

War Ideation and Peace Education in Japan and the US – A Case Study Comparison –

Mark W. Langager *

Students in countries around the world are confronted with a wide range of facts regarding their countries' histories, some of which have potential to evoke condemnation, shame, pathos, remorse, or indifference, depending on content structure and presentation of materials. The implications of having children study the acts of nations present educators with ethical imperatives to address moral issues as they arise, so as not to desensitize students to morality while teaching them facts of geography and history. This imperative has been ignored, honored and misunderstood throughout history, but a discourse of peace education has emerged to address these issues. This discourse, when understood, gives us new ways to compare education systems and their potential for shaping the minds and attitudes of the public.

I. Introduction

There is a duality in the way schoolteachers teach about conflict in school life versus history. They so often seem able to construct morals into students' behaviors, but less able to provide a moral context in which to understand the events of history. Often the best that can be expected in even the most progressive-minded social studies classrooms is that the morality of any given event be addressed "objectively" from various historical stakeholders' perspectives. Betty Reardon (1997, p. 23) has argued that curriculums

"have been...ambivalent on the subject of values and ethics, alternately purporting to be value free and/or to encourage consideration of contending values and value systems,

* Assistant Professor at the Division of Education

while in actuality conveying the unarticulated and unexamined prevailing values of the society, mainly ignoring the ethical questions imbedded in social issues.”

Ironically, this lies in stark contrast with the firm way in which teachers are often called upon to work out actual problems among their students. On the playground, for instance, teachers are keen to get to the bottom of a conflict and resolve it with the students concerned or together with whole classes on some agreed-upon, moral basis.

Of course, part of what stifles teachers’ moral voices is that the actors in history are nations and states, and, directly or indirectly, it is these states that currently employ the teachers who teach history. But it would seem that any moral lesson to be taught through daily events might, at least to some extent, be un-taught by omitting the same moral lesson in the coverage of historical events. If the curriculum is, in fact, talking about human conflict and fails to address the morality of the actions of nations, certainly this results in teaching amorality, by omission. Perhaps no good schoolteacher would ever fail to address an extreme form of torture or slaying incident if it were to occur in the lives of students, but teachers find themselves in a position where they must recount a litany of murderous and heinous acts of war committed by their countries against human beings (along with a myriad notable and commendable achievements) without having the wherewithal (even the time) to properly address the degenerate moral status of the many atrocities being covered.

However, while official accounts of institutional actions have always tended to whitewash them and de-emphasize the gravity of their moral error within mainstream curriculums, there has for a long time existed a side-stream of “peace educators” striving to reflectively address their countries’ shameful actions in an attempt to teach for a more peaceful future citizenry. Immanuel Kant (1957; 1795, p. 46) commented that, “true politics can never take a step without rendering homage to morality.” Peace education is an acknowledgement that “true education” must also pay this stepwise homage to the moral implications of what is taught.

Historically, “peace education” can be traced back at least as far as the

London Peace Conference, held in 1843, which discussed, among other aspects of peace, the importance of inculcating “principles of peace” into the minds of children (Grossi, 2000, p. 4). The pacifist movement grew together with the movement for public education in Europe and North America, and adherents discussed the role of education in uprooting the attitudes of prejudice and hatred and the ignorance that lead to war. As early as 1893, historians such as Jules Prudhommeaux (1893, in Grossi, 2000, p. 7) complained that reciting wars and glorifying the state dominated history teaching, and history textbook creation became a focal issue of the movement.

In the early twentieth century, peace educators struggled with issues of what constitutes a responsible history curriculum, reconciling patriotism with love of humanity, what historical accounts to present, and how to portray heroism and self-sacrifice (Grossi, 2000, pp. 6-13). Pacifism fell under attack, however, and peace educators, such as the prizewinning author of a handbook for teaching pacifism (Seve, 1910, in Grossi, 2000, p. 9), were criticized for promoting anti-patriotic attitudes in students.

During the interwar years, the Andrew Carnegie Endowment, a strong, new ally for the peace education movement, funded research into the content of history textbooks of countries involved in WWI, and this proved useful for international reconciliation (Grossi, 2000, p. 16). During this time, several international conferences were also held to reorient education toward morality and justice. Writers like Pierre Bovet (1927, in Grossi, 2000, p. 23) promoted concrete moral precepts in peace education, such as not attacking those weaker than oneself and not fighting for personal interests.

Throughout the twentieth century, well-known educational figures, such as John Dewey, Maria Montessori and Jean Piaget lent their research work to the peace education movement as well. Piaget, for instance (1933, in Grossi 2000, 24), identified children’s egocentricity as a factor in the way they understand history. John Dewey critiqued the common sort of citizenship education that centered on the nation-state as “just a paper preparation for citizenship” (1983, p. 160, in Ahmad, 2003, p. 4).

Today, peace education in the U.S. can be seen as part of “education for democratic citizenship and peace” (Ahmad, 2003, pp. 7 and 8). Educators have constructed this vision, drawing on the work of philosophers like Kant (1957; 1795, pp. 12 and 13), who reasoned that a republic is more likely to avert war than an autocratic state because the people would oppose it more readily than their rulers, and Tocqueville (1956; 1835; 1840, pp. 59-61), whose description of American life praised its civic forms of democracy. This particular movement seeks to prepare “caring, thoughtful, peace-loving, conscientious, independent-minded and active citizens” (Ahmad, 2003, p. 7). It points out that willingness for civic involvement in groups that promote human rights, environmentalism, safety, and other causes serves as a societal check on governmental power (Diamond, 1994, in Ahmad, 2003, p. 7).

In general, peace education these days centers on “violence, its control, reduction and elimination” (Reardon, 1997, p. 22). Current concerns of the peace education movement include teaching human rights and diversity, human dignity, the “roots of violence,” conflict resolution skills, and local as well as global alternatives to violence (Harris, 2002, in Ahmad, 2003, p. 11). Among these, human rights education offers perhaps the most concrete, positive and corrective set of ways to address a wide range of problems (Reardon, 1997, p. 22).

Japan did not historically share in the same peace education movement with the West, although textbook controversies date back to the Imperial Rescript on Education of 1890 (Nozaki and Inokuchi, 2000, in Masalski, 2001). Currently, controversies surrounding official textbook coverage of Japanese foundation myths and Japan’s colonization of East Asia continue to loom large in Japan’s international politics. Ever since Ienaga Saburo began to file lawsuits against the Ministry of Education in 1965 for their rejection of what he insisted were accurate depictions of Japan’s actions on the basis that they contained too much of a focus on the “dark side” of these actions, the history control issue has gained a high profile in Japan as well as in on-looking neighbors, such as North and South Korea and China (Masalski, 2001). This has raised a critical discussion on

the history curriculum that Masalski argues American educators could profitably learn from.

The textbook controversy issue notwithstanding, however, the postwar Japanese national curriculum has systematically incorporated the topic of peace at one important juncture within the social studies curriculum: studying Article Nine of the Japanese Constitution. This article, renouncing the right of belligerency, was written and imposed by American General Douglas MacArthur, an act that, in hindsight, certainly violated Immanuel Kant's Preliminary Article Number 5: "No state shall by force interfere with the constitution or government of another state" (Kant, 1957; 1795, p. 7). Chalmers Johnson views this renunciation as Japan's form of apology after the war, which occurred in a much different geopolitical context than that of Germany (Johnson, 2000).

The Current Study

Because schooling is a place where our minds and attitudes are shaped to a great extent by the content of what we learn and the pedagogical practice of our teachers, I assume there to be a strongly related output: the ideas adults have regarding the justifiability of war in various scenarios. Although this study does not statistically establish such a cause and effect relationship, it examines in an exploratory manner the curricular context of the teaching of peace through social studies in Japan and the US, as well as public ideation of war in the two countries.

II. Examining Teachers' Voices and Public Opinion

In order to examine the context of teaching peace in the social studies curriculum in the two nations, I conducted case study interviews with two ninth grade junior high school teachers about the curriculums they teach, Mr. C. from A Junior High School in Arizona, USA, and Mr. H. from B Junior High School in Tokyo, Japan. Both interviews were conducted in the spring of 2005, and both teachers were males. Copious notes were taken, and profiles were crafted (Seidman, 1991, p. 91) based on these notes. These profiles were organized

to examine the curriculum itself, the climate for peace education, and the teacher's personal approaches to teaching peace, in both respective cases, and some comparisons were drawn along these lines.

In order to examine public war ideation in the two countries, Japanese (N=543~552) and American (N=896~928) survey responses to six questions about the justifiability of war in a range of scenarios (Study of Attitudes and Global Engagement, 2004). These were analyzed, using One-way ANOVA tests for equality of means.

Examining Two Teachers' Voices

MR. C., A JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL, ARIZONA, USA

The State of Arizona finalized the fifth standard curriculum for K-12 social studies in March 2005, revamping content for grades seven and eight, but with less impact on grade nine. Students are required to summarize and analyze, but rote knowledge is as far as the guidelines require classes to go in terms of depth. There are now statewide tests, called the AIMS test. In these tests, the social studies section is to include some aspects of reading, writing, and even mathematics skills.

There is nothing about "peace," per se, in the curriculum guidelines, although the ninth grade curriculum covers: the holocaust, the rise of fascism and dictators, and genocide in contexts such as Armenia, Cambodia, Bosnia, Rwanda, Kosovo, and Sudan. There is also a chapter on imperialism in Africa. Students also study the roots of terrorism, religious fundamentalism, globalization, multi-national corporations, and environmental issues. The Civil War is covered in grades seven and eight. The history of wars emphasizes the "turning points" in wars.

However, there is nothing in the curriculum about American atrocities or "lessons that we need to learn from these various events in history." I briefly touch on the Korean War and the Domino Theory, etc., but there is barely time to cover the Viet Nam War by the end of the ninth grade year. World War II coverage does not include the Nanking Incident or the Comfort Women issue,⁽¹⁾ and there is little coverage of North Korea. The curriculum does not cover US-Japan relations, US-EU relations, or the United States' role in the Middle East.

Peace Studies is in its infancy stages. My daughter could not find a Ph.D. program in

Peace Studies at numerous universities she looked at. I personally get into “peace” issues, but that is just my approach, but it is not in the curriculum. If I wanted to say that we (our country) were the good guys in any historical situation, I could. All we have to teach is facts, no values.

There is hardly time for teacher-to-teacher dialogue in the school. If anything, we would talk about what we are going to do on the weekend or else about the nuts and bolts of getting through the curriculum and being ready for the criterion-referenced tests (CRTs) we give each year. In the curriculum we do not go any higher than Bloom’s taxonomy, second level. We talk about “critical thinking” and reforms are calling for it, but it is not on the test. ⁽²⁾

My approach to pacifism is to teach “peace” versus “war.” In teaching about wars, I do not focus on battles, except the “turning points” that are required in the standard curriculum. I focus on causes and effects. I have always seen war as ridiculous. It is about nationalism and believing “we are better than others.” However, I try to emphasize that all humans are capable of supporting a leader like Hitler. I ask, “How many of you eat lunch with kids who are like you?” Almost all the students raise their hands. I ask, “How many of you say something bad about other groups or listen when someone else says something bad about another group?” I used the issue of gangs [to talk about exclusion]. I teach about racism, inequality, social justice, the treatment of women, imperialism, whites’ treatment of others, etc. We also read Dr. Seuss’ *The Butter Battle Book*, aimed at emphasizing the absurdity of the Cold War and using nuclear weapons.

Regarding American atrocities, I emphasize that we were not the “good guys” in World War I, which is the war that I cover the most thoroughly. In covering World War II, I give a quick coverage of Pearl Harbor, but especially emphasize Hiroshima. I do not get into debates of motives – we were ready to jump into war anyway, and our reason for dropping the atom bomb was political: to keep Russia out of Japan. We saw the devastation. The two cities chosen contained 90% of the Christians in Japan. Ground Zero was a church. The goal was to take a pristine city and destroy it. I do not cover Nanking or the Comfort Women issue – it is too easy to criticize other countries. I want to emphasize our own atrocities and our need to self-reflect.

I spend time talking about spheres of influence in China, the Boxer Rebellion, and how Europe and North America took over much of Africa and Asia. Japan chose to emulate the West and copy Western imperialism. It is important for students to understand that we showed Japan how to colonize, and then we changed the rules. But Japan worked to modernize its colonies, unlike Western empires.

I teach that Europe and North America got Africa into poverty and now we are trying to get them out of it. In the wars between the Tutsis and the Hutus, a million people were killed before we did anything about it. Half of the Tutsis were wiped out. We created the current situations in Sudan, Somalia, and Rwanda. We started Liberia⁽³⁾ to keep blacks out of our neighborhoods, seizing the land from local Africans.

I teach about the significance of various religions and that there are five kinds of “golden rule” among the great religions of the world. I don’t reveal my political or religious affiliation, to students. One cannot be preachy. Regarding conflicts between science and religion, I talk about Galileo, evolution, abortion and cloning, etc. I also teach about how we cannot ban people’s beliefs.

In teaching about the Balkans, I explain that the Balkans “Balkanized” or split at Kosovo and Serbia. There were changes in culture and ethnicity, and Islam joined as Religion No. 3 in that area. There have been 1500 years of conflict. Then we go in and say that we are going to fix it! The same is true in the Middle East. These deep problems are not going to be solved quickly. The Iraqi conflict did not start in 1991; it started with Alexander – Muslims and Christians both battling in the name of God. It is purely based on religion, thus adding to the conflict. Who, after all, protected the Jews from the Christians in the Crusades? It was the Muslims.

I sometimes get letters from students long after they have left. I recently received a letter from a student from ten years ago who had graduated from D University, majoring in History. She is in the National Conference for Community and Justice (NCCJ). That conference runs a peace-oriented camp in which nearly a hundred 15- to 19-year old high school students participate, called “Anytown USA Camp.” Among the participants there is diversity in religion, race, gender and disabilities. They end the camp with a role-play event to teach participants about bigotry and labels, etc. In this role-play event, they begin to impose rules about who to talk to. The rules start with a sense of legitimacy, but become increasingly offensive until students find the courage to stand up and confront the rules. Another day, students experience what it is like to live with a disability. I let my current students know about this camp.

MR. H., B JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL, TOKYO, JAPAN⁽⁴⁾

In the Japanese Course of Study for Social Studies, seventh and eighth graders⁽⁵⁾ study geography and history, while the study of civics (mainly political science and economics) gets introduced in the ninth grade. Toward the end of the ninth grade year, students typically take entrance examinations for high school, and the students are very

aware of the importance of these examinations, so they heavily influence what we cover and emphasize.

Teachers are free to give more coverage to places we choose, as time allows us. In geography, in fact, teachers are supposed to choose several countries to cover. Most teachers, however, resort to choosing the countries that are covered in the textbook and that are likely to be on entrance tests. You look for the past three years of entrance examinations and you can see how tests are devised. Generally the three countries most likely to appear on the high school entrance exams are the U.S., China and Germany, so these three are typically covered the most thoroughly, but I think Germany may be replaced with South Korea as another option, and I believe other teachers would agree.

Nevertheless, coverage on Japan's relationship with the Koreas has been scaled way down. As of three years ago (the reform of 2002), this section of the textbook has become very thin, both with regard to North and South Korea. Japan's relationship with the U.S. is covered well, of course, as America is weighty on the entrance exams, and to some extent, so is Asia. Aside from Germany, however, Europe need not be covered at all. Africa and poor countries in Asia were also cut from the curriculum, and there is now no required coverage of these areas either. Because tests focus on these top three countries, teachers focus on them. Because teachers focus on these three, they remain on the tests. The teaching of geography could change [for the better and more diverse] if the tests were not taken up with the top three countries.

In history, we have to go through the whole curriculum, including the American Civil War, the Russo-Japanese War, WWI, the (Second) Sino-Japanese War, etc. WWII is by far the biggest topic covered in the social studies curriculum. The Nanking Massacre, Pearl Harbor, the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombings, and the Viet Nam War are all covered. While Pearl Harbor gets some coverage, Hiroshima and Nagasaki coverage are prominent. The Viet Nam War is covered in less detail than WWII, and Nanking is covered less than Viet Nam.

What can be learned through war? Here again, WWII is the big one. We look at the cause of war, from Japan's side, in order not to repeat it. We reflect. In the ninth grade civics section, students study about Article Nine of the Japanese Constitution. This is a special event, and we consider on what stance we can build a peaceful society. This is also the most effective time of all three years of lower secondary to teach peace, based on students' comprehensive understanding of geography and historical knowledge. The textbooks all cover the idea of pacifism *through* the study of Article Nine.

In social studies we do not really teach about current events, as they are not in the textbooks. What we study now happened 50 to 100 years ago. The closest the textbooks come to current events is when they mention, “international society.” Japan’s role in the Middle East comes up in the civics section, and all teachers realize they are called upon to cover the Japan-US Security Pact, issues surrounding the existence of the civil defense force, their PKO role, etc.

Nanking and events [related to Japanese imperialism] are what most teachers emphasize who are into peace education. Although we would be free to touch on African tribal life, education in African countries, literacy there and in Southeast Asia too, I believe most teachers do not. Teachers have opportunities to talk with each other [about what they teach] at academic conferences, although I do not attend, as I am an instructor, not a tenured teacher. I do speak with others in the teachers’ room, but only informally.

Previously, Japan’s pacifist stance was usually the way to discuss world peace. Now, we are finally starting to talk about Japan’s peace being dependent on world peace. If we do not address [peace in a more global context], we leave ourselves open to US manipulation and to many [threats in] the world. This increased emphasis on global peace is not only my own. Teachers in general have been talking about this since when Japanese PKO troops were stationed in Cambodia [in 1992]. The interpretation of Article Nine was taken up at that time [in the government and the media], and we developed a heightened awareness of this issue, namely, that Japan’s peace is tied up with world peace.

When talking about Nanking, I use the term, “the Great Nanking Massacre” [as opposed to weaker terms like simply, “the Nanking Massacre” or “the Nanking Incident”]. Nanking is difficult to deal with. I escape by telling the facts: the rules of war were broken; the timing was unfair, there were rules about what we could and could not do in war, and we broke them, and civilians were harmed. I do not intend to hide [the truth]. Nanking was one event in the war for us, but it was not decisive in determining boundaries, etc. [i.e. therefore, it was entirely unnecessary and impossible to justify on any grounds]. The reason Nanking is a hard subject to deal with is because of the bad thing we [Japan] did. It is hard to move on from there. We can show pictures and tell of witnesses. We have to reflect on it. But it is hard to make an application to today. Students are left asking, “So what should we do?” Of course the teacher’s philosophy enters in here. However, although all things could never be [presented] fairly, we should provide knowledge to students and let them conclude.

Regarding the Middle East, I choose to cover the Palestinian problem, starting with Jews

from the Old Testament. I teach this in an elective seminar class. We talk about Nazism and anti-Semitism in Russia. I give this background to show why it is easy for war to start in the Middle East. This problem is very good for reflection, since we have no clear resolution. Although there is no clear resolution, however, as with many events, we are not able to say that it has nothing to do with Japan. That is my personal approach. [So I confront them with this problem that has no clear solutions and no way out of working to solve it]. In addition, students study the Iraqi situation in civics section. I personally like Europe, too, so I cover it as well.

Current events are difficult to teach [and interpret]. In civics class, we can cover some things, depending on the teacher, but it is difficult to decide *how current* to become. Personally, I cover the Japan-US Security Pact and issues surrounding the existence of the civil defense force, and their PKO role thoroughly – more, I think, than most teachers do. I also cover Takeshima.

A difficulty in covering these controversial topics is that it is hard to understand. Students also differ in their opinions, and they ask the teacher for his or her opinion, but the teacher cannot tell what his or her opinion is. Therefore, these lessons frequently end with, “Let’s give this some good thought.” Anyway, I do not grade on opinions, but on thorough, logical interpretation.

Public Opinion Survey Results

Six questions were asked regarding the justifiability of war (Table 1). Answers were given on a Likert scale of one to four (Table 2). One-way ANOVA tests indicated greater levels of war justifiability on the part of American respondents in all six scenarios with statistically significant heterogeneity of means ($p = 0.000$). These results are shown on Table 3 below.

Table 1. Questions Regarding the Justifiability of War

War is Justified:

1. ...to prevent human rights abuses in other countries

2. ...to prevent genocide in another country

3. ...to acquire scarce resources

4. ...when threatened by a hostile power

5. ...when attacked

6. ...when another country is suspected of harboring terrorists

Table 2. Likert Scale Answers to Questions Regarding the Justifiability of War

1. Very Justified

2. Somewhat Justified

3. Not Very Justified

4. Not at all Justified

Table 3. One-Way ANOVA Test of Difference of Means

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Q 1	Between Groups	39.754	1	39.754	52.956	.000
	Within Groups	1099.765	1465	.751		
	(Total)	1139.519	1466			
Q 2	Between Groups	116.535	1	116.535	145.144	.000
	Within Groups	1158.576	1443	.803		
	(Total)	1275.111	1444			
Q 3	Between Groups	49.490	1	49.490	78.546	.000
	Within Groups	909.835	1444	.630		
	(Total)	959.325	1445			
Q 4	Between Groups	263.440	1	263.440	365.010	.000
	Within Groups	1050.845	1456	.722		
	(Total)	1314.285	1457			
Q 5	Between Groups	153.406	1	153.406	367.124	.000
	Within Groups	617.594	1478	.418		
	(Total)	770.999	1479			
Q 6	Between Groups	131.902	1	131.902	166.433	.000
	Within Groups	1160.251	1464	.793		
	(Total)	1292.153	1465			

III. Discussion of Findings

Both official curriculums stressed historical facts, especially major wars or “turning points” in ways that were maximally flattering or neutral and minimally embarrassing to the image of the state. In the American case, US atrocities in Viet Nam, for instance, could hardly be addressed, and responsibility for inter-Asian interpretations of WWII was not considered. The Japanese coverage of the Nanking Massacre was less important than its coverage of US involvement in Viet Nam, which was, in turn, not as thoroughly covered as atomic bombings in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Neither curriculum required or encouraged teachers to comment on the morality of events, but the selection and length of coverage items were favorable to the state in both cases.

American involvement in global crises loomed large in Arizona, touching practically everything students learned about international affairs. Meanwhile Japanese global involvement in world affairs was limited to some discussion of the PKO role of the civil defense force.

Testing, a well-established routine in the Japanese case, and a new and evolving dynamic in the American case, considerably impacted both curriculums. In both cases testing seemed to discourage critical thinking, limiting the time for delving into problematic moral issues.

In both countries, teachers believed their colleagues varied considerably in the extent to which they taught peace, but whereas peace was nowhere considered in the official American curriculum, it had an important place in the official Japanese curriculum. That place, however, had traditionally focused on Japan's own peace constitution, with little thought given to waging peace through global engagement, whereas American children had many chances to consider the US role in working toward prosperity in other parts of the world (e.g. Africa), albeit not explicitly through peaceful means. This suggests a traditionally passive notion of peace in the Japanese curriculum (which is currently changing toward a more active discourse on peace) and a de-politicized dismissal of peace on the American side.

The American teacher seemed much more focused on his personal ways of teaching and the reflective content he covered, whereas the Japanese teacher seemed psychologically connected with stronger bonds to normative teaching practices and the standard curriculum, being a non-tenured teacher in a system with a well-defined curriculum with constant entrance exam pressures. Accordingly, the Japanese teacher innovated within a narrow range, while the American teacher took considerably more agency over his teaching and felt free to work to countervail what he saw as a shallow curriculum.

Based on these descriptions, it would be reasonable to assume that American students, at least in Arizona, typically cover wider areas of the world and see their country as an active player in many of these places, while Japanese students gain perhaps greater mastery over more narrowly selected areas of

the world, and selected topics, and do not grow up assuming their country to be on center stage in world affairs. It would also be reasonable to surmise that relatively few American students are confronted with deeper issues relating to peace and are given plenty of room to feel comfortable about their country's moral behavior, geographically and historically, while Japanese students are confronted uniformly with the notion of peace and reflection, but at a shallower, less globally engaged level.

It is perhaps not the greatest coincidence that American survey respondents uniformly expressed greater comfort with the idea of war in all six scenarios, while Japanese survey respondents condemned it more strongly, in light of these curricular findings. As these respondents were adults in 2004, their opinions presumably reflect the influence of the education they had received during the 1990s and earlier. Further analysis should explore the effects of age (and hence educational experience) on public war ideation in the two countries, and future interviews should seek to recount perceived changes in the curriculum with regard to peace.

Notes

- (1) The Nanking Massacre and the Comfort Women issue are examples of Japanese atrocities, not American. However, inasmuch as the US exerted considerable control over the Tokyo Trials (e.g. Bix, 2000, p.618), there would be ample room to argue that the US bears responsibility for clarifying these historical issues and making students aware of their existence.
- (2) Schools receive letter grades that are posted on the Internet, based on results of these tests.
- (3) This refers to the creation of Liberia as a place to return African slaves from the US.
- (4) Translated from Japanese.
- (5) I am using the same nomenclature as that used in the US ("seventh, eighth and ninth grade") for the sake of a parallel analysis, but in Japan, the nomenclature is "middle school, first year; middle school, second year; and middle school third year."

References

- Ahmad, Iftikhar (2003). Education for Democratic Citizenship and Peace. U.S. Department of Education, Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) Doc. No.: ED475576.
- Bix, Herbert P. (2000). The Tokyo Trial. *Hirohito and the Making of Modern Japan*, New York: Perennial, 581-618.
- Bovet, Pierre (1927). *La paix par l'école. Travaux de la Conférence internationale tenue à Prague du 16 au 20 avril 1927*, Geneva: Bureau international de l'éducation, 144-147.
- Dewey, John (1983). Social Purposes in Education. *The Middle Works, 1899-1924*, vol. 15: 1923-1924, Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 158-169.
- Diamond, L. (1994). Rethinking Civil Society: Toward Democratic Consolidation. *Journal of Democracy*, 5, 4-17.
- Grossi, Verdiana. (2000). Peace Education: An Historical Overview (1843-1939). Peace Education Miniprints No. 101. U.S. Department of Education, Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) Doc. No.: ED445990.
- Harris, I. M. (2002). Peace Education Theory. Unpublished Paper Presented at the Annual AERA Conference at New Orleans, 1-16.
- Johnson, Chalmers (2000). Some Thoughts on the Nanjing Massacre. *JPRI Critique*. San Francisco: Japan Policy Research Institute. Downloaded from the World Wide Web at: http://www.jpri.org/publications/critiques/critique_VII_1.html on Sunday, November 6, 2005.
- Kant, Immanuel (1957; 1795). *Perpetual Peace*. Lewis White Beck, ed., Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc.
- Masalski, Kathleen Woods (2001). Examining the Japanese History Textbook Controversies. *National Clearinghouse for U.S.-Japan Studies*. Downloaded from the World Wide Web at: <http://www.indiana.edu/~japan/> on Sunday, November 6, 2005.
- Nozaki, Yoshiko and Hiromitsu Inokuchi (2000). Japanese Education, Nationalism, and Ienaga Saburo's Textbook Lawsuits. *Censoring History: Citizenship and Memory in Japan, Germany, and the United States*, Laura Hein and Mark Selden, eds. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 97.
- Prudhommeaux, Jules (1893). Comment on enseigner l'histoire. *La paix par le droit (P.D.)*, no 3, May-June 1893, 45.
- Seve, A. (1910). *Cours d'enseignement pacifiste. Principes et applications du pacifisme*. Preface by Frederic Passy. Paris: Giard et Briere.
- Piaget, Jean (1933). Psychologie de l'enfant et enseignement de l'histoire. Rapport présenté à la Conférence de La Haye. *La Conférence internationale pour l'enseignement de l'histoire*, no 2, 1933, 8-13.
- Reardon, Betty (1997). Human Rights as Education for Peace. *Human Rights Education for the Twenty-First Century*. George J. Andreopoulos and Richard Pierre Claude, eds. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Seidman, I. E. (1991). *Interviewing as Qualitative Research*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Tocqueville, Alexis de (1956; 1835; 1840). *Democracy in America*. Richard D. Hefner, ed. New York: Mentor.

Dataset

SAGE: ICU-WSU Joint Research Group. (2004). Survey of Attitudes and Global Engagement (SAGE). This study was graciously funded by the ICU Center of Excellence Program: Peace, Security and Conviviality. World Wide Web Site: <http://subsite.icu.ac.jp/coe/sage/index.html>

日本とアメリカにおける戦争思想と平和教育 —事例的比較研究—

< 要 約 >

マーク・W・ランガガー

本研究では、日米における平和教育とその歴史、および、暴力の根絶（Reardon, 1997, 22 頁）と自国の不道徳な行為への反省を含む、現在の平和教育の強調点を論じている。分析的な比較のために、日本とアメリカのそれぞれの社会科カリキュラムにおける歴史的な事件の捉え方とそこでの強調点及び平和道徳への明確な注目点に焦点を合わせ、日米それぞれ一人ずつの中学校社会科教師が物語る体験を検討した。その結果、アメリカでは、扱われている地理的・歴史的な範囲が広く、国際的な関係が広範に説明されている一方で、平和をそれほど道徳の視点から捉えていないことが明らかとなった。これに対し、日本では、構造的ではあるものの、地理的・歴史的に限定的な幅で平和への希求が語られ、それへの注目度は形式的であることが示された。また、戦争に対する意見調査を一要因分散分析した結果、アメリカ人成人回答者は、用いられた6つの場面いずれにおいても、戦争に対して、より穏やかな態度をとっていた。これに対し、日本の成人回答者は、一貫して強く戦争を非難していた。本研究から、平和をカリキュラムで提示していくことと、成人の戦争に対する意識との間のかかわりが推測された。