and peace, the late Mr Hirakubo, a famous survivor of the terrible Imphal Campaign during WWII. The whole AR was organised around his plenary session with the students preparing for it in a lead-up session and summer assignment and following on from it in two further sessions, including another plenary. The main unifying theme of **international understanding** was identified early on by the teachers and then left to emerge gradually for the students (it was hoped).

In a lead-up session and assignment, the students were, in effect, preparing to listen to a person who had really experienced the terrors of war and then had worked for peace. His presentation to the students was supported by his own writings, an award-winning video and an excerpt from a well-known novel for teens. However, they seemed most emotionally stimulated and very captivated by Mr. Hirakubo’s own telling of his story. We saw that many wrote in their comments after the lecture that they could now imagine the Imphal Campaign vividly, and they frequently referred back to this session in the two later sessions. In those final sessions, we (teachers as well as students) drew also on our own daily experience of dual British and Japanese culture, as we focussed on thinking about *international communication*, and we did this in a classroom process that was itself facilitating communication. By the end, many students were spontaneously claiming a better understanding of their own Japanese culture. Through communication, we can develop our ways of thinking more dramatically than by a more ‘one-way’ form of teaching.

In sum, AR3 showed the pedagogical value, both of access to an articulate participant / witness, and of a sharing of intercultural experiences, and it at least hinted at the value of intercultural experience for developing international understanding.

The themes of communication and international understanding are, once more, deeply connected to democracy. To understand others and have some reconciliation where

necessary, in the first place we need two-way communication, in effect discussion, as Mr. Hirakubo mentioned. Without it, we cannot achieve democracy. In the top-down hierarchical society, only a limited form of discussion may be necessary, just enough to understand precisely what the top says and sincerely act out what the top wishes. However, in the democratic society, it is necessary to understand why this authority considers like this or that. Rather than ‘learning’ some definitions and instructions that we ‘should remember’, we listen to others, understand them and mention our own thought in a non-dictatorial way. By this listening and mentioning, both parties can be brought to reflect upon and to develop their own beliefs and attitudes.

The more democratic way of teaching we were using in AR3, building on what we teachers and continuing students had learned during AR1 and AR2, was designed also to lead us all towards an understanding of what **peace** is.

The final evidence for the value of our ‘new’ pedagogy and for our confidence in it is that we continued to build a shared ‘theme and plenary’ into our annual schedule, well beyond the 3-year period in which I was formally researching for this thesis.<sup>122</sup>

## **8-2 An Evaluation Methodology**

What is now needed to conclude my thesis is a more general evaluation of the AR1-AR3 experience as a whole. However, I will not be alone in conducting this ‘global’ evaluation. In February 2007, a month before their final graduation from JSSL, I conducted individual interviews with a sample of the S3 students, nearly all of whom had experienced all three ARs, starting from S1 in 2004. The purpose was to get their overall evaluations of the ARs. These would include how they saw themselves as having changed as a result of their participation in the ARs. I will feed these evaluations into my own overall evaluation of the three ARs. After much consideration, I have found that it is most convenient to be able to move quite freely from student observations to my own evaluative comments, while

---

<sup>122</sup> In 2012 we had our 9<sup>th</sup> such ‘theme and plenary’. The chosen themes have included classical Japanese texts; appreciating, composing and sharing short poems in Japanese; relating texts and poems to periods in Japanese history; as well as ‘social studies’ type themes, like global warming.

maintaining clarity about which are the students' and which are mine. First, however, the methodology of the student evaluation exercise must be adequately described.

The sample of seven students, five males and two females, turned out to be self-selecting in the end, a sample that was a combination of 'opportunity' and 'volunteer'. Many of the S3 students had moved on to their university courses (even if they might still attend JSSL on some Saturdays) and others preferred not to volunteer. For example, two of the three student chairpersons at the final AR3 plenary were among the seven volunteers, while the third 'did not see himself as a good interviewee'. Luckily, all but one of the seven willing volunteers had excellent attendance records and had properly returned questionnaires and comments for the three ARs.<sup>123</sup>

The interviews were conducted on successive Saturdays (after classes) and took approximately 45 minutes each. To get them thinking in advance, I gave them to read copies of their own assignments and other written works for each AR, as well as prepared written summaries of the ARs. I also included a note requesting their more formal agreement (following their informal agreement), and the permission of their parents, to conduct the interview. All indicated their consent. At the beginning of the interviews, I asked each student if they would permit me to use the tape-recorder and all of them agreed.<sup>124</sup>

The interviews are best described as semi-structured, working to the agenda of the following three basic question areas:

1. Which of the three action researches was most impressive – had the greatest impact on you? What did you learn from it? [FOCUS: RECALLING AND COMPARING THE THREE *THEMES*]
2. What is your idea or definition of 'democracy'? What do you mean by 'peace'? Do you think anything changed in your way of thinking about peace over the three years?

---

<sup>123</sup> The exception was 'Jiro', who had missed much of AR3 – but who turned out to have strong memories of ARs1 and 2. (His transcript – translated into English – is in *Appendix 8-2*.)

<sup>124</sup> Later, a parent who was also a teacher in the school asked if she might listen to her own daughter's tape – for which the daughter gave her free permission.

[FOCUS: THE *STUDENT-LEARNING* THAT THE ARs MAY HAVE CAUSED OR FACILITATED.<sup>125</sup>]

3. Do you think we should continue with these plenary meetings? What changes would you make in their structures? Do you think this ‘theme + plenary’ form of teaching and learning would work in schools in Japan? [FOCUS: THE VALUE OF THE *PEDAGOGY*]

As discussed in chapter 2, citing Newton, ‘semi-structured’ covers the whole range between ‘structured’ and ‘unstructured’ and its recognised advantages are *flexibility* in relation to different interviewees and increased *depth* in the data and analysis. It combines some of the freedom (and visual observation, usually) of conversation with some of the formality of the questionnaire. I put the general questions above to all seven of the students, ensuring it would be possible to compare their answers. According to their individual replies, I then asked deeper and more detailed follow-up questions. As well as enhancing my understanding, this allowed them to reflect and develop their own thinking.

When I had previously taught these interviewees, they were around 16 years old, in many ways children who would like to be adults, too active and noisy during the classes, sometimes making me wonder about the appropriateness of my teaching methods. Interviewing them as mature 18-year olds before their graduation, I was particularly aware of how cooperative and helpful they were being. However, when I was later reviewing and working with their taped responses, what particularly impressed – and sometimes overwhelmed – me was how sincerely and seriously they were addressing *the issues*, their apparent recognition of the importance of those issues.

---

<sup>125</sup> It is reasonable to suppose that the ARs would have had *some* (un-quantified) influence on their views here, along with other factors, including their own maturation.

**Analysis of the interview data** was in two stages:

1. Selective transcribing from the tape recordings proved unsatisfactory. Therefore, I made *full* transcriptions of *all* the tapes in their original Japanese. I then made two full transcript translations into English for illustration purposes (see *Appendix 8-2*), but otherwise I translated only for the purpose of quotation.
2. The analysis follows the 3 question-areas just stated (*theme comparisons, student-learning, and pedagogy*) and my own evaluations will generally follow and interact with the student evaluations.

### **8-3 Comparing the Themes**

To the question ‘*which of the three action researches was most impressive – had the greatest impact on you?*’, 4 students chose AR2 and the other 3 chose AR3, one of whom also chose AR1. Among possible reasons for the low vote for AR1 are that it was furthest from their memory, that it was relatively conventional up to its PM, and that they were slightly embarrassed by their own youthful work for it, which they had just been re-reading. However, the motive for this opening question was really to get interviewees thinking *across* the ARs from the beginning, both about the differences between them and their shared emphasis on peace and democracy. Though the three themes had not been planned in advance, our teacher-view was that they balanced each other usefully as they emerged. But would these students have seen that balance? How would they remember each one and how *coherent* had their experience of the three been?

Taro offered a compact and insightful comparison of the three ARS:

*... the novel is much better for imagining concretely what was going on around that time. The poem ‘When I was the most beautiful’ was very appealing to me as well. From the newspaper [exercise], I acquired ‘the truth’, rather than the imaginative understanding. For the third AR, I listened to the person who had actually experienced WWII. I could feel his message very directly and really understand what he wanted to tell us, [that] we cannot repeat the wars again. I could ‘feel’ this through him.*

More commonly, interviewees made observations that focused down on one AR, usually the one that had made the greatest impact on them, or that compared some two ARs. Hachiro,

though choosing AR2, was perceptive about AR1 – and he appealed to a broader concept of ‘truth’ than Taro:

*H: In the class, we investigate who the author is and what kind of life he spent. From this point of view, we can understand gradually why he/she wrote the story. We can understand their purposes. The author<sup>126</sup> experienced the war, so he knows what the war was. I can learn what the author tries to say in the story. This is not like ‘the author wrote like this, so I am thinking the same way’. But when I analyse the story and think more deeply, I can acquire ‘truth’.*

*After taking all the ARs, I can consider much more deeply.*

*I: From what point of view, can you consider more deeply?*

*H: For example, I already knew the fact that the A-bomb was dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. [Now] I could learn much more at the personal-story level about how people thought and acted before the A-bombs were dropped.*

*I: Do you mean you can now consider that matter from the ‘personal’ level?*

*H: Yes. [And] I learned that this is very important.*

AR1 did indeed aim to make war ‘personal’, rather than ‘national-historical’, for the students. It focused on personal-emotional experiences of war as embodied in novels (especially) that, in each case, featured a strong connection with a definite young person. It assumed that students could empathise with the novels’ young characters and, through them, with novels’ other characters. They could thus imagine and visualise being young during a war like WWII, and thereby gain one deep kind of insight about that war, and about war more generally. ‘Empathy’ was, indeed, the keyword for AR1. I considered it was crucial to developing a proper ‘understanding’ (= ‘standing side by side’, in Japanese) of war. My presumption was that using the strangely ‘equal’ reader-author-characters relationships in the literary encounter and then dwelling on the similarities would develop this empathy. The video *Boys and Girls in Nagasaki* (a great many of the Nagasaki victims were teenagers) would also be strong in this way, provided its shock-impact would not inhibit the students from developing their thought to another level.

Here are some reasons offered by those who selected AR2 as their preference:

---

<sup>126</sup> AR1- Miki Taku, *After the Bomb*

*The first theme, the atomic bomb, occurred more than 60 years ago. Since I can see what is happening on TV every day, I could feel more familiar with the fresh news than with atomic bombs.....[Also] I could not figure out the bird flu news when I first saw the article without the photos (and articles) ['the first' was just a map!]. It was impressive. (Jiro)*

*The reason for the occupation [of Iraq] was economic. This AR was deeply connected with economic reasons [for war]. I could enjoy news that was more up-to-date, compared to considering the differences in thinking between the British and the Japanese. The other AR subjects – atomic bombs and the differences between Britain and Japan – frequently arise and we discuss them so often. (Hachiro)*

*The occupation in Iraq was the big news. I had not previously thought about the different opinions on this. Before taking the second AR, I just had the general idea of it that I had heard from the Japanese news. I had taken it for granted and not thought so deeply [about it]. (Goro)*

The character of the second AR is emerging in these comments. That it featured fresh and very up-to-date news attracted the students. The A-bomb was old news, while the occupation of Iraq seemed 'now' and 'fresh', also fluid and open to debate. They had also been impressed by the experience of how their understanding changed as information was added step by step in our illustration of how news can be constructed and reconstructed. That they could instantly recall this almost two years later suggests that it lay deeply in their memory.

Hachiro was particularly interested in comparing AR1 and AR2 – in terms that showed his awareness of AR2's *critical edge*, its critique of 'news':

*The first AR focused on human beings themselves: war is caused by people... by people's personal greed. This is not 'theoretical', more 'emotional'. In [AR2], 'automatic' information takes over the human being. This means human beings cause wars, but then information takes over..... In the A-bomb AR, the [literary] stories allowed us to think people's inner thinking.*

Later he explains this further:

*Human beings produce information at first, however, after the production information itself spreads and develops itself automatically. Human beings do not mean anything anymore for this information. Personal feeling is not included here anymore.*

His image of 'automatic' information overpowering us every day is a strong one. All we can do is consume, and quickly forget, 'a bunch' of the day's news items, like grapes. We empathise with people in the news, but just for a moment. Most news cannot provide the kind of personal connection with the subject that *sustains* empathy and deeper appreciation. And, as Hachiro implies, the excess of 'automatic information' forces detachment rather than

attachment on us. By contrast, in the novel we get to know at least the main characters in detail and in depth, how and why they act, react and end up as they do. Often, therefore, we cannot help getting emotionally attached to them and the good novel continues to interest and attract us beyond our first reading of it.

AR2 had particularly focused on the responsibility to interrogate and challenge the power of the press to manipulate and control our views. We saw how the Japanese had blindly believed the ‘official line’ on WWII as reported in the government-controlled news outlets. It had to be ‘right’, since there was no way of challenging it. With the novel, superiority and inferiority between readers and author cannot be clearly distinguished, because of the completeness of the depictions of character and plot that are available to both. With news, however, the ‘superior’ supplier has the advantage over the ‘inferior’ readers – which is reflected in the ‘take-it-or-leave-it’, declarative style of news reports. Even with a free and pluralist press, reports may be picked up from the surface of some event, be partial and one-sided, and be completely careless of their effect on the people involved. In turn, their readers and hearers can then become judgemental and extreme. Tatsuru Uchida, describes the anti-conversational effect of this in the *‘Japan on the Frontier (『日本辺境論』)*,

The problem of being ‘declarative’ is that we cannot converse, seeking for some agreement between us. This type of person can behave as follows, either: ‘blindly agree with others’ opinions’ or ‘totally deny others’ opinions’. People who just borrow what others say, cannot compromise or create a medium-like opinion when hearing both sides of an argument. [But] when they just insist and cannot compromise at all, their opinions are not truly theirs. They just ‘borrow’ them from others. .... When we borrow the ‘signboards’ from somebody, we lose the right to change the design into our own (p.121).

Our aim in AR2 was to set our students on the path to being critical users of news media who could minimise these dangers while keeping themselves informed, for example, being sceptical about headlines, being aware of bias in sources, looking-out for alternative sources and points of view and for multi-dimensional analyses of complex major issues (e.g. the political, economic, religious and historical angles on the Iraq war).

Did these interviewees offer some evidence of success? Several students spoke about how the second AR had changed their ways of looking at the world:

....I could learn not only about the Japanese, but also the British, way of thinking, and some other ways of thinking of people from many other countries. Previously, I was limited to the Japanese way, but now I can learn how to view things from various angles..... When I watch TV recently, I always have some doubt that this news has another side. (Jiro)

If I subscribe to the Yomiuri newspaper, I tend to follow the opinions of Yomiuri newspaper. So it is better to read various articles from different newspapers. (Goro)

I investigated political, religious, economic and historical reasons [for the occupation in Iraq] by myself. I could understand this occupation more deeply. The article about Iwo-jima showed how we tend to judge things even when we don't have enough information. As more information was added, I could experience how my opinion changed. (Rokuro)

For nurturing the ability to consider a topic from different and diverse angles, AR2 seems to have been effective. Four of the seven students mentioned this – and we teachers had experienced it ourselves in our shared preparatory study of political, economic, historical and religious reasons for the Iraq war. In such matters, information itself is unstable and changeable, as are the opinions and theories based on it. This has the benefit that it may challenge and permit students to develop their own various ways of viewing the world. Dealing critically with on-going news stories is surely useful for developing flexible thinking – if in a different way to how more ‘experiential’ dealings facilitates flexibility by enriching our imaginations.

Rokuro was one of the four interviewees for whom AR3 was the most impressive:

*R: When learning about the Imphal Campaign in the preparation class before Hirakubo's lecture, I looked it up in the internet as well. I did have some knowledge about this campaign! But, I realised how horrible this Campaign was [only] after listening to Mr. Hirakubo's lecture.*

*I: You could not realise this from the internet?*

*R: No, I could not.*

*I: Did you then realise it because you listened to someone who had actually experienced it?*

*R: Yes. In the internet articles, I read just 'some sentences'. But when I listened to the person who actually experienced it, his body language, his way of speaking, meant I could visualise it much more effectively.*

For Hanako, the contrast was with AR2's focus on news stories, but the result was the same and, again, the key factor was 'experience', this time her own experience of cultural difference:

*H: I could attend most actively in the third AR. In the second AR, I read newspapers and tried to analyse what they were presenting. But, I could not form strong opinions or present my own opinions very much.... However, I had actually experienced the cultural difference between Britain and Japan, so [in AR3] I could present some ideas from this experience.*

*I: All right..... Why did you think it was good to do this?*

*H: When summarising my own opinions, I can do very well, to my mind. In AR2, I just 'collected' information, but in AR3 I could feel some strong affinity with it because I had actually experienced it.*

The preference for AR3 was also shared by Taro and Sakura – who expressed it in positive comparisons with other ARs and, again, in explicit or implicit reference to 'experience':

*The third AR was the most impressive, because I could listen to Mr. Hirakubo who had actually experienced WWII. We really don't understand war unless we experience it. The second plenary meeting [of AR3] was very impressive as well, because we could see the different ways of thinking [among ourselves], because some were born here in Britain, some were born in Japan and some in other countries. (Taro)*

*I liked the third and the first ones. I didn't know so much about the A-bomb previously. Of course, I had known the word 'A-bomb', but I did not know about [survivor] children drawing pictures of dead people [and so on]. .... Regarding the Imphal Campaign, I had never heard of it previously. But listening to Mr. Hirakubo, I could understand a lot of things. I heard a lot that was new. (Sakura)*

These students' choices seem deeply connected to the degree of their emotional-empathic identifications with the ARs. By this measure, the first and third ARs came out stronger than AR2, which focussed rather detachedly on how information is conveyed.<sup>127</sup> AR1 and AR3 can then, further, be distinguished by the different types of experience that made them potent for engaging student emotions and empathy. In one case, it was the experience attributed by authors to the characters in their novels, in the other it was the experience of a living witness like Mr Hirakubo (clearly, a very special witness who is likely to be a powerful memory and influence for many of the interviewees for a long time). However, both of those external

---

<sup>127</sup> It may or may not be significant that neither of the two female students in the sample, Hanako and Sakuro, volunteered positive views on AR2.

sources of experience actually worked their magic by becoming lively and rich parts of the students' *own internal* experience.

That last point helps to identify a third rich source of experience mentioned in interview data, especially in connection with the final PM in AR3: the daily lives in two cultures of the students (and the teachers). These were the basis for that PM's most lively discussions. The strength of Hanako's contrast above can be recalled: between sharing 'collected information' with colleagues and sharing opinions and viewpoints based on personal experience. Her own experience is not for her just extra pieces of information. It is first-hand; hers; and she mostly knows its sources and its history. Therefore, she can feel spontaneous and confident in drawing on it in discussion.

She can also take responsibility for it and, indeed, this owning of experience connects deeply to people's sense of responsibility. Without it, when we feel used or forced by somebody or some organisation, we become 'victims' and blame others – as Uchida illustrates:

Even though many theories prove the cause of pacific war (WWII), nobody can accept that 'Japanese actively chose WWII based on strong and clear strategies and vision'. All those who support WWII describe the going to war very passively, insisting that 'only one way remained – to choose the war – because we were driven into a corner'. [In Japan] nobody considers that wars are based on the strategies and thoughts and then we began the wars. Indeed nobody does. So, even those who insist most strongly on the need for nuclear armaments are based on the 'victim' theory: 'Oh, we are afraid that North Korea will attack us with missiles.' 'Oh, we are worried that China will control the petrol fields in the East China Sea.' (2009: 56-57)

This Uchida's argument reminds me that we should take our own decision from our own active involvement in the society. To achieve this, we need a truly democratic nation. Moreover, to create this democratic nation, we need the educational system to nurture pupils' democratic minds.

## 8-4 Student Learning

What, overall, had students learnt regarding peace and democracy from their participation in the three ARs?

‘Peace’ had been at or near the front in all three ARs, but ‘democracy’ was different – in our classes we had rarely referred to it *directly*. We teachers had always wanted to enable the students to think voluntarily, independently, creatively and responsibly – which is a condition of healthy democracy – and the experience of our first PM deepened our understanding of how to succeed with this. And, as we moved on to AR2 and AR3, it became clear that our three themes should also be regarded as education for democracy (‘the trunk’ for the various ‘branches’!). But because we had not addressed democracy directly with the students, finding a definition would be a new challenge for the interviewees. I could not expect answers that were knowledgeable about democratic institutions, but I could hope that they would reveal democratic instincts. In fact their responses were fresh and truly interesting. As a first example, Sakura:

*I: What is your definition of democracy? What is democracy?*

*S: I don't know... it is very difficult. I don't know what to say. But I hope that the world will become peaceful.*

*I: Do you mean that peace is related to democracy?*

*S: Yes, countries should help each other.*

*I: Does this relate to democracy?*

*S: Yes. But very greedy people will grab money and food, so poor people will still suffer from poverty because of these greedy people.*

*Democracy... Peace... Greed... Poverty*; this is already an interesting list!<sup>128</sup> And other interviewees came up with *the people, independence of mind, statesmanship, equality in rights and duties, justice and law and communication*. The interview transcripts at some points read like mini-explorations of the links between ideas like these, sometimes with back references to AR experiences.

---

<sup>128</sup> Sakura, whose father is English and mother Japanese, had been shy and quiet when I was teaching her in S1 and I was genuinely surprised by the improvement in her way of thinking, as well as in her command of Japanese.

## **Independent-mindedness.**

Five of the seven interviewees got their start from how ‘democracy’ in Japanese is written: ‘民主主義’, which means ‘people-centred principle’. Two examples:

*Democracy literally means that ‘people’ become the ‘centre’. So, the country is ‘made’ by people in the first place, [whereas] before WWII, the Emperor had the priority.....This is the definition of ‘democracy’. (Hanako)*

*Democracy means that people are the centre of the country. So, people’s opinions should be respected. (Rokuro)*

Most present countries, however, have indirect democracy, based on ‘majority rule’, as Jiro observed:

*J: Simply speaking, democracy is majority rule. The most powerful person does not control the situation, the persons who are selected by us govern us. They listen to all opinions and proceed with some. This is democracy, I think, compared to dictatorship.*

*I: Do you think it is possible to listen to all opinions?*

*J: There are some issues we cannot all agree with. But when we are told, ‘we all considered this and reached this decision’, normally the Japanese people will accept this decision. The Japanese agree with what all others agree.*

Here, Jiro touches on what is actually a danger for democracy, particularly in Japan, that the majority government’s decision obliterates or diminishes people’s personal independence. Our own ‘will’ and ‘opinion’ disappear very easily and blind acceptance of our ‘elected’ authority becomes the norm. Jiro himself was quickly aware of the issues:

*J: I think we need some compromise. If we cannot compromise, we are led by one dangerous opinion and we might go toward a dangerous position. Democracy might turn into dictatorship. We should not only compromise but also should have independence. We can develop our own thinking like this.*

Goro draws on his experience of two countries as he also wrestles with independent mindedness:

*G: In the third AR, I learned that Japanese soldiers had to walk to Imphal without enough food. That situation might never arise for British people, because they try to decide for themselves.*

*I: What is your conception of democracy?*

*G: I think democracy is based on the fact that people act on their own decision.....it is not good that we ignore completely orders from the top, but we should act as what we consider..... We should decide by ourselves about some big things.*

*I: On what basis can we decide by ourselves?*

*G: We decide based on our experience and circumstances.*

Hachiro, however, raises the legitimate issue of the necessary levels of knowledge and understanding:

*H: Democracy is 'people-centred' policy. But to what degree do we need to have knowledge and understanding of society? After all, our understanding of society is not perfect..... I think our understanding is much more basic: something happened, it reminds us of something else, sometimes... most people's understanding is at this level. When asking people their opinions, so many and varied opinions may appear. Most.... are not so important for deciding national policy. Possibly, this amounts to no more than 'just hearing people's opinions'.....*

*I: Then do you think it is OK that we are just 'kept informed'? We don't need to analyse information?*

Faced with my perhaps surprised response, Hachiro adjusts his thoughts a little:

*H: The policy can be deepened when the good statesman considers it. Maybe some specialists could define 'democracy' more correctly. Also, the definition of democracy will change as time passes.*

Good statesmen who create policies that benefit people are more likely to come *from* healthy democracies. Meantime, there are the many examples of peoples being manipulated by governments and mass media. We, the people, have difficulty persisting in our own opinions and judgements; we want to 'believe' official media lines, and even 'make efforts to believe' them. In the worst scenario, we let ourselves be used mentally and physically and, finally, discarded as 'cannon fodder', as the Japanese people experienced in WWII.

Maruyama, a famous political philosopher, reflecting after WWII on the democracy that America introduced to Japan, connected inner independence with inner responsibility:

Maruyama wrote that because individuals do not establish their independence in Japanese society, there is no inner responsibility in their mind. Even men in power lack responsibility and behave like servants or robots under the Emperor ..... At the same time, the 'inferiors' transfer the pressure from the top to lower orders – this 'stress shift' happens everywhere. In international relations, Japan relieved the pressure from western countries by invading Asian countries. (Oguma, 2002: 85)

To think as independently as we can and try to improve the society creatively by ourselves are ‘the basics’ when thinking of democracy. If we Japanese do not think for ourselves, we never can become truly democratic. But following orders blindly is still deeply embedded in the Japanese mind. The ‘top-down’ system maintains the smooth order of society, but it makes it very difficult psychologically to sustain points of view that disagree with majority opinion and policy. For real democracy, formal democracy needs a democratic culture as its ally.

‘Independence’ is a word with different – and more questionable – uses in Japanese political slogans: not being the ‘American mistress’ anymore; re-arming; or contrasting Japan’s ‘slavish’ dependence on the West with communist China’s ‘go-it-alone’ post-war development by ‘self-denial’ and ‘self-improvement’ (which may ignore the lack of democracy and independence of thought and speech in China). ‘Independence’ should not be reduced to those contexts, whatever one’s view of those slogans,

### **Equality, Justice and Law**

Goro articulated a connection between democracy and equality:

*I: Do you think Japanese society is democratic?*

*G: Well, maybe. But recently Japan became a stratified society, so not completely democratic, I think.*

*I: Will democracy disappear as stratification develops in a society,?*

*G: Yes.*

*I: Why?*

.....

*G: I have an image that bottom people would have to listen to upper people’s opinions.*

*Everybody will gradually have the same opinions.*

*I: All right, to be equal is the starting point of democracy.*

As Goro says, democracy needs equality. However, there are perhaps different kinds of equality. Nakane criticised what he took to be the usual Japanese understanding of it:

The base of the Japanese ideology comes from an extremely primitive human egalitarian society. This does not come from rationality, but comes from emotion. This egalitarianism is different from democracy in the Western countries. However, [it] gives people the confidence to make constant efforts... (1967: 100-101)

And to compete endlessly with each other, he goes on to say. The democratic sort of equality is open to solidarity with others. But, though certainly threatened by great inequality, democracy does not have to wait on a completely 'classless society'. In countries such as Britain, students can think more independently and critically than Japanese students, even though they have a stratified society. It can be said that equality in schools means that teachers give students equal opportunities to think creatively and spontaneously, but also to share their thinking with each other. This approach will create a more democratic society in the end.

Taro, who was brought up in Japan, saw equality as one of a cluster of related concepts:

*I: What would be your idea or definition of 'democracy'?*

*T: ...that those who are born in the country have equal rights and duties and can use them and (to?) maintain 'justice'.*

*I: How can we maintain 'justice'?*

*T: If we follow the laws, some balance will be made.*

*I: By whom?*

*T: The balance will be made naturally.*

*I: But what will we do when some dictators like 'Saddam Hussein' control the country?*

*T: I think the order of the country become unbalanced*

*I: Do you think maintaining the order of the country is one aspect of 'democracy'?*

*T: Yes. In China, recently the individual is allowed to have property. I think the differences between the poor and the rich will become wide. I am interested in how China will change from now on. They can judge what is right and what is wrong from their history and reflect. Then they can govern the country well.*

Taro also spoke about his own career ambitions and their relation to the ARs

*I: Did these ARs give you the idea of undertaking something for peace and justice in your future life?<sup>129</sup>*

*T: Now I would like to study law. This started from an idea that I should do 'right'. I think it is not right to write false articles in the newspapers!*

*I: Did you already have this idea of respecting 'justice'?*

---

<sup>129</sup> I regret not putting this question to all the interviewees. An opportunity missed!

*T: From around 2006, I have a feeling that I would like to study law.*

*I: What made you think like that?*

*T: I think that laws are the foundation for everything. Rules have been required in every era. If we respect laws, wars never happen and the atomic bombs never drop. If we respect laws, falsified articles will not appear. If we are internationally aware of the gaps in matters concerning laws, this awareness will surely help towards the peace.*

*I: However, from country to country there are different interpretations of 'justice'. For example, the US considers the occupation in Iraq 'just'.*

*T: Each country has its circumstances, so it is very difficult to say, but with Saddam Hussein there is no 'justice' at all. Since he was born in the country, he has been brainwashed into a specific idea of leadership. What he did was mass-murder. ....*

Taro neglects issues around 'bad' or 'unjust' laws, but since his starting point is wanting to do 'right', he will probably get to them later!

## **Peace and Communication**

Jiro offers a good entry point:

*J: When I lived in Japan, I was living in a 'fools' paradise', but now I live in the UK which seems to connect to other countries much more closely. Living in Japan, watching news on TV was thinking of 'someone's' problem, but not mine. In Britain, there were the terrorist incidents on July 7<sup>th</sup> and I do not feel in peace anymore. The area where I lived in Japan was safe, and then I thought this world was in peace, but I cannot say 'peace' so easily in Britain.*

*I: Why can you not say 'peace' so easily now?*

*J: I have some Arabic school friends. I ask them, 'Are your father and mother OK?' I cannot say 'peace' so easily anymore.*

Jiro could consider the deep meaning of 'peace' after he had some experience of the opposite in UK. He had come to 'own' the issue of peace, though as much from living now in London as from Mr Hirakubo's influence. (He might have been one of the 200,000 people who demonstrated against nuclear power stations in 2012 after the earthquake and fallout in 2011. It was unsuccessful, first because the media did not report the true level of radiation exposure in Japan, but, second, because not enough citizens 'owned' the problem.)

If Japan had real democracy, having an army would not be dangerous. However, when the army's power becomes strong and begins to dictate to the people, Japanese people may not

have the energy to resist and will just do what they are told. As the army during WWII exploited many Japanese, there would be so much danger that the same situation would happen again if democracy is still very weak and society becomes more stratified as a result of economic depression and, possibly, another earthquake or disaster.

To maintain peace, what can we do? Hanako and Goro were fully explicit about the need for communication:

*When two ways of thinking are different, conflict will occur. I think it is better to solve it by communication. However, some people perhaps think that they should solve the problem by wars when some conflicts occur at the national level.(Hanako)*

*I: How can we maintain peace?*

*G: We cannot trust our own opinions all the time. We should listen to others and analyse why they have different opinions from ours.(Goro)*

In the two PMs of AR3, communication emerged as the first step for resolving differences at national, cultural and individual levels. That is what Mr. Hirakubo organised for British veterans when he brought them to Japan – to dramatic effect in most cases – and in the second PM, the interviewees had experienced the very positive power of courteously sharing their own multiple intercultural / international experiences across their own differences of both age and background. Through such discussion with ‘different’ people, we can observe our own opinions more objectively and develop our own thinking. Independent-mindedness is protected from arrogant isolation at the same time as it promotes peace. This is what democracy is. Democracy cannot exist unless people think independently – not as directed by government or the mass media – and then discuss the matters with others.

Sakura also commented as below:

*Wars start from some people's greed..... They easily kill people for their own benefit and thus war begins. For example, when they try to invade another country, a war begins.... Wars will not begin if this kind of person does not appear.*

I became impressed by her point of view. Perhaps, it is appropriate to hold persons mainly responsible for wars, rather than countries, to focus on the *individuals* whose thoughts and ambitions were promoting and then prolonging the wars. Then peace can be seen as also an individual responsibility: we should spontaneously, independently and critically analyse what is really happening, then act for ourselves to make society as a whole better.

Of course, both war and peace also require *collective* action. So there is collective greed. Many governments, industries and corporations regularly have material profit in mind when they contemplate war. On the other hand, there are campaigns and battles to fight for ‘democracy’, ‘human rights’ and ‘independence’. So Ikeda agreed with his dialogue partner in *Choose Peace: A Dialogue between Johan Galtung & Daisaku Ikeda*:

You dismiss as vulgar materialism the notion that economic factors alone stimulate popular uprisings and point out how concern for democracy, human rights and independence incites people to risk their lives to act on their own behalf. Stirred by emotionally charged slogans, reminiscent of the *We shall overcome* of the blacks in the United States, the East Europeans reinforced my own belief in the masses as the bedrock of history. As long as they work together, the people can change the current of events (1995: 96).

However, the Japanese vertical society may still not facilitate collective action *of this kind*.

## 8-5 Values of the Pedagogy

This section of the evaluation will address three pedagogical *variants* and three pedagogical *constants* across the three ARs.

### Three Variants

(1) *Literature for imaginative/emotional engagement* Concerning the relationship between literature and politics, Oguma remarks:

Literature is vulnerable to politics directly: however, literature can be related to politics when literature pursues literature itself.....we can analyse our own inner darkness for self-denial and self-improvement. Thus men of letters can influence others (2002: 414).

Literature can indeed give us energy to reflect on ourselves and, thus, to improve the base for our own decisions and spontaneous actions. Using novels and poems to understand wars and peace in the first AR, we were relying on the students’ empathy with the characters, and their feeling close to the story, to get them interested in these matters. We saw in several students’ comments in 8-3 above that this strategy worked well, despite the unintended disconnection between the AR’s classes and its PM. For example, Hachiro:

*.....we don’t just acquire some knowledge from reading [literature]. We investigate authors’ intentions.... We don’t just ‘receive’ what authors write. When we analyse and think deeper, we can see some truth through literature..... I just thought from shallow angles previously but now I could think deeper. ....*

Of course, letting students imagine themselves ‘in the issue’ is more generally a way of getting them responsibly interested in that issue, as I knew as a social studies teacher. But the stronger emotional engagements and ‘pseudo-experiences’ provided by appropriate literature can *sustain* student interest and thinking to reach for deeper ‘truth’ and conviction, and beyond that – the next level – towards the possibility of political action.<sup>130</sup>

Taro’s comparative observation, which we also saw earlier, points towards AR2 and the next variable:

*Yes, the novel is much better for imagining concretely what was going on around that time. The poem ‘when I was the most beautiful’ was very appealing to me as well. From the newspaper, I acquired ‘the truth’, rather than the imagination (imaginative understanding).*

**(2) Newspapers for critical thinking and enquiry.** AR2 brought students up to date by focusing quite analytically and critically on the media coverage of the Iraq occupation in two preparatory holiday assignments and one class-session, before then broadening the critical focus to include coverage of some other contemporary issues and to reintroduce WW2. Students were not just to acquire ‘knowledge’ from newspapers, but to categorise reasons under four headings and distinguish the ‘official’ from the ‘unofficial’, and to consider their importance. They were thus making multiple judgements and actively and creatively reaching their own opinions. Rokuro, for example, describes the process and its impact on his own reading of newspapers:

*R: I had been thinking of just the political reasons for the Iraqi occupation. I understood then that there was a range of reasons, such as economic, religious and so on.*

*I: ...Do you mean that you found new perspectives?*

*R: Yes, I do.*

*I: How do you read newspapers now?*

*R: By considering various elements, I make my own opinions for the particular situation. ... there is a great danger of being led in the wrong direction – [as] particularly during WWII. So, it is better for me to have many sources of information and form my own opinion.*

---

<sup>130</sup> The (English) Citizenship Order [1999] identifies three levels: developing knowledge and understanding to become informed citizens; developing skills of enquiry and communication; and developing skills of participation and responsible action. I considered using this attractive model, but its ambition would have had to be scaled back too much to fit a Saturday school.

Teachers should indeed teach ‘the basic facts’, however, we should always be thinking how to facilitate the enhancement of students’ critical minds. Now teaching back in Japan, my impression is that this is lacking in Japanese social studies at present.

**(3) Personal experiences heard and shared.** In AR3, Mr. Hirakubo’s lecture was what brought alive the horrors of the Imphal Campaign for the students. Its great impact was reflected in their notably active engagement with the subsequent Summer Assignment. Its particular charisma, however, was not so much a matter of personality – we saw he was actually quite low-key – but the charisma of his *experience*. Thus Rokuro again, and we saw earlier that Rokuro was not alone in this:

*R: When I read the article before Mr. Hirakubo came, I couldn’t really imagine what the Imphal Campaign was. But as I listened to his story I felt very vividly that now I was really experiencing this Campaign.*

.....

*I: Did you then ‘feel’, because Mr. Hirakubo had actually experienced [the Campaign]?*

*R: Yes, the internet article was just sentences. But seeing a person who actually experienced it, I could see it from his body language and could hear it from his ways of talking. This was very effective for me.*

On other topics, too, we teachers could invite people to our classes who actually work in the particular field, having prepared our students with some information about the person beforehand. They bring something different with them – the charisma of experience.

### Three Constants

These are *collaboration, diversity and discussion*. The first refers primarily to teachers and the other two primarily to students.<sup>131</sup> Though interdependent, they can be considered one by one. The first two can be dealt with quickly; the third will require a longer consideration.

**(1) Collaboration among teachers.** This is what made the project of the ARs possible. Its beginnings are described in detail in the early chapters of the thesis and later chapters comment on its further evolution and strengthening, stimulated especially by the dramatic experience of the PM of the first AR. Three comments will be enough here. First, its value is in large part to be judged by what it made possible, the cross-age learning and the new learning strategies of the students. Second, the continuation of collaboration – well beyond the ARs in my thesis – over so many years and themes, and through many changes of staff, is evidence of the professional satisfaction and value we were finding in it. Third, its additional value to our students as they approached adulthood and adult relationships was as a model of working *colleagueship* among equals. (I realised this more fully when I returned to Japan to teach.)

**(2) Diversity among our students** was a product of two factors: the different countries of their upbringing and their different age-groups. Both factors were recognised and repeatedly referenced by student interviewees. For example, Taro mentions one below and Hanako both:

*Taro: ... .. The people who have lived in Britain for a long time and those who have lived in Japan for a long time have very different cultural backgrounds. So it is important for each to experience the other culture. .... the PM makes me aware of this cultural difference.*

*Hanako: In JSSL, there are various students who have a lot of different experiences. Some were born in Britain and brought up here: some have just come here from Japan or other countries. So we can exchange various ideas in JSSL. Also, S1 and S3 students have different ideas. Especially for S3, we can learn a lot of things in a plenary meeting. (And these social issues can be used for A-level exams or Japanese university entrance exams!)*

Outside the big cities like Toyko and Osaka, most of Japan is still mono-cultural and most students (and parents) are surrounded by neighbours brought up in the same area and in the

---

<sup>131</sup> The *curriculum* themes of peace and democracy were another ‘constant’, considered in 8-3 above.

same dialect. This does not mean that plenary meetings in Japan would be boring. Domestically, temporary home and school half-and-half swaps for students might be possible on quite a large scale, for example, between such culturally different prefectures as Hokkaido and Okinawa. In such cases the potential for developing participants' thinking processes would be great. And even without this swapping, the cross-age diversity in a PM is already challenging and exciting for a school's students and teachers.

**3) Discussion** In the right conditions, students can develop their thinking through 'discussion' – the word itself implies *flexibility* to try out opinions, explore each other's theories, and reshape or abandon their views. It should be clear that discussion of 'the matter' is a necessary stage in coming to a mature opinion about 'the matter', and in developing students' critical and analytical attitude towards 'matters' generally. Teachers can help to establish the right facilitating conditions – though they must be careful to avoid pushing their own views and returning the students to passivity.

Learning through discussion became more and more a feature of the ARs as they progressed, in the separate classes as well as in the PMs. This development 'took off', in particular, from the levels of student engagement and participation that were experienced and witnessed at the first PM, and were then acknowledged and praised at the later 'Reflective Meeting' of the Head-Teacher and Deputy Head-Teacher with the teachers. At that time, also, we realised that *common materials* for all the classes would protect the unity of our later ARs and enhance their PM discussions further. And, for some, discussion seemed to reach its highest point at the final PM of AR3, because the students were then consciously and deliberately drawing on *their own varying experiences* of living in two cultures. Thus Hanako:

*H: I could not defend my own opinions so much in the previous ARs, however, I could defend my opinions in the [final] plenary meeting. I have experienced the cultural difference between Britain and Japan and I always question myself about it. So I could say clearly what I was thinking.*

*I: All right, you could express your own opinions well when they are based on your own experience. Why do you think this is better?*

*H: [Usually,] when summarising my opinions, [other] ideas and opinions 'infiltrate' me. In AR3, the theme was what I actually experienced, so I felt a special affinity to it.*

There is a reminder here of the teachers' duty to *facilitate* the less confident and less certain student voices. But the 'infiltration' that was frustrating Hanako is a large part of the value of discussion, as she herself realised:

*Hanako: When I decide something by myself, I have to consider others' opinions. I should listen to opinions that are for and that are against some positions, and then make my own opinions*

.....

*I: Do you put weight on listening to a range of opinions?*

*H: Yes, and I can listen to many more opinions than in my usual classes.*

These interviewees, as they were about to leave JSSL, were all very definite that the PMs should continue for the benefit of the classes behind them. Hachiro, for example, expressed his faith in their educational power in this way:

*If we do not understand the theme, or even if we are forced to attend a PM, we can still learn something for ourselves when attending it.*

Class exercises and assignments, themselves involving discussions, built ways towards plenary gatherings centred on now better informed discussions in wider and more diverse student groups. This overall process clearly did nurture students towards thinking voluntarily, independently, analytically, critically and responsibly. This attitude makes society peaceful. Social life need not start from hatred or hostility, but from communication, discussion and understanding.

### **Japan Now**

Several interviewees referred to the need to have something similar in Japanese schools. For example, a student who had received most of her schooling in Japan:

*In Japan, there are not so many opportunities to mingle and discuss. We should hold meetings like the PM in Japan as well. (Hanako)*

But Goro and Sakura, who were brought up in Britain, expressed almost the same view, presumably out of their concern for what they had been told about Japanese education. Goro speaks for both here:

*I don't have many opportunities to consider social problems, because I am very busy. If I didn't have opportunities like the PMs, I wouldn't think at all so deeply.....In Japanese schools, they just learn from textbooks. They should have more opportunities to listen to others. (Goro)*

Rokuro, who had studied in Japan, mentioned the difficulties of the senior-junior relationships among students and the large class sizes<sup>132</sup>, but the deeper contrast here is with the lecture-style *teaching* that is dominant in Japanese schools. As some students remarked, just learning from textbooks and listening to teachers might be an effective way to cultivate the ‘techniques’ to pass the universities entrance exams, but it does not cultivate students’ independent thinking. Indeed, teacher-student relationships in Japan and other East Asian countries make it difficult for students to consider things analytically and critically. Students are just supposed to reply to teachers’ questions with the ‘right’ answers. Actually, though this may work for some students and the exact curriculum fields, it is very difficult to stay focussed in the lecture-style class when students are not interested. They do not have to ‘really attend’ and their teachers may have no real concern whether or not they really understand. In the PM pedagogy, by contrast, students are examined on their commitment to the lead-up lessons and to the discussion, not so much by teachers, but by other students and friends.

The ultimate reason for teaching social studies themes is to nurture active citizens who understand what democracy is and can vigorously join the society. But, in these decades, the Japanese voting rate is approximately 30%. The economy has been low since the bubble-burst in the early 1990’s. Japanese people are also worried about the Chinese economic boom and, after the earthquake in 2011, about their dependence on nuclear power stations.

In the school where I worked in the 1990s and am working again from 2013, a lot of teachers mention that we do not see interesting students anymore. Students are very studious and very well-behaved, but passive and, thus, less interesting. What is the reason for this? When the economic situation becomes more depressed, students are more desperate to get ‘better’ jobs after graduation from schools, for which the scores, reputation and reports of the schools are highly significant. Therefore, students ‘behave nicely’.

---

<sup>132</sup> There are usually around 40 students per class in secondary schools (and often more in private schools). Of course this is a problem for discussion-rich pedagogy more generally. But how it might be addressed has to be a question for another time.

I have noticed that something similar has happened to some teachers. Being employed as a full-time teacher / lecturer in schools / universities at this time is 'to save the teacher's life'. This research has helped me to observe that this has strengthened the staff hierarchy and weakened collegueship. Ordinary teachers, considering their own survival, are less adventurous and reluctant to express their own opinions to the senior staff. It can then be supposed that this changed relationship among teachers hugely influences students' thinking, because adult human relationships in the school are the students' first lesson-experience for what society is.

This pedagogical system is out of date, but to break it open would require a gradual build-up of an *alternative system that puts 'top-down' teaching in question*. We did this to ourselves in JSSL, but, as explained in the early chapters, our context was very favourable to the change. Japan right now seems like another world.

To indicate how much may be at risk, it seems appropriate to quote from German President Weizsäcker's famous speech in the Bundestag on 8 May 1985, during the ceremony commemorating the 40th anniversary of the end of War in Europe and of National-Socialist Tyranny.

.....Whoever opened his eyes and ears and sought information could not fail to notice that Jews were being deported. The nature and scope of the destruction may have exceeded human imagination, but in reality there was, apart from the crime itself, the attempt by too many people, including those of my generation, who were young and were not involved in planning the events and carrying them out, not to take note of what was happening. There were many ways of not burdening one's conscience, of shunning responsibility, looking away, keeping mum. When the unspeakable truth of the Holocaust then became known at the end of the war, all too many of us claimed that they had not known anything about it or even suspected anything.

There is no such thing as the guilt or innocence of an entire nation. Guilt is, like innocence, not collective, but personal. There is discovered or concealed individual guilt.

.....

Hitler's constant approach was to stir up prejudices, enmity and hatred. What is asked of young people today is this: do not let yourselves be forced into enmity and hatred of other people, of Russians or Americans, Jews or Turks, of alternatives or conservatives, blacks or whites. Let us honour freedom. Let us work for peace. Let us respect the rule of law. Let us be true to our own conception of justice. On this 8th of May, let us face up as well as we can to the truth.

**To conclude this thesis with a positive appeal:** Usually in schools ‘we’ work beside each other; but ‘we’ learn / teach quite different things. Our chances of wider and deeper discussion and self-development are thereby diminished. Could we not build into our school-year some opportunities and times for working across age-groups and classrooms on common tasks using common materials? During the three years of the fieldwork for this thesis, I learnt tremendously from students and colleagues, as we discussed, planned and implemented our ARs together. I would come to conclude that *this kind* of togetherness could be a key to enhancing education for peace and democracy in schools.

## Bibliography

- Abiko, K. (December 2002 – January 2003), Educational Research for understanding United States- Peace for US and peace for Japan- Report of AR (米国理解教育授業「アメリカの平和・日本の平和」実践報告)in the Junior 1 Social Studies Class at Higashi Yonesato Secondary School, *The Japan-United States Educational Research Project 2002-2003*, Hokkaido University of Education, Hokkaidō
- The Ajegbo Report, Ajegbo, K., Kiwan, D. and Sharma, S. (2007) *Curriculum Review: Diversity and Citizenship*, Institute of Community Cohesion, Coventry
- Al-Ghanem, S.(2010), *Making Sense of Al-Ru'yah as a New School Philosophy and its implications for Curriculum and Pedagogy* PhD Thesis, Institute of Education, London
- Anderson, B. (2006), *Imagined Communities: Reflection on the origin and Spread of Nationalism*, Verso Books
- Andō, H. et. al. (2004), *Careful Selected Integrated Japanese – Contemporary Japanese* 『精選 国語総合 現代文』, Chikuma Shobō, Tōkyō
- Andō, K. ‘The Bird Flu - Afraid of Spreading from Turkey 「鳥インフルエンザトルコから拡散 懸念」 ’ Asahi Newspaper 21.01.2006
- Andō, T. ed. (2009), *The Government Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School – Pinpointed Explanation for Revision* 『高等学校学習指導要領 改訂のピンポイント解説』, Meiji Tosho, Tōkyō
- Anonymous, ‘Ten times more US soldiers died than ours 「敵死傷我に十倍す」 ’ Asahi Newspaper 04.03.1945
- Anonymous, ‘We attacked 2000 enemies in the North area 「北部落、敵二千邀撃」 ’ Asahi Newspaper 09.03.1945
- Anonymous, ‘The Price of Incompetence 「『無能』の代償」 ’, Yomiuri Newspaper 26.05.2006
- Anonymous, ‘Describing Precisely about The Tragedy of Imphal Campaign 「インパールの悲劇 克明に」 ’, Yomiuri Newspaper 21.09.2006
- Apple, M. and Beane, J. (2007), *Democratic Schools: Lessons in Powerful Education Second Edition*, Heinemann, Portsmouth, NH
- Arai, T. et al. (2003), *Contemporary Japanese* 『現代文』, Chikuma Shobō, Tōkyō

Araki, T. (April-December 2004) , Japanese History in the Senior 2 Social Studies Class in Kawadana High School in 'Theoretical and Practical Research for Curriculum Development for

International Understanding in Education for the Global Age' 「グローバル時代に対応した国際理解教育のカリキュラム開発に関する理論的・実践的研究」, *International Understanding in Education*(2006)

Atsumi, T., Classes for High School students to think independently about Modern Society: Through an Analysis of Subjects for A Decade of Law-Related Education in Japan in Social Studies class at Koiwa High School, Tokyo (2010), *Journal of Social Studies No.114* (2011)

Baasland, B. (2004), Citizenship Education in Norway, in *Flexibility in Curriculum, Citizenship and Communication European Community Commission: Socrates Programme*, Lisbon, 203-212

BERA (2011), *Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research*, British Educational Research Association, London

Brodhagen, B., The Situation Made Us Special, an action study conducted over a year in a 7th grade (=J1) class in Marquette Middle School, Madison, Wisconsin (before 1995) edited and written by Apple, M. and Beane, J. (2007), *Democratic Schools: Lessons in Powerful Education Second*, Heinemann, Portsmouth, NH

Byram, M. (1997), *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence, Multilingual Matters*, Clevedon

Chang, J.(1991), *Wild Swan*, William Collins, London

Crick, B. (1998), *Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools – Final Report of the Advisory Group on Citizenship 22 September 1998*, QCA, London, QCA/98/245

Crick, B. (2000), *Essays on Citizenship*, Continuum, London

Crick, B. (2002), *Democracy: A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford University Press, Oxford

CSV (2003), *CSV Reports on Citizenship in the Curriculum One Year On*, CSV Reports On No.12

Dana, N. and Yendol-Hoppey, D. (2009), *The Reflective Educator's Guide to Classroom Research*, Corwin, Thousand Oaks, CA

Derrida, J. (2001), *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness (Thinking in Action)*, Routledge, London

- Egi, S. 'Send the mother's message to US president 「大統領に届け母の思い」', Asahi Newspaper 13.08.2008
- Elliott, J. (1991), *Action Research for Educational Change*, Open University Press, Buckingham
- Elliott, J. (2007), *Reflecting Where the Action Is. The Selected Works of John Elliott*, Routledge, London and New York
- Fujii, C.(1990) 'Development of Moral Education in Japan (chap 4)' in A. Sano and N. Araki (ed.) *The Viewpoint of Moral Education*, Kōyō Shobō pub., Kyōto
- Fukuta, S. (2009), *The Great Finnish Method of Upbringing Teachers* 『フィンランドは教師の育て方がすごい』, Aki Shobo, Tōkyō
- Gaffney, P., Kent, B. and Grace, G.(2004), *Peace Education and Catholic Schools*, CRDCE, London
- Gundara, J. (2000), Social Diversity, Inclusiveness and Citizenship Education, edited and written by Lawton, D., Cairns, Jo. and Gardner, R. (2000) *Education for Citizenship*, Continuum, London
- Galtung, J. (2003), *The Technique of Getting the Idea to Create Peace ( Iwanami Booklet No.603)*, Iwanami pub., Tōkyō
- Galtung, J. and Ikeda, D. (1995), *Choose Peace: A Dialogue between Johan Galtung & Daisaku Ikeda*, Pluto Press, London
- Goleman, D. (1996), *Emotional Intelligence: Why It Can Matter More Than IQ*, Bantam Books, London
- Gombrich, E. (2007), *The Story of Art*, Phaidon Press, London
- Griffiths, M. and Williamson, Z. (2011), 'Evolving new methodologies in practitioner research: the case of visual methods' in Khine, M. and Saleh, I. (eds), *Practitioner Research: teachers' investigations in classroom teaching*, Nova Science Publishers, New York
- Handō, K. (2004), *Shōwa History* 『昭和史』, Heibonsha pub., Tōkyō
- Handō, K. 'Mr. Kazutoshi Handō describes wars 「半藤一利さんがつづる戦争」' Asahi Newspaper 13.08.2005
- HM Government (2007), *Bicentenary of the Abolition of the Slave Trade Act 1807-2007*, Department for Communities and Local Government Publications, Wetherby

Hiura, O. et al., 'Losing Equal Opportunity of Employment 「揺らぐ雇用機会の平等」', 10.09.2005

Hirakubo, M. (1998), 'Criticism' (Mr Hirakubo gave a copy of this article to us teachers on his preliminary visit to the school on 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2006. However, he could no longer remember its publications details. )

Hirakubo, M. (2006), *My Own Imphal Campaign* 『真実のインパールー印度ビルマ 作戦従軍記』, Kōjinsha pub., Tōkyō

Hudson, A. 'Citizenship education and students' identities: a school-based action research project' in Osler, A. edited (2005), *Teachers, Human Rights and Diversity*, Trentham Books, Stoke-on-Trent

Ibaraki, N. 'When I was most beautiful 「わたしが一番きれいだったとき」', in *General Japanese (Kokugo Sōgō* 『国語総合』) approved by MEXT in 2002, Chikuma Shobō pub., Tōkyō

Ikegami, A. and Masuda, Y. (2013), 『突破する教育 世界の現場から、日本へのヒント』, Iwanami Shoten, Tōkyō

Imperial War Museum (2000), *The Holocaust – The Holocaust Exhibition at the Imperial War Museum*, Imperial War Museum, London

Imphal Campaign:

<https://ja.wikipedia.org/wiki/%E3%82%A4%E3%83%B3%E3%83%91%E3%83%BC%E3%83%AB%E4%BD%9C%E6%88%A6>

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Battle\\_of\\_Imphal](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Battle_of_Imphal)

Nada, I. (1974), *Authority and Power* 『権威と権力』, Iwanami Shinsho, Tōkyō

Ishihara, C.(2005), *The Ideology of Japanese Textbooks* 『国語教科書の思想』, Chikuma Shobō pub., Tōkyō

*Japonica Encyclopaedia* 『ジャポニカ百科事典』 (1980), Shōgakkan, Tōkyō

Kageyama, H. (2007), *Children's Happiness Begins from Energy* 「子どもの幸せは『元気』から生まれる！」, edited by Yamaguchi, T. (2007)*The Education in This Country* 『この国の教育のあり方』, Alc pub., Tōkyō

Kang, S. and Morris-Suzuki, T. (2004), *Adventure of Democracy* 『デモクラシーの冒険』, Shūeisha shinsho, Tōkyō

- Kang, S. (2006), *Kang Sung-jung's Introduction to Political Studies* 『姜尚中の政治学入門』, Shūeisha shinsho, Tōkyō
- Kang, S. (2008), *How to Love Your Country* 『愛国の作法』, Asahi Shinsho, Tōkyō
- Kariya, T. (1995), 'Whereabouts of Mass Education Society 「大衆教育社会のゆくえ」', Chūkō shinsho, Tōkyō
- Kemmis, S., McTaggart, R. and Retallick, J. (2004), *The Action Research Planner*, Aga Khan Institute for Educational Development, Karachi
- Kerr, D., Cleaver, E., Ireland, E. and Blenkinsop, S. (2003), *Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study First Cross-Sectional Survey 2001-2002*, National Foundation for Educational Research, Norwich, Research Report RR416
- Kinoshita, Y., Kimura, Y. and Yoshida, T. ed. (1995), Detailed Explanation World History Research 『詳説世界史研究』, Yamakawa Pub., Tōkyō
- Kobayashi, Y. (1998), *Neo Gōmanism Manifesto Special – On War Vol.1* 『新・ゴーマニズム宣言 SPECIAL 戦争論 第1巻』, Gentōsha, Tōkyō
- Kobayashi, Y. (2001), *Neo Gōmanism Manifesto Special – On War Vol.2* 『新・ゴーマニズム宣言 SPECIAL 戦争論 第2巻』, Gentōsha, Tōkyō
- Kobori, K.(2003), Yutori invites downturn of education 「『ゆとり教育』下降志向への誘い」 edited by Kimura, T. (2003) *Responsible Adults* 『大人の責任』, PHP pub., Tōkyō
- Lawton, D. (1996), *Beyond the National Curriculum: Teacher Professionalism and Empowerment*, Sevenoaks, Hodder and Stoughton pub.
- Lawton, D., Cairns, J. and Gardner, R. ed. (2000), *Education for Citizenship*, Continuum, London
- Leftwich, A. (2004), *What is Politics? The Activity and Its Study*, Polity Press, Cambridge
- MacIntyre, A. (1981), *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*, Gerald Duckworth, London
- Maruyama, M. (1961), *Thought of Japan* 『日本の思想』, Iwanami Shinsho, Tōkyō
- MEXT (1972), *Story of the New Constitution* 『あたらしい憲法のはなし』, Japan Peace Committee, Tōkyō
- MEXT(1998), *The Government Curriculum Guidelines for Secondary School - General Ed.* 『中学校学習指導要領総則編』, National Printing Bureau, Tōkyō

MEXT (1999), *The Government Curriculum Guidelines Commentary for Secondary School - Social Studies ed.* 『中学校学習指導要領解説社会編』, Osaka Shoseki, Osaka

MEXT (1999), *The Government Curriculum Guidelines Commentary for Senior High School - Civics ed.* 『高等学校学習指導要領解説公民編』, Jikkyō pub., Nagano

MEXT (1999), *The Government Curriculum Guidelines Commentary for Senior High School – Geography and History ed.* 『高等学校学習指導要領解説地理歴史編』, Jikkyō pub., Tōkyō

MEXT (1999), *The Government Curriculum Guidelines Commentary for Senior High School – Japanese language ed.* 『高等学校学習指導要領解説国語編』, Tōyōkan pub., Tōkyō

MEXT (2000), *Practical Examples for Distinctive Educational Activity Development – Development of Learning Activity in the Periods for Integrated Study (Secondary and Senior High Schools)* 『特色ある教育活動展開のための実践事例集—「総合的な学習の時間」の学習活動の展開— (中学校・高等学校編)』, Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science & Technology in Japan, Tōkyō

MEXT(2003), *The Government Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School* 『高等学校学習指導要領』, Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science & Technology in Japan, Tōkyō

Miki, T., ‘After the Bomb 「砲撃のあとで」’, in *General Japanese (Kokugo Sōgō* 『国語総合』) approved by MEXT in 2002, Chikuma Shobō pub., Tōkyō

Miyadera, A. (2000), *Liberal Philosophy of Education: Diversity and Choice* 『リベラリズムの教育哲学 多様性と選択』, Keisō Shobō, Tōkyō

Murakami, H. (1999), *Underground* 『アンダーグラウンド』, Kōdansha Bunko, Tōkyō

Murakami, H. (2000), *Underground*, translated by Birnbaum, A. and Gabriel, P(2003), Vintage pub., London

Murphy-Shigematsu, S. (2004), *Ethnic Diversity, Citizenship, and Education in Japan, Diversity and Citizenship Education: Global Perspectives* edited by Banks, J., Wiley Jossey-Bass pub.

Muta, H. (2000), *Deregulation and decentralization of education in Japan, Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(5), 455-479

Nagai, T. (1948), *The Bells of Nagasaki* 『長崎の鐘』, Kyobunkwan, Tōkyō

Nakamura, G. (1983), *Mothers got Defoliant – the scars of dioxin* 『母は枯葉剤を浴びたーダイオキシンの傷あと』, Shinchō bunko, Tōkyō

- Nakane, C. (1967), *Japanese Society* 『タテ社会の人間関係 単一社会の理論』, Kōdansha Gendaishinsho, Tōkyō
- Naono, A. (2004), *Meeting Pictures of Atomic Bombs* 『「原爆の絵」と出会う』 ( *Iwanami Booklet No.627*), Iwanami pub., Tōkyō
- The National Council for Curriculum and Assessment (1998), *Civic, Social and Political Education Guidelines for Teachers Taking Action- A Guide to Action Projects and Their Assessment*, The National Council for Curriculum and Assessment, Dublin
- Nelson, A.(2005), *Mr. Nelson, did you kill people? – the real war story by a Vietnam veteran*  
<http://peaceboat.org/english/voyg/49/lob/050524a/index.html>
- Newton, N.(2010), *The Use of Semi-Structured Interviews in qualitative research: strengths and weaknesses*, [http://www.academia.edu/1561689/The\\_use\\_of\\_semi\\_structured\\_interviews\\_in\\_qualitative\\_research\\_strengths\\_and\\_weaknesses](http://www.academia.edu/1561689/The_use_of_semi_structured_interviews_in_qualitative_research_strengths_and_weaknesses)
- NIER (2002), *Periods for Integrated Study (Secondary School) Practical Examples* 『総合的な学習の時間（中学校編）実践事例集』, National Institute for Educational Policy Research, Gyōsei, Tōkyō
- O’Brien, T. ‘Ambush 「待ち伏せ」’, in *General Japanese Selected with Care: Modern Literature* (Seisen Kokugo Sōgō Gendaibun 『精選 国語総合 現代文』) approved by MEXT in 2002, Chikuma Shobō pub., Tōkyō
- Ofsted (2003), *National Curriculum Citizenship: Planning and Implementation 2002/03*, Office for Standards in Education, HMI No.1606.
- Ogi, N. and Richters, N. (2009), *Now, in Opening the Country, Education in Japan* 『いま「開国」の時、ニッポンの教育』, Honnoki, Tōkyō
- Oguma, E.(1995), *The Myth of the Homogeneous Nation (Tanitsuminzokushinwa no kigen* 『単一民族神話の起源』), Shiyōsha pub., Tōkyō
- Oguma, E. (1998), *The Boundaries of the Japanese* 『日本人の境界』, Shiyōsha pub., Tōkyō
- Oguma, E. (2002), *Democracy and Patriotism* 『〈民主〉と〈愛国〉』, Shinyōsha pub., Tōkyō
- Oguma, E. (2004), *Citizens and Armed* 『市民と武装』, Keiōgijuku Daigaku Syuppankai, Tōkyō
- Oguma, E., ‘Disharmonized Twins produced by Homogenization’, *Asahi newspaper* 17.03.2008

Oguma, E. (2015), *The Man Who Returned Alive – A Japanese Soldier’s Experience During and After WWII* 『生きて帰ってきた男 - ある日本兵の戦争と戦後』, Iwanami Shinsho, Tōkyō

Okada, T. (2012), *Mind Control* 『マインド・コントロール』, Bungei Shunjū, Tōkyō

Okano, K. and Tsuchiya, M. (1999), *Education in Contemporary Japan – Inequality and Diversity*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

Okawa, K. et al. (2002), *Integrated Japanese* 『国語総合』, Chikuma Shobō, Tōkyō

Omi, Y., Structural Violence – an action-study in a first year (U1) English Conversation class at Tedukayama University (September-October 2004): *Theoretical and Practical Research for Curriculum Development for International Understanding in Education for the Global Age: International Understanding in Education* (2006)

Osler, A. and Starkey, H. (2005), *Changing Citizenship: Democracy and Inclusion in Education*, Open University Press, Maidenhead, Berkshire

Osler, A. and Starkey, H. (2005), Practising Citizenship: Workshops exploring Community and Identity for 10-18 year olds in four schools in Leicester, UK (early 2000), *Changing Citizenship*, Open University Press

Osler, A. and Starkey, H. (2006), Education for Democratic Citizenship: a review of research, policy and practice 1995-2005, *Research Papers in Education*, 21(4), 433-466

Peace boat: <http://www.peaceboat.org/english/voyg/49/lob/050524a/index.html>

Peters, W. (1987), *A Class Divided, Then and Now*, Yale University Press, New Haven

Pring, R. (2007), *John Dewey (Bloomsbury Library of Educational Thought)*, Bloomsbury, London

QCA / DfEE (1999), *Citizenship – The National Curriculum for England – Key Stage 3-4*, QCA/ DfEE, London

QCA / DfEE (2000), *Citizenship at Key Stage 3 and 4: Initial Guidance for Schools London*, QCA/ DfEE, London

QCA / DfES (2001), *A Scheme of Work for Key Stage 3 Citizenship Teacher’s Guide*, QCA/ DfES, London

QCA (2007), *Citizenship – Programme of Study for Key Stage 3 and Attainment Target*, QCA, London

- QCA (2007), *Citizenship – Programme of Study for Key Stage 4*, QCA, London
- Riley, M., Byron, J. and Culpin, C. (2004), *The Impact of Empire – A World Study of the British Empire – 1585 to the Present*, John Murray Publishers Ltd, London
- Rogers, P. (2002), *Losing Ground: Global Security in the Twenty-first Century*, Pluto Press, London
- Ross, A. (2000), *Curriculum Construction and Critique*, Falmer Press, London
- Said, E. (1993), *Orientalism* 『オリエンタリズム』 translated by Imazawa, N., Heibonsya, Tōkyō
- Saitō, T. and Mori, T. (2007), *Japanese and Responsibility for Wars* 『日本人と戦争責任』, Kōbunken pub., Tōkyō
- Sakamoto-Vandenberg, A. (1998), Comparisons of English and Japanese Schooling, *Journal of Education and Work*, Vol. 12, Issue 3
- Sano, A. and Araki, N. ed. (1990), *The Viewpoint of Moral Education* 『道德教育の視点』, Kōyō Shobō pub., Kyōto
- Sano, A., Yamane, K., Kaga, H., Hayashi, Y. and Fujii, C., (1990), *The Principle of Education* 『教育の原理』, Kōyō Shobō pub., Kyōto
- Sawada, M. (2009), Some Aspects of the Critical Educational Studies in the United States of America for the Critical Re-examination of Michael Apple', *Nagoya Women's University Bulletin* 55 (2009)
- Sawada, M. (2013), translated *Democratic Schools: Lessons in Powerful Education Second Edition* 『デモクラティック・スクール 力のある学校教育とは何か』 by Apple, M. and Beane, J.(2007), Sophia University Press
- Scruton, R. (2007), The Palgrave Macmillan: *The Dictionary of Political Thought*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke
- Seida, N. and Seki, M., translated *Changing Citizenship* by A. Osler and H. Starkey (2005), Keiso Shobo pub., Tōkyō
- Sen, A. (1999), Democracy as A Universal Value, *Journal of Democracy* Vol.10.3 (1999) 3-17
- Senō, K. (1999), *The Boy H* 『少年 H』, Kōdansha bunko, Tōkyō

Shimao, T., ‘The War Letters (Senchu-Ofukushokan 「戦中往復書簡」)’ in *General Japanese (Kokugo Sōgō* 『国語総合』 ) approved by MEXT in 2002, Chikuma Shobō pub., Tōkyō

Shimao, T.(1960), *Thorn of Death (Shi no Toge* 『死の棘』 ), Shinchō bunko, Tōkyō

Skilbeck, M. (1984), *School-Based Curriculum Development*, SAGE Publications Inc

Starkey, H. (2006), Language teaching for Democratic Citizenship, *Lingua E Nuova Didattica* (2006), 44-54

Stenhouse, L. (1975), *An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development* , Heinemann, London

Suzuki, T. ed. (2005), *Citizen Literacy* 『シチズン・リテラシー社会をよりよくするために私たちにできること』 , kyōiku Shuppan, Tōkyō

Tago, K. (2005), ‘Transcending Conflict of War and Hatred - Devoting His Life for Reconciliation: Big Interview Guest, Mr. Masao Hirakubo 「戦争の対立と憎しみを超えて - 日英旧軍兵士たちの和解に尽くす - ビッグインタビューゲスト 平久保正男さん」’, *Eikoku News Digest* 04.08.2005

Takahashi, S. (1997), in *Paradigm Change in Peace Education* 『平和教育のパラダイム転換』 , Meiji Tosho pub., Tōkyō

Takeda, T. ‘Judgement’, in *Modern Literature (Gendaibun* 『現代文』 ) approved by MEXT in 1999, Chikuma Shobō pub., Tōkyō

Takeuchi, Y. (1943), *Authority and Art* 『権力と芸術』 , *Takeuchi Complete Works* Vol. 7, Chikuma Shobō, Tōkyō

Takeyama, M. (1959), *The Burmese Harp (Biruma no Tategoto* 『ビルマの豎琴』 ), Shinchō Bunko, Tōkyō

Tamura, R. ‘Trees 「木」’, in *General Japanese (Kokugo Sōgō* 『国語総合』 ) approved by MEXT in 2002, Chikuma Shobō pub., Tōkyō

Tanaka, S. (2009), ‘Durkheim and Educational Science’ in Yasuo Imai (eds), *History of Educational Thought* 『教育思想史』 , Yūhikaku Arma pub., Tōkyō

Toffler, A. ‘Use the Time Limit Conception for History’, *Yomiuri* newspaper 10.10.2004

Tsuneda, K. (2002), *Teaching Examples for Japanese of Secondary School 3 – Hints of Constructing Units for Developing Students’ Individuality* 『中学校国語 指導事例集 3 個性を生かした単元構想のヒント』 , Mitsumura Tosho, Tōkyō

Uchida, T. (2009), *Japan on the Frontier* 『日本辺境論』 , Shinchō Shinsho, Tōkyō

- Walsh, P. (1993), *Education and Meaning: Philosophy in Practice*, Cassell, London
- Walsh, P. (1997), *The Curriculum: Context, Design and Development*, University of London External Programme, London
- Walsh, P. and Branson, J. (1999), The GNVQ Experience in England and Wales, *Reconciling Liberal and Vocational Education*, by Trant, A (ed.) Curriculum Development Unit, Dublin, 120-159
- Walsh, P. and Gundara, J. (2004), Citizenship Education: Two Sets of Issues, in *Flexibility in Curriculum, Citizenship and Communication*, European Community Commission: Socrates Programme, Lisbon, 125-148
- Walsh, P. and Gundara, J. (2004), Synthesis: Citizenship Education in Five Countries, in *Flexibility in Curriculum, Citizenship and Communication*, European Community Commission: Socrates Programme, Lisbon, 223-233
- Walsh, P. (2007), *Citizenship Education for Diversity: Best Practices and Recommendations*, AND *National Report – England*, at [http://www.ceji.org/acodden/ced\\_resources.php](http://www.ceji.org/acodden/ced_resources.php)
- Warburton, N. (2001), *Philosophy: the Classics* (the Second Edition), Routledge, London
- Weizsäcker's speech in the Bundestag on 8 May 1985  
[https://www.lmzbw.de/fileadmin/user\\_upload/Medienbildung\\_MCO/fileadmin/bibliothek/weizsaecker\\_speech\\_may85/weizsaecker\\_speech\\_may85.pdf](https://www.lmzbw.de/fileadmin/user_upload/Medienbildung_MCO/fileadmin/bibliothek/weizsaecker_speech_may85/weizsaecker_speech_may85.pdf)
- White, P. (1983), *Beyond Domination: An Essay in the Political Philosophy of Education*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London
- White, P. (1996), *Civic Virtues and Public Schooling: Education Citizens for a Democratic Society*, Teachers College Press, New York
- Yamanishi, T., Understanding the Singaporean View of the Pacific War- a study in English Literature S1 Classes at the Private High School in Hokkaido (January-April 2001): *Tomakomai National College of Technology* ( 2004)
- Yamasaki, T. (1994), *A Child on the Ground* (Daichi no Ko 『大地の子』 ), Bunshun bunko, Tōkyō
- Yanagisawa, K.(2006), 'World Peace as a theme in the Junior 2 Integrated Study and Social Studies Classes of the Secondary School of Joetsu Educational University (September-October 2004)', in *Theoretical and Practical Research for Curriculum Development for*

*International Understanding in Education for the Global Age: International Understanding  
in Education*

## **Chapter 2 Appendices**

### **Appendix 2-1 A Note on Entrance Examinations to Japanese Universities**

Usually students in Japan have to take entrance exams for national universities in two stages. In January the ‘Centre-exam’ is held, a multiple-choice style examination across five main subjects Japanese literature, English, Math, at least one Science (from Biology, Chemistry, Physics or Earth Science) and at least one Social Studies subject (one of Geography, History, Politics or Economics). Since the correct answers are published soon after the examination, students are able to judge their own approximate scores. They will also have publicly available statistical calculations of the ranges of the scores of the students who attend the various national universities. These rankings are done by ‘cramming schools’ and are based on years of data and experience. Theoretically, then, students are now in a position to make sensible choices in their applications.

‘The second exams’, held in February, are set by the national universities, sometimes operating in clusters. Students – with some help from their teachers - will have decided according to their estimated centre-exam results which of these exam sets they might pass. They usually enter for several sets and may also take the entrance examinations for one or more private universities.

## Appendix 2-2 Foundations for Elliott's view of 'Action Research'<sup>133</sup>

The first source is the '**process model**' of curriculum development. Stenhouse had developed an account of this model in radical opposition to the fashionable 'behavioural objectives' model. He drew on the philosopher Richard Peters' argument that education should be, above all, an initiation into *intrinsically* worthwhile activities, such as science, arts, the humanities, politics and public debate, in which the important thing to teach students was their 'way around' the activity. He drew also on Bruner's idea of 'key concepts and procedures' in these areas that could be revisited 'spirally' at different ages and stages of development, with teachers learning to provide appropriate 'courteous translations' for the students. Stenhouse himself then added that these key ideas and procedures should be introduced to students more as focuses for exploration than as objects for mastery (Stenhouse 1975). As Walsh (1997) describes it, in this process model teachers are expected 'to represent and exemplify' in their own persons, out of many possible contents, the intrinsically most important ideas and procedures in each field. Stenhouse realised the high responsibility this model placed on teachers, as Elliott also acknowledges for his parallel model of teaching as action research. Indeed, the common strand in these two models, and their main contrast with the Objectives Model, is their insistence on the need for teachers to realise the wide scope of their mission for truly educational learning.

Another theoretical stream for Elliott starts from **Aristotle's fundamental classification of kinds of thinking and reasoning** into *theoretical, practical* and *technical*.

Walsh illustrates this classification when making it an important criterion of curriculum breadth and balance. Learning to think (like 'thinking' itself) can be (*i*) towards good, or better, understanding of **how things are**, as in science, history and sociology *OR* (*ii*) towards **making** good artefacts, as in art, music, and the technologies, *OR* (*iii*) towards developing good powers and habits in **decision-making and lifestyle**, as in preparatory studies and engagements at school in ethics, politics, relationships, health and business (adapted from Walsh 1997:39)

---

<sup>133</sup> With much assistance from my supervisor, Dr. Walsh

Elliott, however, applies the classification in a different way:

In his *Ethics* Aristotle argued for a distinction between activities which constitute the making of a product, and those which involved doing something well. Technical rationality, or *techne* as he called it, is the form of reasoning appropriate to the making of products, while practical deliberation, or *phronesis*, is the form of reasoning appropriate to doing something well. These two forms of rationality, underpinning the ‘objectives’ and ‘process’ models of curriculum planning, have been around a long time (1991: 138).

Elliott is moving here to identify the widespread *wrong* assumption that was alluded to earlier about the whole enterprise of education, namely, the view that it belongs mainly in Aristotle’s third category of ‘technical thinking’. In reality, education is primarily a task for Aristotle’s second category of ‘practical thinking’. It is much more fundamentally ‘a doing’ than ‘a making’! As such, for Aristotle, it calls for ‘right judgement’ (*phronesis*), which is a virtue rather than just a skill. Furthermore, it must be considered an *ethical* virtue when it refers to education. That is because education is a *fundamental* practice, presupposed by other practices and expected to convey ‘some holistic view of the goals and goods of human life generally’ (1991: 140). Indeed, for Elliott, ‘right judgement’ in education needs to be supported by the additional virtue of *wisdom* and he also refers here to a *spiritual* dimension of education as a whole, and not just of certain curriculum subjects.<sup>134</sup> (1991: 147-9).

Finally, Elliott returns to the intrinsic-extrinsic distinction he had noted in Peters and Stenhouse. Alasdair MacIntyre (1981), working in the Aristotelian tradition, built up a famous analysis of ‘**practices**’ – farming, football, portrait-painting, science, politics etc. It included a discussion of the relationship between their partially-defining and historically-evolving ‘internal goods’ and whatever external goods might have got attached to them at particular times and places. Elliott now notes that this lights up the issue of competition versus co-operation in human activities, including education. The achievement of external goods, given that not all can succeed, necessarily involves

---

<sup>134</sup> I believe our research team would have found the term ‘spiritual’ quite appropriate to our experience of our practice and research.

competition between practitioners. Whereas, the achievement of internal goods penalises nobody else and normally benefits the community of practitioners as a whole. (1991: 140) Obviously, this community benefit should be enhanced when the practitioners are working together, as they were in our ARs.

## Chapter 3 Appendices

### Appendix 3-2 Digests of the Main AR1 Texts (S1, S2 and S3)

#### ***S1 After the Bomb (novel), written by Taku Miki***

[This extract is the latter part of chapter 4, 'Night', of a fourteen chapter novel. It occupies 15 pages (making it the longest item) in the 352 pages of the textbook *General Japanese* (Kokugo Sōgō 国語総合), published by textbook company Chikuma Shobō (筑摩書房). It was approved by MEXT in 2002.]

The main character of the story is a boy. (The story is based on the author's own childhood. The author does not state how old the boy is just that he is attending elementary school.) The story is set in Manchuria during WWII. One day the boy happens to hear outside his home a conversation by two men talking about atomic destruction. The men are colleagues of his father; he knows them. His father works for a newspaper company. He does not fully comprehend their conversation but it makes him nervous. His nervousness is heightened on his father's return. The men continue their conversation with his father. What makes him nervous is his father's depressed face. His father doesn't say anything to him and enters the home. His mother listens to her husband and says, 'I cannot believe it!' The boy doesn't know what is happening and his parents' attitude increases his concern. Finally, his father tells the boy and his elder brother about the atomic destruction of Hiroshima. After the explanation it is time for bed. The two children begin to sleep.

However, at 1:30 am, the phone suddenly rings very loudly. His father answers the phone and say 'Yes, yes, yes, .....oh, yes; I could imagine this. My worries became true...' After the telephone conversation, the father calls his wife, his two children, and wife's parents. The father begins to explain what is happening. He says, 'thirty minutes ago, Soviet Union invaded Manchuria and is advancing toward us.' The boy's elder brother is shocked that Japanese army does not protect the border between Manchuria and Soviet Union. The father explains the truth that there are no Japanese forces at the border. They have to pack right now. However, the father must go first to the newspaper office. The elder brother and boy begin to pack. The boy suddenly becomes very sad. Packing meant to go camping; now it means to flee danger.

As the boys pack mother is preparing food for the journey. They try to recognize the noise of their father's shoes for his return. Listening they hear it is not only their family who are worried and nervous. The boys hear a woman cry, the cracking of pottery, and banging of doors. It is almost 2:30 am. The boy is keen to observe more and goes to the top floor. He sees a lot of lights coming from windows of houses. Seeing these lights the boy thinks they are beautiful. Usually there are no lights at night, to prevent an enemy attack. The boy imagines that the lights lift the people's spirits. For him the lights are symbol of hope. However, the Japanese lit the lights to prepare their escape.

#### ***S2 Ambush, written by Tim O'Brien (Translated by Haruki Murakami)***

[The work was originally written in English, and translated into Japanese by Haruki Murakami (村上春樹), under the revised title 本当の戦争の話をしよう ('Let's talk about the real war') 1990. The extract from the story occupies 8 of 224 pages in the textbook

*General Japanese Selected with Care: Modern Literature* (精選 国語総合 現代文編), published by Chikuma Shobō (筑摩書房). It was approved by MEXT 2002. It was the only extract of an appropriate length that contained direct description of war.]

When daughter of the writer, Tim, was 9 years old she asks him whether he had ever killed men in war. She knows that he was a soldier during the Vietnam War. His answer is, 'I 've never killed anybody'. He hopes she will ask the same question when she is an adult. He wants very much to talk about what happened to him during that war. He writes the story as if she were an adult.

At midnight, he and other soldiers go to an ambush site. They lie in wait for five hours. It is misty and hot. He cannot see very well. However, he can locate three hand grenades and he lays them down in a line. He positions the grenades to where they can be best thrown. He sees further as dawn brightens the day. Mosquitoes persistently bite him. He wants to wake up his buddy, Kaiowa, who can deal with the mosquitoes. However, he doesn't want to wake him. Alone he struggles with mosquitoes. Suddenly he sees a young man walking in the mist. The young man wears black clothes, rubber sandals, and grey bomb band around his waist. He walks stooped and carries a weapon in his hand. But his muzzle is down and the young man looks relaxed as if he were walking in the middle of the street. He looks like part of the morning mist or a figment of the writer's imagination.

However, he feels tension in his guts and already he has pulled off the pin of the hand grenade. It's a conditioned reflex. He does not hate the young man. He does not feel the young man as his enemy. He does not think about morality, politics, or military responsibly. Before making himself throw the hand grenade, he has already thrown one. The scene freezes in his mind like a camera shutter. He swallows something like lemonade from his guts.

The hand grenade explodes. The young man flies up as if on a wire and drops to the ground. His right eye is closed. Where his left eye had been is now a big hole shaped like a star.

There was no danger. If the writer had not thrown the grenade, nothing would have happen. Afterwards, Kaiowa tries to persuade him that the young man would have died sooner or later. The writer's action is correct. Kaiowa even tries to persuade the writer that this is war. Kaiowa says to him, 'Don't stare at the dead body so much.'

However, what Kaiowa tells the writer is too complicated for him to understand. All he can do at that time is stare at the dead body of the young man. Even now the writer cannot overcome his memory. Sometimes he thinks there was no alternative and sometimes he thinks there was. He tries not to think about this often. However, when he reads the newspaper or is sitting alone in his room, suddenly he sees the young man coming toward him in the mist. The young man passes by him, smiles at him, and walks into the mist.

### ***S3 Judgment, a short story written by Taijun Takeda***

[The story was originally published in the magazine *Criticism*, April 1947 – and later republished in *Taijun Takeda Complete Works* in June 1971. It occupies 33 of 334 pages of

the S3 textbook *Modern Literature* 『現代文』, published by Chikuma Shobō (筑摩書房) approved by MEXT in 1999. It is the longest item in this textbook.]

The writer hears the news that Japan lost WWII in Shanghai, known at the time as ‘International City’, where he was working for the China-Japanese Culture Association. Having borrowed a Bible from an old teacher neighbour, he feels as if the destruction described in the book of Revelations exactly informs the Japanese situation. Now the old teacher’s young son, Jiro, returns from the battlefield. The father is proud of Jiro’s maturity and calmness, and the writer is also impressed by him. However, Jiro shows no interest in Japan’s lost war and, regarding Revelations, he says, ‘There might be some cases where people are punished by destruction. However, will each person be punished equally? Will each person be punished equivalent to the scale of his or her own crime? I wonder about this point.’ In February 1946, the writer hears that Jiro broke up with his beautiful fiancé and then he gets a thick letter from Jiro (*which then becomes the main focus of the work*).

**The letter (in summary).** My father and I had agreed to go back to Japan. However, I have decided that I will remain here in China alone. Perhaps he will understand my decision if he reads this letter.

I killed people in the war. You think this is normal for soldiers. However, my murder is ‘personal’; I did not kill people as soldiers, I killed people. In the battlefield everything was mad. In my hometown in Japan, everybody lives very happily with his or her morality. However, in the battlefield, nobody has any morality or ethics. Soldiers easily insult Chinese people, hit them, steal from them, rape women, burn their houses, and devastate the fields and so on. You really cannot imagine how awfully soldiers can behave, especially those of less education. There is no law and no judgment by God. There is just violence. People can do whatever they want and have no responsibilities for their own action. If I feel like killing someone there, I could kill him or her immediately.....

*The letter then briefly but graphically describes the two occasions in which Jiro himself had killed on a whim. Once he had joined some others in shooting two obviously non-combatant Chinese farmers on the orders of his patrol head, for whom it was a joke. I really didn’t want to shoot....but suddenly I ask myself, ‘Why is it wrong to kill somebody?’ I also shoot..... The second killing, a little later, was him shooting an old Chinese blind man, sitting with his wife outside the burnt remains of their home. The head of our patrol says they will die sooner or later. Then in my mind again emerges an insensitive thought; ‘I can kill, killing is nothing. I need no effort. I don’t have to suppress my emotion, either.’ I shoot the old husband in the head..... only me and the head of our patrol saw this murder, and the head died six months ago. It is only me in the world who knows the fact of this murder. But I don’t remember even the faces of that old Chinese couple.*

*Now back in his father’s home and reading newspaper accounts of the Tokyo war-crime trials, the memories were troubling him – and troubling his relationship with his fiancé. I had a beautiful loving fiancé called Suzuko; I really love her. We talked about marriage. Also we talked about the life we would have when we become old. Suddenly this conversation reminded me of the old Chinese couple. I remember that I killed just the*

husband and left the old wife. Suddenly I could imagine that they loved each other. Even when the village was burnt, they might still love each other... They might console each other.... What did I do to them? .....I imagined very vividly the awful possibility that my fiancé Suzuko was in the old Chinese wife's situation. Suzuko cannot cry out to me because of my death and she remains silent. And night comes. Nobody helps her. I imagined this very vividly..... I decided to talk to Suzuko about my own murders. She did not want to listen, but I could not help telling the truth to her and preparing to ask her 'Will you still love me?' However, Suzuko became terribly shocked and, afterwards ... I felt the 'cold stone' in our relationship. Suzuko made efforts not to hate me, but I cannot make her 'sacrifice' like this. I broke up with her.....I forced myself to do this.

Then I begin to think that consciousness of my own crime is my only salvation. If I cannot be conscious of my own crime, what would I become? I am afraid about this. I decided to stay in China. Of course, I can go back to Japan; however, if I do my conscience of my own crime will become weaker. I am eager to make a place for my own judgment. *He did explain that his decision to Suzuko's father and now he concludes by thanking the old teacher.* .... I am very grateful to you, because I can tell my story. A lot of people do not have a person to whom they can tell the truth. They just remain silent.

### Appendix 3-3 The Programme for Considering Wars

	<b><u>S1</u></b>	<b><u>S2</u></b> the two teachers worked closely together	<b><u>S3</u></b>
4 <sup>th</sup> Sept	*Questionnaire *Reading together the first half of <i>After the Bomb</i>	Pupil presentations: what they did during summer vacation	Pupil presentations: what they did during summer vacation
11 <sup>th</sup> Sept	*Reading the second half of <i>After the Bomb</i> *Examining the historical background, using a handout from a history textbook and Toffler's newspaper article	*Questionnaire *From where did Japanese 'philosophy' come? Some Chinese thoughts in Japanese classics	*Questionnaire *Reading the first part of <i>Judgement</i> (up to Jiro's letter)
18 <sup>th</sup> Sept	*Analysing structure and characters' roles * Considering Japanese misery as depicted in Naono's pictures and Manchurian Chinese misery as depicted in <i>Wild Swan</i> .	*What is the nature of war from ancient times? (through a supplementary text)	*Explanation of historical background *Reading the later part of <i>Judgment</i>
25 <sup>th</sup> Sept	A Holiday at the London Japanese School		
2 <sup>nd</sup> Oct	*Further examination of roles in <i>After the Bomb</i> *Explaining 'left-behind-in-China Japanese children' as in Yamasaki's novel - analysing the author's message	*What is the situation of "Vietnam War"? *Reading <i>Ambush</i>	*Summary analysis of the first part
9 <sup>th</sup> Oct	*Continuing analysis of Yamasaki *What is the meaning of 'the light' in <i>After the Bomb</i> ? * Writing short essays (worksheet template provided)	*About Tim O'Brien *Dividing and analysing the three parts of <i>Ambush</i>	*Summary analysis of Jiro's letter
16 <sup>th</sup> Oct	*How did war affect the Japanese people? How did they feel during the war? (using <i>When I was beautiful</i> )	*Why does this author continue to write about his Vietnam War? *How <i>Ambush</i> deals with the passage of time	*Analyzing the process of Jiro's 'realization' of his sin. *Analyzing the reasons why Jiro rejects going back to Japan
23 <sup>rd</sup> Oct	* 'What is justice?'(1), using <i>Trees</i> . *Colonial powers 'exporting' injustice to their colonies	*Close examining of the passage of time in <i>Ambush</i>	*Writing essays
30 <sup>th</sup> Oct	* 'What is justice?'(2) What did Marx think about justice? *Questionnaire worksheet on 'Justice'	*Writing essays	*How some Japanese philosophers reacted against WWII? Reading <i>The View of Life</i> by K.Miki (who 'died' in prison).
6 <sup>th</sup> Nov	From where did Japanese 'philosophy' come? Chinese thoughts in Japanese classics	*Historical background to Japan's involvement in WWII (using a supplementary text) *How did most Japanese react during and after WWII?	*Analysing the structure and literary techniques of <i>Judgement</i>
13 <sup>th</sup> Nov	*How did most Japanese react, during and after the war? (using <i>War Letters</i> )	*How the Japanese behaved outside Japan?	*Analyzing anger and hope
20 <sup>th</sup> Nov	Plenary meeting	Plenary meeting	Plenary meeting
27 <sup>th</sup> Nov	Repeat main questionnaires with all classes		

## Appendix 3-4 (a) Sample Class/Research Diary Extracts for AR1

### (i) Extract of Diary for 18<sup>th</sup> Sep

On the 18<sup>th</sup> September, I used a different method than I had used on 11<sup>th</sup> September. The lesson of the 11<sup>th</sup> September was more of history than a literature class. By following MEXT compulsory guidelines I concentrated on enabling pupils to understand what story is about. At first I asked pupils to divide this novel into sections. I instructed, 'If this novel can be divided into four sections, how can you divide into four sections?' It is necessary for pupils to understand how the story develops when they divide into four sections. I separated the pupils into groups to discuss and asked them present how they divided the story. Pupils agreed about the beginning and end in first, second and third section, however, about the beginning of the fourth section, there were two opinions. Pupils agreed that the fourth section might begin from author's movement (he realised that not only the author's family but also other Japanese families were busy preparing their escape from Manchuria). However, there were two perspectives which focused on the boy's actual movement (boy suddenly got out from his apartment and went to the top of the apartment building), or which focus on the boy's realization (before he got out from the apartment, his brother told him to realize that not only his family but also other families were busy preparing their escape from the city. His interior world was enlarged from solely focusing on his own family to that of focusing on others.).

The two perspectives were interesting ways of understanding the author's recognition of Japanese's occupation of Manchuria. The boy's concern changed from just thinking about atomic bomb in his own country to the realization with his brother of broader issues of Japanese occupation of Manchuria.

Prior to the two perspectives raised by the class I had not realized this hidden meaning. When listening to two perspectives I was enthused about this issue. I asked myself where it was best to divide the section: at the boy's recognition of broader issues or when he moves from the interior world of reflection to the exterior observation. I did not conclude by showing the 'right' answer, but just by showing the division.

Following this activity I asked the pupils to write a subheading for each section in order to understand the novel better. After that I asked pupils to think and imagine how main characters and sub-characters thought and felt in the story. I let them raise all of the characters (boy, boy's mother, his father, his grand-parents, father's two colleagues, neighbours) and analyze their roles in the story. Why was boy not very afraid of atomic bomb, did he have ambiguous insecurity when he heard that his father's colleagues talk about atomic bomb? Why did his brother and father know more about the atomic bomb? I let them discuss and then write their summary on the blackboard. Then I explained what boy learnt about atomic bomb from his father and brother. I supplied the supplementary textbook to describe how the atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima and how people in Hiroshima suffered from the atomic bomb. I also explained that we would watch a video in plenary meeting on 20<sup>th</sup> November. I read the parts of *Wild Swan* of what Japanese did in Manchuria in to compare suffering. This book is in the Japanese school library; pupils can borrow and read whenever they like. In the second chapter of *Wild Swan* Yuan writes about how awfully Japan had treated Manchuria. I read one section showing the example of how Yuan's mother

and her friend were oppressed by Japanese. (In the school athletic festival, Manchurians had to lose the race on purpose. However, her friend did not lose the race and came first. She was bullied by Japanese and later was ordered to quit school.)

**(ii) Extract of Diary for 16<sup>th</sup> Oct**

I asked pupils to read the poem several times asked some questions to enable them to think about what was Japanese situation during the WWII. The first question is why the beginning of each section in this poem begins from ‘when I was the most beautiful?’ The second question was ‘why did not the author use the year such as “in 1945”?’ Why did she express the wartime by saying, “when I was the most beautiful”?’ I asked them to make groups to discuss and present. When they presented, I tried to make their points more clear and wrote their presentation on the blackboard.

[Question one]

- It is a comparison between collapsed town and the author. When she mentions about her own beauty, she can emphasize how horribly the town collapsed.
- Everybody died during the war and only the author survived among her acquaintances; therefore, she expressed herself ‘beautiful’.
- She looks back to the past from present. She wants to emphasize that she looks back to the past from the point of view of the present.

[Question two]

- The poem is from personal experience. The author can emphasize subjectivity. (If she mentioned the year, the poem would become more objective.)

As pupils present, the poem is of personal experience; therefore, it could be the text of Japanese literature. When she mentioned exact date, it cannot be the textbook for the Japanese literature. Even though this poem is written from the author’s subjective view toward wartime, there is one important fact to tell readers what she thought during the war and after the war.

As I returned the papers, which pupils submitted last week, and I tried to ask pupils about what poet Ibaraki Noriko, who lived in Japan during wartime, experienced during the WWII. A lot of answers came back to me. When pupils answer that she could not dress herself up, could not make up, and could not get any gentle present from men and so on. I explained people’s lives during the war by introducing the book called ‘The boy H’ written by Kappa Seno, who experienced WWII. I explained the fact that not only Ibaraki but also other writer such as Seno had the same experience. I told them that the Japanese government had a propaganda saying; luxury is harm and makes people supply any metal such as personal finger rings and even teeth fillings. I wanted to tell pupils that nobody could be indifferent to WWII at that time (some pupils wrote on papers), because the government enforced people to attend the war by various actions, like the propaganda ‘One for all, all for one’. At the same time, we cannot blame just the government of that time, because Japanese people did not think logically (Some people protested, however, people who protested, went to the prison.). People had their own responsibilities for cooperating with the government. (Japanese government after the WWII, exaggerated this point. After Japan lost the war, the news companies wrote that all of the Japanese nations should repent. The government

'forced' people to repent.) We did not have and still do not have a strong civil society to oppose the government decision.

Ibaraki's poem describes very well how most Japanese people reacted during the wartime. In the fourth section, she describes as below.

**When I was the most beautiful**

**My head was vacant**

**My mind was stubborn**

**My hands and legs were just shining brown**

I asked pupils what Ibaraki meant by writing, 'my head was vacant. My mind was stubborn. (However,) My hands and legs were just shining brown'. I made the group and let them think about what they meant. The presentations from pupils were truly interesting. About the meaning of 'my head was vacant', they presented that

- Japanese could not get accurate information from outside.
- Japanese could not help obeying the authority.
- Japanese did not have their own voluntary will and idea.
- As for the meaning of 'my mind was stubborn', they presented that.
- Japanese were not flexible.
- Japanese could not think freely.
- As for the meaning of 'My hands and legs were just shining brown', they presented that
- Japanese people worked outside and got sunburn.
- Japanese had to work a lot outside.
- 'Shining brown' might mean 'muddy' from the work in the fields.

I made them compare 'inside' and 'outside' of people and presume that there might be some contrast between 'inside' and 'outside'. That means that their brains did not work properly, however, bodies just work finely. It made me imagine 'robots'. However, no pupil mentioned 'robots'.

*It seemed that pupils enjoyed my class. This poem is abstract compared with historical textbook. However, I found it is very useful to describe people's life, thoughts and feelings, even though it is written from author's subjective point of view. Objective understanding could augment this subjective view by adding historical facts.*

### **Appendix 3.4 (b) S1 Supplementary Texts in AR1**

*(i) Poem 'Trees' by Ryuichi Tamura*

*(Translated by Miwa Mizushima-Macmaster)*

*Trees Ryuichi Tamura*

*I like trees because they are serene  
I like trees because they do not walk and run  
I like trees because they do not shout love and justice*

*Is it true  
Is it really true*

*When people see trees  
Trees are whispering with slow and quiet voices  
Trees are walking toward heaven  
Trees are running like lightning below ground  
Though trees surely do not shout  
Trees are truly love  
If trees are not so, birds do not come  
Birds do not stay on their branches  
Trees are truly justice, if trees are not so, they do not suck underground  
water from their roots and they do not return water to heaven*

*Young trees  
Old trees*

*Each tree is different  
Each tree is awake  
Under the different light of stars*

*Trees  
I like you very much*

*(ii) Poem 'When I was the most beautiful' by Noriko Ibaraki*

*(Translated by Miwa Mizushima-Macmaster)*

*When I was the most beautiful  
Towns became collapsed  
From somewhere we did not expect to see  
The blue sky was seen*

*When I was the most beautiful  
A lot of people around me died  
In the factories, in the sea, in unknown islands  
I lost my chance to dress myself up*



**2<sup>nd</sup> July (From Miho to Toshio)**

I pray for you from the bottom of my heart. I have nothing to tell you about. I will go with you forever without words to the end of the ocean and to the end of the sky, as far as your Shirokinu goes. (Miho gave a Shirokinu to Toshio. Women during wars gave Shirokinu for praying for their men's safety. Shirokinu was stitched at 1000 points by red thread.) Please forgive me to go with you.

To the Commander [Two shorts songs]

**10<sup>th</sup> July 7:00pm (From Toshio to Miho)**

I am eager to meet you. Come to me along the beach. I will lend you a torch for the snakes. (*The torch was used as the signal for a sally it was, therefore, a precious one.*) This is very important one, so please do not bump it or drop into the sea. High tide is around eight o'clock; please leave around ten o'clock. I will wait for you around eleven o'clock at usual place. The low tide is midnight, therefore, I will think of how you can get home around that time. Toshio

**28<sup>th</sup> July (From Miho to Toshio)**

In the evening, I felt very sad. Sad and sad.... The commander is in his military clothes! I dreamed that you were about to leave under the order. I hold you and I try to stop crying with bitten lips. I saw your back on the rough beach leaving the words, 'I don't look back'. However, I could not stand and was about to cry. I almost fainted, maybe I was really about to faint, therefore, I ran after you... oh.... I ran after you.

Toshio! Toshio! Oh, I am still crying when I am writing to you. On the way home, I saw your kamikaze ship for the first time far away in the dark. I felt very insecure and I knelt down to pray. I cried loud. Your subordinate, Fujii, also cried. I yearn for you, I cannot bear to be still. Toshio, what will Miho become? I am heartbroken. Toshio! Toshio! I became insane. I just need you, just need you. I just need you under the heaven, on the ground, and in this space. I cannot help crying. Toshio, I do not know what to do. My tears do not stop. If I can meet you, meet you, oh I want to meet you, I would be calm if I could meet you. I feel insane with this great insecurity. With my heart waving,

Nine twenty in the morning.

**3<sup>rd</sup> August (From Toshio to Miho)**

Please come to the beach around nine o'clock. At the place where I brought lilies to you, near 'Fuku'. Toshio

**13<sup>th</sup> August midnight (Sally for kamikaze was ordered and they are preparing for it.) (From Miho to Toshio)**

I have come to the place near the North Gate.

Cannot I go with you?  
Please let me see you.  
Please let me see you.  
Please let me see you one way or another.  
I will not get upset. Miho

**14<sup>th</sup> August Early in the morning (There was no order for the departure of sally and the day breaks.)**

(Toshio to Miho) *Yes, it happened as I told you. You should never worry about me,*

My dear Miho,

I felt very sorry for you last night. However, this is my job; therefore, I am very sorry. Please come to see me to the place where you came last night, because I cannot go for you. The low tide is past five o'clock in the morning. It will be one hour late compared with yesterday. I will try to go to the place around three o'clock.

I cannot see you for long; however, I will be satisfied to see your face just for a while. Never get upset. Dear, dear Miho

**15<sup>th</sup> August night (The surrender day of Japan) (From Toshio to Miho)**

I am fine.

## Appendix 3.4 (c) Sample Extracts from S2 and S3 Teachers' AR1 Diaries

### Teacher X (S2B)

#### Structure

- 1) Explanation about author Tim O'Brien
- 2) Explanation about Vietnam War
- 3) Dividing section through meanings
- 4) Questions
  - (1) What did Tim and his daughter talk about?
  - (2) Why did author tell a lie to his daughter?  
If his nine-year-old daughter knew that he had killed somebody, would she be shocked?
  - (3) What did Tim think of about his own action (murder)?
  - (4) Does Tim try to continue to tell a lie to his daughter?

#### 1<sup>st</sup> Section

- 1) Why does Tim write the story?
- 2) What is the reason for the murder?

#### 2<sup>nd</sup> Section

- 1) Where, when, and what did Tim do?
- 2) From when to when, did Tim go on ambush?
- 3) Make the chart of Tim's feeling.
- 4) Did Tim finish 'ambush'?
- 5) What did the young man look like?
- 6) How did Tim respond when he found the young man?
- 7) What was the result of Tim's tension?
- 8) What did Tim do during his tension?

#### 3<sup>rd</sup> Section

- 1) Why does Tim tell people about his own murder?
- 2) Is this novel against wars?
- 3) Writing essay about pupils' own thoughts after reading 'Ambush'.

### Teacher Y (S2A)

#### Structure

- (1) Sorting out by time, space, and characters
- (2) Understanding the relationship between each sections
- (3) Understanding the structure of story-telling style by Tim

#### 1<sup>st</sup> Section

- 1) Why did Tim have problem when his daughter questioned to him?
- 2) Why did Tim tell a lie to his daughter?
- 3) What is his true feeling?

#### 2<sup>nd</sup> Section

- 1) What is 'ambush'?
- 2) What did Tim think of about a young man in front of him?
- 3) What is the reason for Tim's next action?
  - The reason why Tim threw away hand grenade

- What is Tim thinking about his own action?
- 4) Why does Tim think that Kaiowa's rationalisation is not effective?

### **3<sup>rd</sup> Section**

- 1) Why does Tim not settle his own thinking?
- 2) Why does Tim try to think of too many things?
- 3) When does Tim have dream of a young man who he killed?
- 4) Why does Tim dream of the young man?

### **Teacher V (S3A)**

#### **Structure**

- 1) The background of the end of WWII
  - \*How do Japanese people thoughts about the loss of WWII connect with Revelations in the Bible?
  - \*What did Japanese, who lived away from Japan, think of about the lost of WWII?
- 2) Reading with pupils
- 3) Understanding difficult words
- 4) Dividing sections
- 5) Questioning and thinking about Jiro's action
- 6) Discussion
- 7) Writing essay

#### **The Section before Jiro's letter**

- 1) Summarising Takeda's story line
- 2) Understanding the image of the 'Revelations' in the Bible

#### **The Section of Jiro's letter**

- 1) Summarising his situation and mentality when Jiro killed Chinese.
- 2) Why is it wrong to kill people? (Discussion as well)
- 3) Explain the reason why Jiro confessed his murder to his fiancé Suzuko?
- 4) Summarising the change of their relationship between Jiro and Suzuko.
- 5) Why did Jiro break the engagement with Suzuko?
- 6) How did Jiro recognise his own murder?
- 7) Think the relationship between going back to Japan and recognition of his murder.

#### **Through whole of the story**

- 1) What does Taijun Takeda try to express by the title 'Judgement'?
- 2) What is individual ethics when wars happen?
- 3) What does 'Judgement' mean to us who live today?

## Chapter 4 Appendices

### Appendix 4-1(a) The Programme for the AR1 Plenary Meeting

<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Scenario</b>
<p><b>1.Opening</b></p> <p>Clarify what this plenary meeting is and MC explains today’s process according to the handouts, supplied by teachers.</p> <p>Students can prepare for how the plenary meeting proceeds.</p>	<p><b>(3 min.)</b></p> <p>Girls and boys, we will think of wars from now for 2 hours and 25 minutes. This plenary meeting is called ‘The plenary meeting for considering wars’.</p> <p>We are today’s meeting MC Chairpersons from S3.</p> <p>We will explain how today’s meeting is going using the handouts.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Opening</li> <li>2) Each teacher explains the storyline of textbook, which he/she taught in the class.</li> <li>3) Representatives from each class will present what they learned during classes, what they focused on, and what they thought.</li> <li>4) Each class learnt different content. For one of the visual examples, we will watch the video showing how people in Nagasaki suffered physically and mentally from the atomic bomb.</li> <li>5) We will have 10 minutes break.</li> <li>6) People from S1 to S3 make groups and discuss in each group.</li> <li>7) Then the representative from each group will present the group’s thoughts. If we have more time, we will discuss further as a whole.</li> <li>8) At the end, we will write what we learned from this plenary meeting on the paper, which will be supplied later.</li> </ol>
<p><b>2.The explanation for the story line of novels by S1 to S3 teachers</b></p> <p><i>So students can recall the content of their own text and learn what other classes did; So they can review what they did and widen their knowledge.</i></p>	<p><b>(S1 3min, S2 3min, S3 3min---9minutes)</b></p> <p>S1 to S3 teachers briefly explain the storylines, which they taught.</p> <p>Teacher Miwa for S1, please explain. (Explanation) Thank you very much. Then, teacher X for S2, please explain. (Explanation) Thank you very much. Then, teacher V. for S3, please explain. (Explanation) Thank you very much.</p>

<p><b>3. The presentation by the representative from each class</b>  <i>So students can review what they learned, widen their points of view, and seek for the common points among S1 to S3 materials.</i></p>	<p><b>(Each representative 3min, 4 classes=12minutes)</b>  Representatives who are chosen from each class will present what is the focus of their class and make their own views. We have to warn them now before they will present that there are common points among the three texts from S1 to S3 studied. Please listen to each presentation carefully and think of common points. Then:  Shiro from S1A, please present. (Presentation) Thank you very much. Then, Kiyoshi from S2A, please present. (Presentation) Thank you very much. Then, Seiji from S2B, please present. (Presentation) Thank you very much. Then, Masao from S3A, please present. (Presentation) Thank you very much.  By the way, everybody, could you find common points from S1 to S3? (Look around.)  (Some opinions will be presented from pupils)  A lot of opinions have been presented; shall we focus on <i>invasion into others</i>?</p>
<p><b>4. Watching video of atomic bomb in Nagasaki (Title of video: Boys and girls in Nagasaki)</b>  <i>Students can watch the real experiences of survivors and disaster. They can imagine and ‘experience’ damages physically and mentally.</i></p>	<p><b>(30 minutes)</b>  We can say that one of the ultimate experiences for the invasion into others is atomic bomb. Therefore, we will watch the video showing how people suffer physically and mentally from atomic bomb. You can also think: what is the difference between other bombs and the atomic Bomb. Then shall we watch?   (Watching video)   We will have 10 minutes break. Please return here on time.</p>
<p><b>5. Break</b></p>	<p><b>(10 mins)</b></p>
<p><b>6. Discussion in mixed-age groups</b>   <i>So students can develop their own way of thinking. Students do not discuss freely, but they discuss some of themes, which are picked up. By picking up, some groups can choose same topics and pupils can have chances to deepen their understanding toward wars.</i>   Representatives from each group should make presentation to all. Therefore, <u>students can</u></p>	<p><b>(45 minutes)</b>  We learned about wars from September, listened to the summary of story lines by teachers and presentations by representatives from each class, and then watched the video about atomic bomb in Nagasaki. Now we will discuss in groups.  Groups are already divided (by teachers). Each group has S1 to S3 pupils. Before discussion, I will explain briefly what we will discuss.  (Supply the papers for the group discussion)  Please look at the paper called ‘Group recording for discussion’. What we will discuss are as the papers show:  1) About the ‘invasion into others’  (1) What are the ‘invasions into others’?  (2) Why do the invasions happen?  2) What did the video producer want to tell?  3) Why do we read literature relating to wars during Japanese literature lessons?  4) There are a lot of ways of thinking about why Atomic Bombs were dropped. For example, one way of thinking is that Japan would</p>

<p><u>realise that each pupil have responsibilities to think.</u></p>	<p>never have stopped the war unless United States would drop atomic Bomb. If we discuss this here, we have no end of discussion. It is better to explain historical cause of atomic bomb. However, there is the fact that atomic Bomb was actually dropped as we watched on video. Therefore, we can discuss what we can do from now on.</p> <p>5) Let's think of the difference of ways of thinking between winners and losers.</p> <p>Each group should decide who is to write what we are discussing. We will collect the papers for each group. Please choose a representative in each group. They will present opinion.</p> <p>Now please divide into groups according to the chart. (Discussion) Time is over, so please stop discussing.</p>
<p><b>7. The presentation from representatives</b> Students can hear different ways of thinking and <i>deepen and develop their own understanding regarding wars.</i></p>	<p><b>(9 groups/ each group has 3 minutes=27 minutes maximum)</b> The representative of group one, please present. Each representative should say your name and class before presentation. (Presentation) Thank you very much. Please applaud! Then the representative of group two, please present. (Presentation) <i>- continue-</i></p> <p>(If we have more time to discuss after all of presentation finishes) The representatives of each group finished presentation. If somebody wants to say something individually here, please present.</p>
<p><b>8. Writing opinions individually on the paper</b></p> <p>Each student writes what they learned and deepened their thoughts. <i>By writing immediately, they can bear this in their mind and can understand their own understanding more</i></p>	<p><b>(15 minutes)</b></p> <p>Then please write what you learned and thought from this plenary meeting. We will supply papers.</p> <p>We will collect now.</p>
<p><b>9. Closing</b></p>	<p>Now we will finish this plenary meeting. Thank you very much. (applaud)</p>

### **Appendix 4-1 (b) The Content of the A-bomb Video**

A-bomb video is about the boys and girls who experienced the atomic bomb in Nagasaki on 9th August 1945. The video's title is ナガサキの少年少女たち (Nagasaki no shōnen shōjotachi) (1996). The story starts from the history about how the plutonium atomic bomb was made in U.S. Jewish scientists including Einstein discovered uranium fission in Germany; however, they were afraid that Hitler would have these bombs. Therefore, they exiled to U.S. one month before the Pacific War began. Atomic bombs were aimed at Germany and Japan, however, Germany had already defeated in May 1945. Therefore, in July, an atomic bomb called Fat Man was made and the experiment was successful. President Truman ordered to drop atomic bombs the day before Japan received the Potsdam Declaration. All students were carefully watching video. Every student is concentrated on this video very hard.

The story moved on what happened below the 'mushroom-shaped' cloud. It was very cloudy on that day, so the U.S. pilot could not see the target point, so they dropped the bomb further north. On the centre of the explosion, there is a famous Urugami Catholic church, which means that they dropped the bomb near the place where there were many Christians. On this day, a lot of Christians gathered in the Church, because on 15th August they were completing confession for Assumption of Virgin Mary.

This bomb killed a lot of Japanese Koreans and Chinese. The video clearly explains that the bomb was an experiment.

Then the video moves to several persons' story how they were bombed and exposed to radiation. The first person was Christian doctor, Dr. Nagai, who himself got hurt very severely, but kept helping people who severely injured. Then several people who still survive were interviewed. Those people were 10-15 years old when the bomb struck. Their story and photos are very shocking. They saw many people with the guts out of their stomach, dead bodies burnt to black, suffering from their body swelling like balloon. Their memories were very vivid and explain in detail. Single every student was watching very carefully.

After Japan lost war, the criticism against atomic bombs was severely prohibited in Japan. In 1954, on the Bikini Atoll, the H-bomb experiment was done and a Japanese boat crew (第五福竜丸'Daigo Fukuryūmaru') were bombed and some died. This incident made Japanese more interested in the A-bombs and H-bombs. In Hiroshima, following year (1955), the first world conference for appealing to prohibit nuclear weapons was held. The grassroots movement for 'no more Hiroshima, no more Nagasaki' increased. The main people who promoted this movement were those who were bombed in Nagasaki and Hiroshima. They are praying for the world without nuclear weapons. When the video finished students became very quiet and every student seemed to reflect. Afterwards the discussion was very passionate and energetic responding to video and novel we had studied.

## Appendix 4-2 (a) 'Before and After' Questionnaires for AR 1 (tr)

### [For the S1 and S3 classes]

- 1) What do you think about Japan participating in WWII? Why did Japan need the war?
- 2) What do you think about Japan attacking Pearl Harbor?
- 3) What do you think about United States dropping the A-bomb on Japan?
- 4) What do you think Japan taking many Koreans and Chinese from their own countries?
- 5) What do you think about British colonizing India and China?
- 6) What do you think about the British taking many Africans as slaves?
- 7) What did Japan achieve in WWII? What did Japan lose through WWII?
- 8) Can peace be achieved?  
If you think yes, how can peace be achieved? If you think no, explain why you think so.
- 9) What are the advantages and disadvantages of peace being achieved in this world?
- 10) Is an Army necessary? Answer yes or no, and explain why you think so.
- 11) Do you think a Japanese defence force is necessary or unnecessary? What do you think about American military bases in Japan?

### [For the S2 classes]

- 1) *What does the "Vietnam War" remind you of?*
- 2) *Why is war necessary"? Raise one example that you know and answer the question.*
- 3) *What do you think about United States dropping "defoliant" in jungle during the Vietnam War?*
- 4) *There are American soldiers who still suffer from the side effect of "defoliant". What do you think about them?*
- 5) *What do you think about British colonizing India and China?*
- 6) *What do you think about the British taking many Africans as slaves?*
- 7) *What did United States achieve in Vietnam War? What did United States lose through Vietnam War? If you don't know the Vietnam War, raise another war and answer the question.*
- 8) *What does word "peace" remind you of?*
- 9) *Can peace be achieved?*  
*If you think yes, how can peace be achieved? If you think not, explain why you think so.*
- 10) *What are the advantages and disadvantages if peace being achieved in the world?*
- 11) *Is an Army necessary? Answer yes or no, and explain why you think so.*
- 12) *Do you think a Japanese defence force is necessary or unnecessary? What do you think about American military bases in Japan?*

## Appendix 4-2(b) Four Categories of AR1 ‘Before and After’ Questions

### 1. Japanese aggression in WWII, S1 and S3

*[American aggression in the Vietnam War, S2]*

What do you think about the fact that Japan participated in WWII? Why did Japan need the war?

What do you think about the fact that Japan attacked Pearl Harbour?

What do you think about the fact that Japan took many Korean and Chinese people from their own lands?

*[What does the “Vietnam War” remind you of?*

*What do you think about the fact that the United States dropped “defoliant” bombs in the jungles of Vietnam during the war?]*

### 2. Japanese suffering from the war, S1 and S3

*[American suffering from the Vietnam war, S2]*

What do you think about the fact that United States dropped the A-bomb on Japan?

What did Japan get out of WWII? What did Japan lose through WWII?

*There are American soldiers who are still suffering from the side effects of “defoliants”. What do you think about them?*

*What did the United States gain from the Vietnam War? What did United States lose through the Vietnam War? (If you don’t know the Vietnam War, give another war and answer the question.)*

### 3. War and invading other countries [S1 and S3]

What do you think about the fact that Japan took many Korean and Chinese people from their own lands?

What do you think about the fact that Britain colonized India and China in the past?

What do you think about the fact that many British took many black people from Africa as slaves?

*[S2] Why is war “necessary”? Give one example that you know and answer the question.*

*What do you think about the fact that Britain colonized India and China in the past?*

*What do you think about the fact that many British took many black people from Africa as slaves?*

### War and Now, S1, S3 – and S2

Can peace be achieved? If you think yes, how can it be achieved? If you think no, give the reason why you think so.

What are the advantages and disadvantages if peace could be achieved in this world?

Is an Army in Japan necessary? Answer yes or no, and give the reason why you think so.

Do you think a Japanese defence force is necessary or unnecessary? What do you think of the fact that there are American military bases in Japan?

## **Appendix 4-3(a) Student Interview Transcripts (two group interviews) (tr)**

### **(1) Group 1 – interview with three students**

I: I would like to ask about what you learnt during this plenary meeting. Did you discover something?

Jiro: I could hear a lot of opinions during the plenary meeting. I lived in Japan before. However, I think that I never could have heard such opinions in Japan, maybe.

I: Why do you think so?

Jiro: Nobody says opinions.

I: How about you, Shiro? Did you learn or discover something during the plenary meeting?

Shiro: I think this plenary meeting was very useful, because I could hear older pupils' opinions. I could change my own opinions and develop them.

I: Yes. That impressed you?

Shiro: What impressed me more was the time when I heard Hiroshi's opinion. Before I heard Hiroshi's opinion, I was thinking that I learned; I got the impression of, 'sorrow' and 'suffering' from this plenary meeting. However, Hiroshi said that we did not get anything during the wars, not even sorrow and agony. This opinion impressed me very much. My world changed from his opinion.

I: Wow. Changed opinions...?

Shiro: No, my views toward the world become broader, I mean.

I: How about you, Hachiro? Did you learn or discover something?

Hachiro: My opinion is very close to Jiro's opinion. The (Japanese) person who are brought up in London and the (Japanese) person who are brought up in Japan have very different views about the world. I am very amazed at the people who are brought up in London. These opinions seem very precious to me.

I: What did you think of the video?

Hachiro: I had seen several Japanese programmes relating to atomic bombs. However, the video we watched during the plenary meeting told me things that I did not know before. It is a very important video, I mean, for knowing what was happening and to tell others what happened. I mean, to discuss together is very good because we can do something for peace.

I: Did this plenary meeting change your way of thinking?

Jiro: My view of wars was that there are always have 'winners' and 'losers'. Losers are always at a disadvantage after the war. I was thinking that losers have more disadvantages when war trials happened. During the plenary meeting, one person said that both are losers when they begin to have wars. I heard this opinion for the first time. Yes, it is very fresh. And...Yes.

I: So you think this idea really hit you.

Jiro: Yes.

I: How about you Shiro? Did your way of thinking change before and after the plenary meeting?

Shiro: Well... the Japanese lost the war. As I said before, they got just sorrow and agony from wars. They got nothing. But nobody won from the war. All were losers. Yes, I heard this opinion during the plenary meeting. Yes, I think so, I thought and my opinion changed a little bit. People who live here have a different opinion about wars, but I think Britain won the war (WWII), so they don't know anything about wars. They can have jokes about wars.

They have a different view of the war. During the plenary meeting, I thought everybody knew in their mind wars are wrong. Many people died during wars and there are many ways of dying.

I: How about you, Hachiro?

Hachiro: I had some experiences of discussion in Japan, too. But as I grow up as a senior high school student, I think my knowledge has become deeper. My opinions become deeper.

I: Yes, your opinion became deeper?

Hachiro: Yes, because I increased my knowledge, I came to understand more things. During the plenary meeting... oh, I already knew and learnt how atomic bombs could destroy so many things. At the plenary meeting, I saw the reality from the video. And the older students' opinions are various, I think. They will graduate from the senior school soon. So I thought their opinions were a little bit different from mine.

I: How different?

Hachiro: Very different from mine.

I: OK, this is the last question to you. What do you think about our action research implemented from September (to November). OK, from Jiro.

Jiro: You mean merits and demerits?

I: Yes, you can answer from that point of view.

Jiro: The longer research periods means ideas can remain in my mind. There are a lot of opinions for the same theme. This is very good, I think.

Shiro: I am impressed by the older students' opinions. They have a lot of knowledge and can have various opinions.

Hachiro: Well... I think it is better to have time between one discussion and the next. Between discussions, our opinions can develop. I think it is important to share opinions and pass them on to the next generation. I mean the succession is the process by which everybody thinks about peace year after year.

I: (It seems that every pupil wants to go home) OK, I am sorry to keep you, but this is the really last question. Did you think 'voluntarily' during action research?

Jiro: Could you say the question again?

I: Teachers organized this action research and get pupils to think about peace. But, Jiro, did you think by your own will during this research?

Jiro: Oh, you mean during this research?

I: Ah, yes.

Jiro: Well...well...

I: Ok, then, could you reply first, Shiro?

Shiro: I never felt I was 'pushed' to think about it. But now you ask like this...I think you could think of it like that. But I think 'pushing' from teachers was right in this case. In my English school, I attended history classes, but I quit. I learnt only up to WWI. So, I did not know these things. I did not know the sorrow of the people who got the atomic bomb. I did not know some survivors still live. I am very amazed. I am maybe 'pushed' by you to learn. But I learnt new things, too.

I: So you think you learnt by yourself.

Shiro: Yes, I can say so.

I: How about you, Jiro?

Jiro: I had this type of learning in Japan. I learned and used my knowledge for the exam in Japan. Here, I learned one theme for a long time and eventually I had a plenary meeting. I could hear opinions of people who live here for a long time.

I: So you think you learned a lot?

Jiro: Yes.

I: How about you, Hachiro?

Hachiro: I never think for myself. In Japan I was pushed to think. For example, after watching video I wrote some comments, I had to memorise knowledge for exams.

I: (Side A of tape finished.) Sorry.

Hachiro: I never think by myself. I did not think willingly about this action research, either.

I: Yes, that's true.

Hachiro: So... but, to make pupils think is good.

I: Yes?

Hachiro: This plenary meeting is not 'pushing', rather, to share our opinions. To discuss and summarize these opinions and present them is not 'pushing'. These opinions are our opinions, already. I think so. We did so. A lot of people never activate themselves unless they are pushed. You can push us to do so, but thinking itself is not being 'pushed'. The 'push' to some level is necessary, I guess. We thought, anyway. This experience is good, I think.

I: Thank you very much for sharing your thoughts with me.

## **(2) Group 2 – interview with two students**

I: We had plenary meeting in November. What did you learn and discover from this? Please start with you Kyoko.

Kyoko: What do you mean? About the content or about what we did?

I: OK, please talk anything about both the content and about what you did; or one of them.

Kyoko: I was not so impressed by the content itself, because I could guess already in some ways.

I: All right. So you discovered something about what you did.

Kyoko: Yes, I am very impressed at the plenary meeting, because our group did not have the oldest leader. However, we could summarise our own opinions.

I: Anything else? You can say some discovery about the content, if it is possible.

W: Nothing special.

I: OK. Could you tell me your discovery, Sakura?

Sakura: Well...About the content, I was very amazed by the destruction.

I: Destruction?

Sakura: Yes, the town was so badly destroyed.

I: Oh, you were amazed at how badly the city in Hiroshima was destroyed in video.

You have never seen such destruction in your life?

Sakura: No, for the first time. I've never seen before. I was very surprised. My group discussed it a lot. We communicated as a group very well.

I: This is good, isn't it? OK, did you find any difference on your own thinking before and after the plenary meeting?

Sakura: I have never before heard the opinions of people who experienced the atomic bombs. Some survivors talked about their own experiences. My thought deepened after I heard such opinions.

I: All right. Other comment?

Kyoko: No.

I: How about you, Sakura?

Sakura: Yes, I have the same opinion.

I: What do you mean 'the same'?

Sakura: I understand others' ways of thinking and opinions.

I: OK. Then I will move on the next question. Teachers, including me, planned this plenary meeting. However, Kyoko, did you think 'voluntarily' by yourself?

Kyoko: I had some activities in the class before. But to communicate with different ages is very new for me. I wanted to do this same type of meeting again.

I: So, through plenary meeting, did you think 'voluntarily'?

Kyoko: Yes.

I: How about you, Sakura?

Sakura: What?

I: Did you think you were 'pushed' to think?

Sakura: Well.... I think this is a good idea.

I: ....OK. What else?

Sakura: Well... that's all.

I: This is the last question, so please relax. We learnt about wars from September.

What did you think of this action research?

Kyoko: Well...

I: What are the merits and the demerits of this action research from September?

Kyoko: The longer period of learning is good. I could deepen my understanding of wars.

I: At the plenary meeting?

Kyoko: It was good that we learnt what happened during WWII.

I: All right. Thank you, Kyoko. How about you, Sakura?

Sakura: Well... At first, I could not understand. Please give us more detail at the beginning.

I: Detail?

Sakura: A little bit more about the author...

I: All right. 'Detail' means that you want the class, not me, to deepen the content more.

Sakura: Yes. Yes.

I: Thank you very much for sharing your thoughts with me.

## Appendix 4-3(b) Teacher Interview Transcripts (*tr*)

### (1) Interview with X (S2B)

I: Thank you for your cooperation. What did you discover? What is characteristic of this plenary meeting?

X: I see some pupils who are usually very quiet during the class, however, during the plenary meeting these pupils made an effort to join the group discussion. Their view of the world made an impression on me, because they see the world as 15-16 year-olds. During the plenary meeting one pupil said that between countries there are no winners and no losers. This opinion impressed me. I imagined that some pupils would say: "American opinions are like this, and Japanese opinions are like that." However, what this pupil said was beyond one country perspective. I can expect a lot from those pupils.

I: Yes, I am very impressed by this opinion, too!

X: I think lack of vocabulary is a problem; I think it is still very difficult for pupils to express the opinions that they formulate in their minds.

I: Did you find some differences in pupils before and after the plenary meeting?

X: Some pupils were very shocked by the video we showed. We (teachers) are used to watching those shocking scenes, however, some pupils seemed to be shocked by what they saw. They had never seen such a video before. Some pupils were shedding tears.

I: Oh, some pupils are shedding tears....

X: Yes, they are shocked. However, this video made pupils aware that they have to think of wars seriously. Not only the video, but also we did a lot of preparatory classes for the plenary meeting. To understand wars through reading literature was one method, but using visual techniques is much more effective in enabling pupils to think deeply. They could become more interested in wars. I think pupils attitude towards wars definitely changed.

I: What do you think of the relation between the class presentations and group discussions?

X: The older pupils could understand what was going on when they heard the presentation from each class, because they have been studying the topic for one or two years. However, for S1, it was quite hard for them to understand what S2 and S3 did just by hearing pupils' presentations. I think it would be better to separate presentation and discussion after the video.

I: Did you think for (commit) yourself? Or did you feel you were just pushed by me?

X: What do you mean?

I: Did you have a purpose of your own for this action research?

X: My purpose was to make pupils think more deeply and freely. Of course, during the discussions, teachers circulated among the pupils and tried to make the discussions more active. Not that we judge the pupils. Pupils have their own opinions on how discussion can be more active. However, I would have liked more time to allow pupils to discuss freely. With more time, they could probably reach more deeply embedded issues.

I: Considered as action research, what 'merits' and 'demerits' did you find?

X: The materials we used through S1 to S3 were different and presentations during the plenary meeting were not enough. We had to address this problem. What S2 did was about the Viet Nam War, which had no direct connection with the atomic bomb video. We had to think harder about this connection.

About 'merits' ....., pupils thinking about wars, developing their understanding of human psychology. Humanity is often unable to control things. The atomic bombs symbolise

“uncontrolled”. As one pupil said, individual human beings should recognise this problem. Human beings can abolish wars.

### **(2) Interview with Y (S2A)**

I: Did you make any discovery during the plenary meeting? How would you characterise the plenary meeting?

Y: Usually quiet pupils were able to present opinions. Four S2B pupils were absent and the others were scattered across groups. However, all of them were able to cooperate with members of their group.

I: Did you find any difference between before and after the plenary meeting?

Y: When we did ‘Ambush’, pupils could not imagine sufficiently what happened to the main character. I tried to explain to pupils: ‘maybe there was no purpose to throw the hand grenade. The main character (the writer) wanted to protect himself and he threw it like conditioned reflex. Today we provided visual material to pupils, and this allowed them to understand and imagine what happened exactly. I think the impact on pupils was huge.

I: How well did you think your class material (‘Ambush’) connected to the plenary meeting?

Y: S2 pupils already have some knowledge about wars; therefore, I thought we did not have to have the presentation from teachers and pupils at the beginning of the plenary meeting. In using the group questionnaire, no group chose question number one ‘invasion of others’. I think we did make it difficult for ourselves to connect the class material with the discussion. Maybe, it would have been better to watch the video from the beginning and make them discuss it. However, I also think pupils should know what other classes had done. Therefore, I think there was a good reason for the presentation, too.

I: Did you have some particular aspirations for the plenary meeting?

Y: I wanted pupils to understand how wars were miserable. The second aspiration: pupils could share opinions with pupils in the other classes.

I: Thank you. Did you find any particular ‘merits’ and ‘demerits’ in our action research from September?

Y: About ‘merits’, pupils could mingle with each other. About ‘demerits’, the pace of the different classes varied. Because I had finished teaching *Ambush* a while ago, pupils’ memory of it had probably faded to some extent. (We did war-poems during later classes.)

I: Thank you very much.

Y: Thank you very much. I want to have some kind of plenary meeting like this again.

### **(3) Interview with V (S3A)**

*I: What did you find out during this plenary meeting? What was the character of the plenary meeting?*

V: In my view it was not a matter of ‘discovery’, but maybe of ‘recognition’. Pupils who are 15-18 years olds will graduate from high school and become members of society. When given chances to think, they think very seriously and enthusiastically. Doing this, frequently, enables pupils to become adults. I recognise this fact about pupils again today.

Secondly, class includes many methods such as speaking, hearing, reading, writing, and seeing and so on. Today we used a visual method, made pupils speak though discussion and made them listen to teachers’ and pupils’ presentations. So I think the plenary meeting is well balanced. Pupils who are usually very quiet became very active in saying something during

the plenary meeting. For quiet pupils, this plenary meeting might be some motivation to speaking. As I also saw in schools in Japan, some pupils can change suddenly when they can think and present their opinions during occasions like this plenary meeting. I enjoyed this meeting. I was grateful for this meeting. Thank you very much.

I: Did you find any difference and change before and after the plenary meeting?

V: I focused on Judgement in S3 class. I think for the S3 pupils, it was quite difficult to understand the connection with the Viet Nam War, which S2 did. I wondered then about the connections across the S1 to S3 materials. [Also,] pupils develop very much from S1 to S3 physically and mentally. Therefore, for S1 and S2 to listen to older pupils' opinions provides, I think, very good opportunities. During the discussion, I could discover some positive things and thoughts from 'After the Bombs' that S1 pupils offered to other members, and S2 pupils offered some thoughts from 'Ambush'. S3 pupils discussed 'why people cannot kill others?' When they see the video and see people are really killed, automatically they begin to ask the reason. Not from their mental world, but from reality.

I: Did you feel some gaps between what you taught in the class and what we did in the plenary meeting?

V: Oh right, the relationship between them. If I say, 'there was no gap between class and plenary meeting', I would tell a lie. However, after the plenary meeting, pupils were thinking about how wars produce victims, how wars begin, why we have wars and should not have wars. We provided the theme around which they should think. We cannot conclude and cannot decide which thoughts are wrong and which good. However, we made them think. In the English school, I think they never see videos like that. This is a Japanese method. [But] Pupils are very logical, because they are educated in Britain. Also they have good sense.

I: Did you have any purpose of your own for this action research, which was implemented from September?

V: I had already told S3 pupils that they could create the atmosphere for S1 and S2 pupils to express their own opinions, and then I saw that S3 pupils did not become arrogant, and could interact naturally with S2 and S1 pupils, that, as S3 pupils, they tried to take care of younger pupils. I do not have to worry about them at all. The content is also OK, because we relied on Mizushima [I]. Of course, we have to think of improvement points, too.

I: OK, last question, did you find any particular 'merits' and 'demerits' during action research from September?

V: The biggest merits are that we could think something as the unit of whole high school. We did do what we could do. What else?

I: About 'demerits'?

V: Right. The purpose was a little bit enforceable, because I was a Math teacher in Japan and I tend to think towards 'one answer' for solutions. What I was thinking about myself during the plenary meeting was 'why it is wrong to kill others'. During the plenary meeting, I could develop my own thinking from this to the question 'what does it mean to kill others'. I am very grateful to the plenary meeting, because I could find this point. When we decide 'it is wrong', there are always some cases to be judged beforehand. We do not decide 'wrong or good' from beginning (in advance?). We always judge 'wrong or good' after something happened. Then we can seek the answer to the question 'why it is wrong to kill people?'.

I: This is such a good point. Thank you very much.

## Chapter 5 Appendices

### Appendix 5-2 Teachers' Study-Group on the Iraq Invasion and Occupation

Feeling obliged to deepen our own knowledge of the invasion and occupation of Iraq, we teachers formed a **study group** and agreed that each of us should research one of four dimensions – political, economic, religious and historical – that students were addressing and presenting to our teacher group during the term.

*1) Political Dimension:* I had agreed to work on this dimension and I led our discussion at our first Study Meeting on October 15<sup>th</sup>. First, I summarised the main themes the students had found in their media research: that the US wanted to turn Iraq into a democracy (most students); that Bush saw Iraq as part of the 'axis of evil' along with Iran and N. Korea (some students); that Iraq had not permitted investigation of whether it still had 'weapons of mass destruction' (some students); that the US feared a strong anti-American leader who might organise Middle Eastern countries to unite and attack its ally, Israel (a few students); and that the US saw Iraq as supporting terrorism and as its enemy in the post-9/11 'war against terror' (many students).

However, such analyses were sometimes tinged with the student's own scepticism, e.g.

US thought that Iraq was related with Al-Qaeda. If Iraq donates money to Al-Qaeda, they should axe the root. Moreover, if Iraq has weapons of mass destruction, there are possibilities of many more victims than those who died on 9/11; the US had to prevent this. The dictator, Saddam Hussein, dominated Iraq. Hussein is 'Hitler' in Germany, 'Stalin' in Russia and 'Kim Jong-il' in North Korea. So the US tried to change this dictatorship into a democracy, to give freedom to the Iraq people.

It looks as if the US is a 'super-hero'. However, this is the superficial reason; there must be some hidden reason behind it.

I brought my own questioning about what is 'democracy' to the meeting, drawing on an Amartya Sen lecture that I had recently attended, *The Diverse Ancestry of Democracy*. Challenging the belief that democracy is quintessentially 'western' or 'European', Sen referred to the history of tolerance in Muslim countries:

There is a considerable history of the cultivation of public reasoning, with good use of tolerance of heterodoxy, also in Muslim countries, including in the Arab world. When Maimonides, the Jewish philosopher, was forced to emigrate from an intolerant Europe in the 12th century, he found refuge in the Arab world and was given an influential position in the court of Emperor Saladin in Cairo.

He accused the Iraq occupation of causing more terrorism and of confusing ‘democratizing’ with ‘Americanizing’. He insisted that in the end the discussion is about what the *base* of democracy is:

The requirements of democracy include the development of opportunities for participatory public reasoning, not least in Iraq. This calls for the promotion of civil rights, including freedom from arbitrary arrest (and, of course, from torture), facilities for public gathering and fuller media freedom. It is important to assist, rather than hinder, the development of non-sectarian identities of women and men, and restoration of the self-respect of Iraqis as Iraqis. The first step is to have a clearer understanding of the nature of government by discussion.

We also considered a *Newsweek* poll that had just (Aug.2005) suggested that more than 60% of people disagreed with the Iraq occupation and, also, Ms. Cindy Sheehan’s sad comment from her demonstration at Crawford, near Bush’s private house in Texas, quoted in the *Asahi* newspaper of Aug. 13<sup>th</sup>.

He stayed in Crawford for over five weeks, but I cannot meet him for just an hour. My life was destroyed by him. Why can he not meet me? Parents need belief that it is absolutely necessary to send sons and daughters to the battlefield. I want to ask him why he started this war and why so many people have to die. When will they ‘come back?’

After wars have actually started is when many insist ‘this war was wrong’. Perhaps Cindy Sheehan herself had been a ‘passive media consumer’ until faced with her son’s death.

**2) *Economic Dimension:*** In the first of two presentations on Nov 12<sup>th</sup>, our S1B colleague dwelt on the theme of oil. Many students had noted and assimilated media references to the US desire for relatively inexpensive oil from Iraq. Eg:

Iraq has the second [largest] deposit of oil in the world. (The first is Saudi Arabia.) The mining cost is very cheap in Iraq. Producing 1 barrel of oil costs 1 dollar, compared to 2.5 dollars in Saudi Arabia and 10 dollars in US. .... Many countries are interested in getting mining rights in Iraq. Russia has already started to prepare fund-raising for getting these rights. The Iraq occupation happened on the way of this competition.

Our teacher colleague then analysed further this attraction of Iraq from the US perspective. Historically, the US had discovered oil and developed the oil industry in Iraq, but the mining rights returned to Iraq through nationalisation of resources. Iraq being landlocked was a reason for its invasion of Kuwait to get a port for its oil exports, and this had led to the American and British intervention in the first Gulf War. Now the US certainly valued the degree of control the occupation gave it over mining rights and the price of oil, an internationally important economic factor.

**3) Religious Dimension:** Continuing the meeting, our S2 colleague developed a strong contrast between the historic approaches to law in Christian and Islamic countries. Because Christianity distinguishes *inner* 'faith in God' from *outer* 'action under the laws', Christian countries can act under man-made laws. This allowed those countries to develop capitalism, because the laws and orders which establish capitalism regulate people's outer action and do not require people to change inner faith.<sup>135</sup> Indeed, the constitutions of capitalist countries typically guarantee and protect people's inner freedom. However, in Islamic countries, inner faith and outer action are more closely related. The Koran always restricts action and laws. Muslims believe that valid contracts are made between God and human beings, but capitalism is based on the idea of contract between human beings. There is a huge conflict between Islam and Capitalism, she argued.

Again, she suggested, when Bush declared 'war on terrorism' in 2001 after 9/11, he spoke of 'Crusades' and 'Jihad', also implying a view of this war as more between Christianity and Islam than between democracy and dictatorship.

**4) Historical Dimension** On Nov 19<sup>th</sup>, our S3 colleague spoke about the huge influence of British imperialism on the Middle-East. She used the example of how British foreign policy 'triple-tongued' Palestine in the WW1 period, making contradictory agreements with French allies, Arab leaders and the Jewish leadership. This had led to the long-term instability and warring in and around Palestine, now Palestine (supported by Arabs) against Israel

---

<sup>135</sup> The classic literature actually associates this more specifically with *Protestant* Christianity.

(supported by the US and Europe). She presumed that this conflict was a consideration in the occupation of Iraq by the US and Britain.

She also spoke about how the strategic importance of the Middle-East in terms both of geography and of oil allowed it to break free of European control, but also encouraged nationalism and an emphasis on national identities that held them back from cooperating with each other and constructing a 'bright future' together.<sup>136</sup>

*In sum*, these study meetings and our individual preparations for them certainly increased our appreciation of the deep complexities in the Iraq occupation (our students' principal 'case-study' of the mass media). I believe we were also aware that the theories favoured in our presentations could be corrected and/or supplemented by other theories and considerations.

---

<sup>136</sup> It may be noticed that neither the S2 (religion), nor the S3 (history) presentations discussed what the *students* had found out about these dimensions.

### **Appendix 5-3 Sample Diary Notes on a Double-Class**

#### **Diary Extract on 11<sup>th</sup> Feb 2006**

The S2 teacher was absent and the substitute teacher brought the class (my AR1 class in the previous year) to join my S1A class. It was an opportunity for cross-age work before the PM and I made nine joint groups of S1A and S2 students. Before the group discussions, we read through a sheet of extracts on journalism and peace from a Johan Galtung booklet together. Each group summarized their opinions into their group worksheet.

I showed the chart of nine groups in the front of the classroom and students divided into nine groups. Some groups could discuss very well, but some groups could not do very smoothly. The substitute teacher and I went around the classroom and asked the students who were very quiet. We tried to let them join in the class.

I finished with a record of each group's written report, augmented by notes I made of their accompanying oral reports to the class, which I had recorded. See two of these records below:

#### Group 1)

1) What is the intention /interest of the mass media?

The president (Iraq) wanted to boost the Iraqis. On the other hand, the president (US) wanted to show themselves as 'justice' and Iraqis as 'injustice'. To report these things, Bush wanted his approval rate to go up.

2) What is the intention/interest of media consumers (receivers)?

Consumers can be categorised into two groups. One group is those who believe all news. Another group is those who try to make their own opinions. When people are in the first group, they believe Bush is 'justice' and Hussein is 'evil', depending on their mass media. However, the latter group is those who get information and try to consider it objectively. They try to find the [particular] medium's intention/interest and they always seek for the true reasons – which may be unofficial ones.

3) If you find a difference of intention/interest between mass media and consumers, what is the explanation for it?

They did not finish yet, therefore, they did not present.

#### Group 5)

1) What is the intention /interest of the mass media?

- The mass media process information for acquiring people's support. Bush justified what he said.

- The mass media choose the information they wanted to report.

2) What is the intention/interest of media consumers (receivers)?

- Consumers want to know information, therefore they do not think of mass media's intention.
- Consumers judge which news are reliable.
- Consumers seek for the news including no empathy.
- Consumers think of the possibilities that mass media omit some particular information.

3) If you find a difference of intention/interest between mass media and consumers, what is the explanation for it?

- Sometimes TV cannot show some images and information to consumers.
- There are possibilities that news include propaganda.
- The mass media intend not to report some particular information to general consumers.
- There are some economic and religious reasons.

## Chapter 6 Appendices

### Appendix 6.1(a) Headmaster's Invitation to Parents to attend Mr. Hirakubo' Lecture

24th June 2006

Japanese Saturday School in London  
Headmaster

Dear parents of the High School division,

#### **An invitation to a plenary meeting to listen to Mr. Masao Hirakubo's War Experience**

I hope that everybody is fine in early summer. Thank you very much for your understanding and support for JSSL.

Every year the High School division hold a plenary meeting which concentrates deeply on one theme. This year, we are planning to invite Mr. Masao Hirakubo to the meeting and listen to his war experience. Mr. Hirakubo experienced WWII as a Japanese soldier and then after WWII he worked to transcend the antagonism / hatred and for reconciliations between Japanese and British war veterans.

Recently in Japan, there are many attempts to tell the story to the young generation to prevent the war memory from fading. In London, some of you see the scar of wars of over 60 years ago on VJ Day. I would like to consider this an opportunity to think together about war. Therefore, I am writing this invitation.

So we can prepare this meeting, if you would like to attend, please fill in the application form and pass it to your homeroom teacher by 8<sup>th</sup> July.

**Date and time:** Saturday 15<sup>th</sup> July 2006 10.15-11.40 am

**Place:** Gymnasium Hall / Please be reserved to come with high heel shoes.

#### **About Mr. Masao Hirakubo**

He was born in 1919. He became a soldier in 1942, was sent to Burma and then joined the Imphal Campaign. After WWII, he returned to work for the Japanese trading company, who later sent him to work in London from 1965. When he retired in 1983, he started a reconciliation programme between Japanese and British war veterans. He received OBE in 1991 for his achievement of reconciliation. He has been a president of the Burma Campaign Society since 2002. (*OBE: Order of British Empire*)

#### **Application Form**

I will attend the plenary meeting to listen to the war experience.

Grade High School Division Class (.....)

The name of the student (.....)

The name of the parent (.....)

## **Appendix 6.1(b) Mr Hirakubo's Address to the Teachers on 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2006**

*He described as follows (1) what he learnt from the Battle, (2) why he went there, (3) what he actually did during the Battle:*

He had been very enthusiastic about wars and believed that Japan would win – he was brought up in this way at school. However, his father traded with foreign countries and was very sceptical about WWII, all the time insisting that we should negotiate and compromise, and furious when a lot of military figures joined the government. Gradually Mr. Hirakubo's opinion was influenced by discussions with his father. He was conscripted into the army at the age of 23 and ordered to Burma, which – he observed – had become independent of British Occupation in 1943 with the support of the Japanese Army. Though the Japanese army had then seized control of the Burmese government, Britain retained command of the air and to protect themselves from this British threat, the army conceived the idea of taking over two British bases in India, Imphal and Kohima: the 'Imphal Campaign'. However, many, including Mr. Hirakubo, thought this could not be achieved and suggested this to Lieutenant General Muta. When the Campaign nevertheless went ahead, Mr. Hirakubo got the role of food supplier, charged with the whole responsibility for supplying meals three times a day to a group of 1000 soldiers. He was very sure this would not be possible, because most of the roads were too narrow for cows and horses to pass along, not to mention the difficulty of surmounting 3000-5000 metre Himalayan mountains, but he had to go because of orders from the top of the army. His belief and trust in the Japanese army went completely at this time and, knowing that they were unlikely to survive long, he recalled his father's opinion and thought his father was right!

15,000 soldiers brought rice and salt individually to survive for twenty days, as well as their own cow from the 15,000 cows that were bought, or stolen, from farmers in Burma. They marched mainly at night to Imphal, because British army might attack if they know this during the day. They had to march on the very narrow road with cows in the dark, so a lot of soldiers fell over the precipice. Mr. Hirakubo himself fell down from the precipice once. He was luckily saved by fellow soldiers. They walked for three days and nights and reached Imphal, which they seized after a 6 day battle, before marching on to Kohima which they also seized. (He reflected that the reason why Japanese army could seize these bases was because they were defended by the Indian troops hired by the British army.) However, after two weeks, the British air force began to attack them from the air, the mid-May to June rainy season intervened, their food supplies ran low, and many were struck by bad diseases such as cholera and malaria. They decided to withdraw, even though no such order came from the top of the army. Mr. Hirakubo saw a lot of abandoned dead comrades.

*Regarding (4) whether or not there are differences in his feeling and thought between his experience at that time and his reflections now more than 60 years later:*

His opinion had not changed from the time of the Campaign in the sense that he had already become sure by then that 'the Imphal Campaign was wrong'. He also mentioned that this change, when the impossible mission was ordered, was also because he had listened to his

father's opinion even though he was against it at that time. Realising then that his father had been right and that there was no escape, he thought what he could do was to pay attention to 1000 soldiers and try to save their lives. He never forgets those who died there. When he had the agony in India, he hoped many times that at least he might be saved himself, but, at the same time, he felt the pangs of conscience at abandoning so many comrades. When he left India, he made an oath to the dead comrades that he would pick up their bones one day.

After he retired from the Marubeni Trading Company in the 1980s, he had lived in London, where he had some opportunities to meet with British veterans of Imphal and Kohima. Some had got serious injuries from Japanese army and continued to hate Japan. He felt as though that it was him that had destroyed the relationship between Japan and Britain. He considered that he had a responsibility to build reconciliation between them and he found that some of the British veterans also hoped for reconciliation with the Japanese army. Therefore, he organised a visit of British veterans to pray in the Yasukuni Shrine, which is dedicated to the Japanese dead soldiers of WWII.<sup>137</sup> He found out that British war veterans could not forget their comrades, either.

*Regarding (5) what his purpose was, and is, in the Burma Campaign Society [BCS]:*

His belief is that mutual understanding and reconciliation can be achieved by sharing of experience in the right way. What he said about this is conveniently covered in the epilogue of his book, *My Own Imphal Campaign*. It sums up why he organises the BCS and what it has achieved.

For the reconciliation between them, I thought it was very important to wipe away prejudice which was embedded during WWII. Therefore, I planned mutual visits between British and Japanese war veterans. Since 1989, after the Japanese Showa Emperor (1901-1989) passed away, British veterans visited Japan six times and Japanese veterans visited Britain twice up to 1995, supported by the Sasakawa Foundation. Each travel consists of around 20 war veterans and two weeks stay. I think I achieved some dialogue and mutual understanding between them. I understand that our thoughts and considerations towards dead war comrades are common and agreed that 'the enemy in the past, the friend at present'. We agreed to hold a joint memorial service for the dead. In 1991, in Kohima, the reconciliation between British and Japanese veterans began in the newly built Catholic Cathedral. Since 1995, we continue to hold a joint memorial service in the Canterbury Cathedral, Coventry Cathedral, Westminster Abbey and Three Wheels (Shin Buddhist House) in London around 15<sup>th</sup> August every year.

---

<sup>137</sup> When some Japanese prime ministers prayed at this shrine, they attracted some 'left wing' criticism.

## Appendix 6-2 Summer Assignment Format: a News-Article on the Imphal Campaign *(tr)*

<p>Please draw a picture as if it were a photo.</p>          <p style="text-align: center;">The caption of photo (The explanation of the picture)</p>	→	<p>Headline</p> <p>(You should summarise in 3-5 lines. )</p>	<p>Newspaper Title</p> <p>(Please name your newspaper.)</p>
---	---	--	---

*The body of the article*  
Please specify when, where, who and how they did.  
Please refer to \*the materials which we supplied in the first preparatory class.  
    \*what you learned from Mr. Hirakubo's lecture.  
    \*what you investigated (books and interview and so on).

Please use up to here for the body of the news.  
←

			Please Write the definition sentences.	Please Write the words you selected	

Please select 3-5 words relating to the news to explain the definition.

## Appendix 6-3(a) Worksheet Responses from a Preparatory Class

*(from my Class / Research Diary for AR3)*

### 9<sup>th</sup> Sep 2006 (The Preparatory Class for the Second PM)

I put three questions to each of four groups. Below are the responses of Group 4, as an example.

Question 1: 'What was the objective of the Imphal Campaign, for the government and for the individual?'

*For the Government*

- Japan invaded US and war began.
- to get other countries to acknowledge Japan as a leading world power.
- to establish a Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere.
- to spread Japanese power by invading Imphal.

*For the Individual*

- They had to protect their Japanese families from the enemy.
- Their pride as Japanese meant they wanted to win the war.
- They had some patriotism for Japan.

Question 2: 'If we swap situations, how do you think the British government, and the British people, would behave, ?'

*The Government:*

- Britain would never implement so unreasonable a campaign, because it could see it would lose and it would be meaningless.
- The British did not only 'help' India; they also stole resources from them.

*The Individual:*

- British people would oppose this campaign, when they understand what it was.
- British people do not consider 'patriotism'; rather, they consider their security.

Question 3: 'Causes of differences and/or similarities?'

- British government would be more careful about acting in its national interest. Considering Japan's own benefit, the Imphal Campaign was very absurd.

## Appendix 6-3(b) Plenary Meeting Group Record Sheet *(tr)*

### Group (...)

*Presenter:*

*Secretary:*

*Other members in the group:*

#### **Examples of different ways of thinking**

Please demonstrate the examples of the different ways of thinking between Japanese and British when you live in Britain.

#### **Conflicts and different ways of thinking**

Please give examples of conflicts and of 'feeling uncomfortable' caused by the different ways of thinking between British and Japanese.

Do you have cases that do not lead to conflicts / do not make you 'feel uncomfortable'? Please give the examples.

#### **Analyzing the problems**

How can you avoid the conflicts you discussed above?

What is the basic cause of the problem?

What is the theme of this PM? Describe in one sentence?