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I. "Educational" Concept of Social History

What is "Education"? This concept has spreaded as one of the links of the current of enlightenment after the 17th and the 18th centuries, and has dropped great influence on our mentalities. It is the premise of my inquiry that we have to define the concept of Education historically as long as this concept is a factor that appeared in the historical process of modernization of society. It's prototype had appeared in the 16th century among the middle class families of Western Europe and other countries. What we call "Education" is the historically particular method to make the new generation live independently in modern society.

However, on the other hand, we have to define this concept in the socio-biological context. Because, it is one of the methods to make new generation live independently that all creatures had been doing.

When we define it from the point of view of the former, the art of education shows the side that is particular only among the human being, i.e. institutionalized, non-daily, and by-state, though it started as the daily work of families. On the other hand, when we define it from the point of view of the latter, the art of education shows the other side of it which is installed in the common field among human being and animals, i.e. traditional customs.

Every time when I think about this subject, one experience always comes up to my mind. That is the experience in survey of educational customs at Tomikura District, Iiyama-shi, Nagano Prefecture. The Studying Group of Voluntary Education and Historical Materials selected this area for studying educational history, and made this survey with the group of Prof. Ota, Tokyo University in November 1976.

At that time, this studying group, of which I was also a member, had been working on a comparative study on the educational customs in many fields for the purpose of developing new method of survey instead of old method. Among them was one questionnaire about the greatest incident in this survey which was done in the village of Tomikura. This incident is the greatest for the people in this village for 70~80 years. So, we should ask

* This article is the rewrite of my old paper entitled "Outline of Social History of Education" (1980, translated by Teruo Nitta, Kazuko Nitta, unpublished.) in order to make the word "education" historically rigid. It comes under my historiology of education that I mentioned in my article "Rebirth of History of Education" (June 1991). I would like to thank Miss Takako Ota, Mr. Yoji Hashimoto to their unfailing efforts in retranslating this paper.
about this incident, especially about elements which made this incident great for the Tomi-
kura people. Most of us expected them to answer:

“One is the poverty after the World War II. The second is the shock of the defeat and
the declaration of human being by the Emperor.”

On the contrary, the Japanese history of the modern times for the people in this deep
snowing village in the winter was conceived in quite another dimension. All the people
of Tomikura village said:

“One is the death of the people by snowslips of △△ mountain, the other is the fear
of the fire at the ○○ mountain, these two!”

In those days, in the field of historical studies of education, History of State-Educa-
tion recited positivism for its own convenience, and was apt to censure other methods
as irrational. So, the fields out of State-Education, for example folkways, customs and
popular religion were not to be studied seriously by educators, and only folklorists have
studied these fields till now. Even in the time educators barely studied these fields, they
made the common people the object of the study and this method itself was progressive
but they studied these fields from the view point of the visitors or enlightener. But
by this method, we can not understand and draw the daily life of common people. The
meaning of the historical philosophy which the people of Tomikura had in the experience
of the measures against natural disaster, for example the fight for the fire at the mountain,
can not be understood after all.

I’d thought that the experience at Tomikura was very important and I still do. Now,
let’s regard the business or art of what people today call “Education,” as a kind of
an equipment for changing-generation, say, a breakwater, people have built up against the
disturbance of the natural world, and for making the new generation independent. It is
the peculiar form of such an equipment in modern society what we call “Education.”
The experience at Tomikura proposes us the necessity of a wider paradigm for under-
standing the human development. The evil surrounds us today, for example, the nucleas,
the medical treatment and the educational problems, they are all social evil and are sys-
tematic illness. So, if the evil will become more serious, people reproach this social system.
But when we inquire about the process of the making of this system and about the way how
this system was accepted, we’d inevitably have to inquire about the natural world, which
lies under the social system that surrounds and threatens the people, and the people them-
selves as a part of the natural world. And we are obliged to think of the relationship be-
tween the natural world and the human way of living.

Homo sapiens sapiens, our ancestor, walked the way of adaptability to the environment,
not by the evolution of its species but by the progress or by changing the direction of its cul-
ture. Then, let’s define the culture as a class or a way of living. In case of the animal except
human being, one species has one living style. So, looking at one nest, we can guess the
name of the species which lives in the nest, for example, a raccoon dog, a bear, etc.. But
in case of human being, said relationship is not to one-to-one and it has built so many styles
of living in each fields, for example production, medical treatment, educational control,
etc.. In another word, human being has built many forms of life-style. By this conduct,
human-beings has expanded his sphere of living to the severest natural condition which human
being can not live without changing his substance of species. The sphere of living is now
expanded to the outside of earth by developing of new stage of life style, space technology.
But human being has some weak points which is attributed to himself who is a part of the natural world. The death or sex are among them and changing-generation is also the one. These are also the places where we have stretched the breakwaters and taboo two-fold and three-fold in order not to rush the natural power in, because these are the weak points of human being who have lived standing face to face with the nature. But the place of death, sex and changing-generation are also the place where the way of their natural existence has been asked about the relation to the method of changing-generation because it is the place where the substance of human species dwell in. The history of reformation of old educational system is the history of challenge to this breakwater or taboo from the viewpoint of the wishes to ‘natural’ changing-generation and reflecting standpoint of each ethnic and classes.

Today when the crisis of existence of human being can be seen in the field of education, we have to re-examine the concept of education again on the context of the said meaning. If we regard the art of education as the modern form of a kind of equipment for changing-generation against the swaying of natural power from the inside of social living, the concept of ‘Education’ would be reconstructed as follows:

(1) First, if we take off the frame of its modern form (that is “Education”), this conduct of teaching for making the new generation independent is the art which can’t be limited only to the human species but expanded to animal world.

The crisis of collapsing life style of one species by changing-generation is the fate every animal had evenly on the earth. So, the building of the breakwater and the taboo are the indispensable links for maintaining species for all the animals. No matter if the art of teaching-learning is instinctive, impulsive or conscious or not, and no matter if there’d be its specific gravity or complexity in the conductive patterns among them. C. Darwin, the evolutionist, pointed out that there were culture-conduct which was taught and could not be attributed to the “instinctive and hereditary habit.”

This theory of animal-taught-culture-existing can draw out the proposition that “monkey can be ripen monkey by education (taught-culture).” This proposition was made from the record of observation of a chimpanzee at Tanganyika by an anthropologist J. Goodall.

But this theory of animal-taught-culture-existing is a minor opinion in the modern society. It is the common opinion to explain that the human being can be human being only by education on the assumption that the teaching conduct would be a peculiar conduct of the human being. It has been said that Portmann’s theory of Nestfluchter-Nessthocker and the records of le sauveur de l’Aveyron etc. which were cited so often in Japan too, prove this.

Studying where does this difference between the existing theory and non-existing theory come from, we came to the difference of what do we think about the concept of teaching conduct. In the case of Darwin, on the part of existing theory, it is the motif of his theory
to prove that the art of teaching-learning which is typical to human species living now, did not exist in the human species transcendentally but was acquired and this conduct had its origin in the other animals just as in the case of other conducts. It is natural as the evolutionist. Then, “taught culture” of Darwin is intuitive and it is looked in an animal, or at a glance, it is a conduct of simple style, for example a parent cat’s conduct of half killing a rat and giving it to its kitten or a parent hawk’s conduct of dropping decreased rat or sparrow in the air to teach its child the judging of the distance and quicklity for the first time, and then, parent hawk brings living birds and releases it. At this scene, the culture which is expected to learn for the child is non linguistic, comprehensive, instrumental, and practical ability and also it is ability of making relationship with others for example to be able to conduct together, and the development of sociability which is the ability to feel himself as one with others.

But the content of the art of teaching-learning which the theory of non-existence has as the assumption is different from these. The concept of “Education” which the theorists of enlightenment have proposed, limits the range of its concept to the bringing up of the ability of “the use of understanding of oneself” (Kant) which is considered as something different from the field of said abilities. Practical report of “le sauvage de l’Aveyron” by J. Itard and experimental and observational record of Portmann is correct itself. But the proof of the existence of conduct of teaching and human development is limited only to the culture in the ability of using language, the weight of brain or the development of autonomy in the division of oneself from another. These abilities are the group of abilities which has especially been expanded in the group of human being of modern industrialized society. So, setting it as the standard of judging, it is natural that the theory of non-existence should be proposed. With this theory, it may be said that there is not the conduct of teaching for making the new generation independent in African, Asian preindustrialized societies.

According to the theory of educational value in the field of modern pedagogy, it had been something like a formula to see the abilities which have something to do with instrumental and practical intellect as abilities in a lower stage, calling it “life value” (Sukeich Shinohara), “material value” (R. Hubert), although they recognize these abilities as one of the educational values. It assumes the title of cultural value to the ability which have something to do with the use of understanding of oneself. The stratified order of this educational value saturates into the every nook and corner of school education for example, the order between liberal art education and vocational education, or main-subject and sub-subject. And we can not deny that the ability which has something to do with the use of understanding by oneself shows the higher level of a way of its existence, whether or not we adopt the evolutional point of view or the progressive point of view. Even if it is so, we can not deny the value of the lower level abilities. It seems unlikely that the conduct of teaching can not be the one for making the new generation independent in case of the conduct of which its content is the lower level value. When we use the word of “teachcative,” it may although sound faint in the world of animal’s conduct, we must expand its range to their world (see Fig. 1). The instrumental mental faculties and the ability of making conduct together with others are in the lower level according to the concept of evolution.

---
8 Darwin, Ibid.
and progress. But it is the basic ability in the meaning of minimum and indispensable ability. So, animals and human being have made a lot of devices and built material and non-material systems for rearing these abilities. The historical study of equipment for making the new generation independent which can not see the history of such an origin and development is, I should say, too autistic.

(2) Secondly, such a teaching conduct can not be limited to the art of drawing out ('educere') some abilities or characteristics of personality, we regard as common sense, from under-age-generation. We must include the concept of 'educare,' in other words, childcare which obstetrics and delivery, gynecology and children's doctor had been coping with. The change of generation takes place on the stage of the development of an individual body. However the teaching conduct never waits till the school age. It's already begun when one makes a match and bears the baby, so to say at the point where a new generation comes out of the nature controlling world to the social controlling world, in spite of the differences among the stages of history, classes or ethnics. As I've mentioned above, what we call "Education" is, historically, the modern form of such a conduct. If it is so, we should recognize the concept of "Education" too, in these context.

It is not the turning away from its substance but rather the approach to its origin of which concept ("Education") we limited historically, and moreover, on the other hand, make it descendant to the biological dimension. The origin of the word, "Education" is not only "drawing" (educere), a Latin word, as sometimes considered wrongly. The concept of "Education" leads to "making fat," to educate (educare) the children. It was the philosophical tide of enlightenment after the 17th and the 18th centuries to make the concept of education special meaning for just only mankind. They excluded the dimension of fattening and educating children, which is common to both the animals and the human kind, from the meaning of "Education," and limited it only to the dimension of drawing out the abilities of use of understanding and the attributions of ego. In this philosophical tide, there occurred this mistake concerning the origin of the word. This paper which started from my experience at Tomikura, now draws back the concept of teaching
conduct which had certain power for making great apparatus of public education institution, to the starting point again. Here, I have to search for the intrinsic characteristics of it.

The behavior of delivery and childcare, or of selecting his/her spouse and the relationship between male and female preceding delivery and childcare, have been regarded as a phenomenon being too close to the nature or biology as well as aging, illness, starvation and weather. So, it is the field where historians had excluded from their field of his study and had ignored. Even in the cases where some historians consider them, it would be assumed as the conduct of man kind in the field of metaphysics, for example, the blood and the tradition of the ethnics as in the case of E. Krieck. This perspective has not the spaces for human intention, frustration, struggles in their history. The study on folkway by ethnology also had the inclination to put emphasize on the concept of timelessness and spacelessness. Socio-historical study which became well known to the new historical study of education started from the assumption that regards the conduct of man kind which used to have been thrown away or considered as metaphysical, as a phenomenon with its own history not having been moved by instinct or heredity, and as the production of human kind's intention. The reason socio-historians likes to take up the history of sex, history of maternal love, history of birth control and the history of the doctor of obstetrics and gynecology, history of relationship between parent and child, history of relatives and family could be drawn out from this context.

(3) Thus, regarding the concept of “Education” as one of the apparatus of generation-changing, we naturally come to regard the concept of “Education” or educational history as the history of boundary between the nature and the culture, and what is more, as the history of daily life which king and peasant, men and women can not avoid evenly. This is also the important transition of the concept of education. Because, when I see the education from the dimension of the daily life history of boundary, in other words, when I see the children and the youth as the elements against adult, women as against men, informal teacher of people as against formal teacher, and the masses as against bureaucrat, and all of them as the bearer of this art, the new history of education puts out these people who had been the silence class under the traditional history of education, to the front stage. We could have found the history of the latter, but always as the supplementary case of the former. Not only that we can see the change of the bearers of history, but also the history of daily life has another and special concept of time and space which are different from the state history. The historical study of silence class proposes the periodical division different from the old educational history, and the administrative district, for example a district of temple, church and school can never be a unit of research. But the space of daily life, so to say the natural district, civil society and family may become the unit.

The boundary of prefecture and state temporalitylily vanishes from the history of education. And again, it appears as dotted lines.

Social history is the field of historical study which tries to make clear the history of this field by its peculiar theory on time and space and by using historic documents of historical demography and daily material culture. If I say this, some people would say that history needs positivity and history is the study of time, and is different from sociology.

---

These people may think that the positivity can only be composed of the form of the state history. Here, social history have introduced the multi-classic, multi-polaristic idea which can be composed of plural dimensions. And as though they may not be aware of it, the positivical study of the state history of education is same with the social history in that they have one certain concept of education. The socio-historical theory of education has another concept of education which is to be called the educational philosophy of social history. And from here, social history draws its dimension of positivity which is different from that of state history. And also, in the process of making of socio-historical concept of time and space, and theory of historical material, it is a fact that social historians had contact with sociologists, geographers and anthropologists. But as far as social history is one of the historical study, it can not regard the time as “special dimension which has a social actuality” to do away with it easily, and nor can transform it as sociologists do. For the social historians, “everything begins from the time and ends in the time.” Social history, sure, treats the boundary area of animate nature. But it never regards this area as the unchangeable territory in the concept of time and also, never makes it metaphysical study and drives away into the invisible field. In this meaning, social history is the legitimate successor of the modern rationalism spirit which studies and surveys the phenomena that belongs to the secrecy of God.

Till now, I was using the word “social history” but I do not mean that there exists one certain formula of this method of history in somewhere. In France, the work of Les Annales which had begun with the publication of “Annales d’histoire économique et sociale” by M. Bloch and some other persons, in 1929, is given the name of social history. And in England, the work of “Cambridge group for the history of population and social structure” is often given this name. There are some groups like these in Germany, America and East Europe also. As far as the word of social history, this word alone had been used among the people, who were studying economical history and history of childhood before the World War II in Japan, too. But actual contents of social history is very much varied. At one place, social history is the history of collective consciousness and at another it is socio-economical history or history of population and rather, it is to be called the historical psychology, or historical sociology. And the content of it is not always divided into the social history of religion, social history of economics, social history of women, and social history of education. Then, one may ask “Is everything mingled in the field of social history?” No, not the case. There is one common subject as a theory of history. If there’d be a academic group of scholar which can be called the school of social history, it’d be composed of people who share this common subject and who look for a new historical study along with each consciousness of problems and field of each major. So, I have no intention of regarding the idea of any special groups or person as the origin and call the precise copy of it as the social history. This trial itself does not make a sense. I am just going to join into the study of this social history, taking into consideration my interests, standing on the side of this common subject.

---

6 J. Graunt, Observation Naturelles et Politiques, introduction (É. Vilquin), 1962, p. 22.
II. The Field of “Social History” of Education

So far I've written rough meaning of social history of education. But I have no detailed idea about general structure of it. So, I'll reexamine the Figure 1 which shows the range of the teaching conduct and I'll try to describe what I presume from it. Looking at the Figure 1, you may see that the equipment for teaching conduct which is made by mankind is consisted of two parts as follows: One is the part where mankind shares its quality with the animals (the primary field). The other is the part which is formed in relation with the special culture to human species (see Figure 2). I've already explained about the contents of these teaching conducts and also the characteristics of cultural value which was expected in this conduct in the primary and secondary fields.

The primary field, in where human-species shares the teaching conduct with animal, appears to be simpler but as I'd already said, children can not be adult without going through this field. I can study about this in detail, little by little from now. I'd propose its method later in this paper. The first thing I have to do here is to think what would become clear concerning the way to look at the history of education from the vertical axis of Figure 2.

The primary field is the part which is shared by human species with animals. And the typical type of the secondary field is the field of teaching conduct which is the substitute of new popularized language culture, after several centuries of its history. This is what is usually called “education”, “indoctrination,” etc... If it be that we, mankind, have evolved from animal, the history of teaching conduct of mankind must have begun from the primary field, adding the secondary field which has to do with the history of language culture special to this species. But the thing I'll have to pay attention with the Figure 2 is this transition, in other words, the history of “birth of education” is not shifting from the primary field to the second, doing away with the first, but that, even if language culture would develop,

**Figure 2. Compositions of Teaching Conduct of Mankind**
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This history is the history of shifting, leaving the first. Of course, along with the specific gravity of the second becoming heavier, the first also changes in relation to the second. So to say, the history of the primary field itself begins. As I had said in the former section, social history had been trying to make clear the boundary history of culture and biological elements or that of soul and body, for example the history of maternal love, the history of the system of birth control, the history of the daily life of children, young people and the youth, and to say more, the mental history of great mother and teacher.

This kind of double structure which is peculiar to the history of human beings may be found more or less in the field of politics, religion, labour, technology or art, etc., but especially in the field of education, we can see it clearly. A child in womb can grow to be a human being of today only by tracing the very long history, through which certain kind of primeval animal had become Homo sapiens neanderthal man, Homo sapiens sapiens and at last human species of today, and by tracing the line which leaves the traces of the primitive period one by one even after it has come out of it. The view on children being “pretty barbarians” living now (Kiyomi Abe) is a wise saying. For the people who want to pursue the history of education, this viewpoint is vital. It is necessary to study the historical process, through which the secondary field was differentiated from the primary, and through which the former and the latter not only developing different cultures but different concepts of time and space, and through which, in turn, they both confront and permeate each other and be integrated. We have come to be able to study these process, after social history which has a potential to deal immediately with the primary field came on the stage.

The long history of differentiation, confrontation and integration of the primary and the secondary had made up the pedagogical culture: the owner of the right to rear and educate child, the role of the persons who are concerned with it, the image of child and the sense and system of age stage which decides the way of installing children in life cycle of a community and family, the structure of the spaces of teaching conduct such as village, civil society, family and school. And it has made up also the symbolic system to rationalize and made each system, as a whole, permeate into mentality. Talking of the right of education, the modernization of this equipment took place in various parts of the world in recent centuries, after, above all, the preceeding experience of Western Europe as a model. And in this process, the ownership of the equipment moved from community which includes the community of same kinship, of the age-ladder and of maternal community, to simple closed family (which includes some forms of the stage, e.g. patriarchal family, affective nuclear family) through a few interim stage. And we can summarize that this modernization process was the one through which the role of newly-born civil society was confirmed and through which the role of school, which had already existed in the ancient time, was changed and that this process proceeded in connection with the formation of the class of literacy people for example the common leaders and the public leaders. But actually this summary is too abstract in fact. For example, in Japan, new civil society was formed as new base of life containing the old orders of town and village rather than excluding them. It may be said, safely, that similar process could be found in other provinces. So, I am going to use the word “civil society” in this meaning. And I would call the educational system made through modernization, “the education carried out by family and civil society.” As we know, in the process of building a nation state which is peculiar to modern society, the state came on the stage as one who generalizes and controls the education carried out by
family and the civil society where class confrontation was gradually becoming severe and the education carried out by family and civil society took the form of public education system. This public education system (the state education) had put on its weight gradually everywhere. Especially in Japan, not only the weight being heavy but also that the state organized the education carried out by family and civil society from above by using categories of “home education” and “school education” under the political power of Satcho (Meiji) government in the 19th century. Because of this special circumstance, it is difficult for us to see that the education carried out by family and civil society logically goes ahead of the State-Education. But social history of education which is the history of daily life of common people can not identify the both as same. In the case of Japan too, it intends to distinguish the both and to explain the process of formation of education carried out by family and civil society which was made through the conflict between the primary field and the secondary, from each of following viewpoints, for example, that of educational right, of image of child, etc. Now, it is the search field called “voluntary education” which I call the process of education carried out by family and society here. Our group of voluntary education and historical materials had been making researches on these historical processes. The example for these researches was the case at Tomikura.

Next, let’s see the Figure 2 from the viewpoint of the horizontal axis. There appears a bird’s-eye view of educational distribution of modern world which sees the expanse of the primary and secondary field not only as a dischronic system but also as a synchronic system. In the synchronic expanse, there are two forms. One is the expanse of both field as geographical ones. It makes up the field of comparative geographical description of education. As I wrote formerly in this paper, the secondary field can not complete the safeguard system for generation-changing alone and likewise, the primary field alone can not always do so, either. Consequently we would devide this expanse into two regions. The region A is the region where the primary field is predominant and the region B is the region where the secondary field is predominant. When we devide the distribution of the art of teaching-learning to make new generations independent this way, we feel that the world is one, whether or not there are ethnics and national boundaries, because education is composed of the primary and the secondary field everywhere. The rate of both field are different in each region. But I wonder if there is as much difference as is believed among our common sense, for example, between the “advanced” area of education like Japan and Europe and the “under-developed” area like Gíkûyû in Black Africa. I have a doubt about the difference of standard asserted by comparative study of education. For, to begin with, this distinction between the region A and B was not always equal to the regional distinction between high-developed countries and under-developed countries, modern society and pre-modern society, or between the north and the south in the level of development of economy. Telling of the myth of the tribe and the symbolic event at initiation ceremony of the tribe of Gíkûyû is an educational behavior in the secondary field not at all inferior to the education of science in West germany or in Israel. The under-developed countries in the “South” observe their initiation ceremony carefully as an indispensable system for generation changing among their community and tribe, while on the other hand accepting elementary school which was introduced by the
missionaries from the “North.” Socio-historical view of education shows us the existence of another educational map which is different from the old one which gets unified with the political or economical map.

I presume one more point. Can the developed countries in the “North” complete their educational systems only by education of science and technology which is the system of written language? The answer is “no.” If people should try to tackle to the problem of generation-changing seriously, they can not complete the educational system that way, as I said before. Many systems belonging to the primary field are devised in the modern educational system visibly and invisibly and are contributing to maintain the total balance. This is the another form of the syncronic expanse of both fields. The time when the balance is lost, is the crisis period for education and human development. Japan today, where rehabilitation of educational function of family and region is called for and where songs in praise of wild nature is heard asserting the value of culture of manual labor, using figures and play, may stand at the point where the balance is lost.

The significance of the fact that we can divide the teaching conduct for new generation into these two layers, is that we can divide teachers, who are the organisers of this behavior in broader sense, and their arts into the two layers. It is a phenomenon which can be traced not only as division of role, for example between father and mother, school teacher and “common teacher” (K. Yanagida) but also as the double structure of personality and educational skills in a school teacher.

III. Comparative Socio-Historical Theory of the State-Education

The State-Education has developed as the form of the public educational system everywhere in the world since the former century.

There are three viewpoints to define the substance of the State-Education. The first viewpoint of public education regards it as a product of humanism and as a method of the extension of human rights. And this viewpoint which sees that the development of public education is good on any condition has been prevailed with the current of the enlightenment since the 17th and 18th centuries and has been the undoubted common thought in the educational field for a long time. The second viewpoint of public education regards the State-Education as the apparatus of ideology (L. Althusser) and (or) the apparatus for the reproduction of cultural capital (P. Bourdieu) to serve for the good of the ruling class and to convey its interest under the name of the public. And the third one is more practical viewpoint of public education which regards the State-Education as “the turning point” of class struggle in ideological part (B. Simon, A. Gramsci and others). The first and the second viewpoints apparently look as if they are totally antagonizing. But they are similar in the point of regarding national public educational system as a tool to serve for certain purposes. On the contrary, the third regards it as one of the “places” (G. Snyders) for class struggle in the ideological field. In France, United Kingdom and

---
America, some social historians regard public education as a tool and others as a place. So, we cannot draw out a common thought in these countries. I think that there may be conception of the State-Education which takes neither these viewpoints in socio-historical philosophy of education.

Whether the viewpoint of public education is tool or place, former saying, the history of education was nothing but history of state (history of public educational systems) substantially in the current studies of educational history as state history or anti-state history. Even if they'd take a step forward to the world existing outside the state history, they grasped it as what distorts, bends and fixes the will of the state or that of the opponents of the state, or they refer to it with the eyes of curiosity to see the visitor. Social history sets, as its object of study, education carried out by family and civil society which goes before state history or anti-state history logically, and furthermore teaching conduct carried out by the community of the naturally developed village. How can substance of the State-Education (i.e. public educational system) be defined in social history? Again, let's look at the Figure 2 constituent parts of teaching conduct.

The primary field of teaching conduct has its own expanse and conception of time, which is different from the expanse where the sovereign of the state reaches and has the conception of time that the state has. It is also the case with the secondary field of teaching conduct. The said difference in the expanse and the conception of time between the fields of educational behavior and the territory of state sovereign existed in the ancient states, the medieval states, and the modern nation-state similarly. The modern nation-state was multinational as well as colonial. This difference is not a gap between the periphery and the center nor that between people and governor, as the theorists of cultural lag used to have argued once. From the social historian viewpoint, this recognition of the differences is making the facts stand on one's hands.

We can find unique space and time different from governmental ones made by states not only in "Charivari", the organization of "Wakashu." Schools have had the same conception of space and time as state had for a long time since the Ancient time. But the popular school based on and supported by the literacy mass population, for example, common reader picked up by R. D. Altick, in the 17th century England, readers of "kusazoshi" in the 18th and the 19th centuries Japan and others, were different from the state schools, though they too were schools. At that time, in Europe, there were Sunday school, Dame school, petite école, Schriftschule and so on. In Japan there were Terakoya, Shijuku and others. They became widespread beyond the limits of state's sovereign. Their timetables were different from those of kings and the States. The literacy class and the popular schools show us the early form of the modern education, but they were not established by the kings and States. If we'd intend to search for the historical factor closely related to their appearance, as I said, the key will be the independency of families from community and its transition to become educational family.

Many texts of educational history, concerning the formation of educational system in modern society, said that the education of family and education of school were opposed to each other, because as family had lost the function of education as well as that of religion and of production, and the modern school have developed to take these functions upon itself instead of family. But social historians sees this in different manner. Independence and establishment of autonomy of educational function of family was parallel to the for-
mation of modern school. Family did not lose its educational function but rather acquired and strengthened it. So, to take an instance, in the 18th century France, theories arguing that the form of public education does not have to always be college only but also could be “maison” and “cercle” as J. J. Rousseau’s were made up in their own ways. M. Condorcet and J. J. Rousseau were opposed to each other in this point. And Condorcet brought up the form of school and similar conception became the dominant current in many countries after then. And now the idea that public education in school education is widely spread. Common theory of historian of education stands on these thought. But it is too much sticked to Condorcet’s conception that one explains the early form of public education in this way, I think. Thing which the system of education of the state clung to, when it was going to overtake education carried out by family and civil society in the form of public educational system, was not only school education but both school education and home education. I think we should see the matter this way. School and home are two legs of the State-Education. Really in Japan, for example, in the 18th century, when the political power of Tokugawa during the Kyoho had begun to give shape to the policy of the State-Education, it was the control of education contents of popular school and at the same time it was the control of child-rearing family education for example the prohibition of abortion by mobilizing Confucianists and temples that it’d tried to do. In Japan, it was in 1882 that the conception of “home education” was formulated as a term of public education. But its original form existed at the beginning of policies of public education for controlling popular schools of Terakoya, more than one century before 1882. At that time, what was conceived to be opposed to each other by the political power of Kyoho period was not family education and school education but family education and home education, and popular school and public school. When we look at the confrontation and struggle between the public and the private at the beginning of public educational system, we find that such a confrontation had two poles and that conflict between family and school was nothing but a superficial outlook of this confrontation. The growing process of the gravity of the State-Education underwent, at least at superficial level, as a process of emptying of the former by the latter, for example, the erosion of family education by home education. Theories of family education carried out by the head of a family, which Giovanni Dominici, a monk in the 15th century Florence had begun to argue and Rousseau (“Emile”) made the peak, was general educational theories including intellectual, moral and physical education. But Mrs. Ellis’ theory (“The Mothers of England: Influence and Responsibility,” 1843) which appeared next, had already been taken away intellectual education, dealt only with moral and physical education.

I questioned the position of family at the time when original form of education was made. By the way, where was the first step for this form taken on the earth? Was it in the 17th century or in the 18th century? Or earlier? What was the motivation of that? There are, actually, different kinds of families. So, by which class’ family was it taken? What class led it? Agriculture, commerce, bourgeoisie, middle class or laborer? These questions are as a matter of course also important. But now among socio-economical historians or social historians like F. Engels, L. Stone, P. Ariès, E. Shorter, C.N. Degler propose different theories, so we can not specify it. But they all agree that the State-Education was brought into education carried out by family and civil society logically, whether or not it be the primary field, the secondary field or both and they also agree that
what was formed there was the public educational system, which now has organized almost all the educational activities and competing with each other in industrial societies today.

If it be so, we'd come to be able to grasp the characteristics of the State-Education gradually. The State-Education is not drawing its plan for public education on a white paper at its own will, but rather integrates and controls education carried out by family and civil society from the sovereign of the state. The integration and control are supposed to be restricted by the education carried out by family and civil society on one hand, and are reflecting the characteristics of the state power itself on the other hand. Is that nation state, compound state, or colonial state? Now, considering the possible erosion of the State-Education into the area of education carried out by family and civil society which has its own conception of time and space, we can draw out the Figure 3. In the case that the society is divided into classes, the question concerning if it be a capitalist state, a socialist state or other from will be added to it. This difference of character of power will decide how and to what extent does the State-Education organize the primary and the secondary field. For example, cases as in Figure 4 may be considered. In this case, the character and the style of state power is not fixed but varied by the stage of development of racial struggle or class struggle. The character of state power is the character of the State-Education and consequently the change of character of state power, is actually the change of character of school education and home education. So, then, whether or not the person concerned himself, is aware of it or not, school and home would be turned into shambles of racial struggle, class struggle, etc.. The dispute on the character of public educational system, for example, which is right, to see it as a tool of class struggle or to see it as a place of it, might have been based on this point. The member of the circle to study educational history or the circle to study history of educational movements which had appeared after the World War II examined the issues of racial and class struggle in education that were never dealt with sufficiently by state educational history till then, and explained its formation and development from the viewpoints of anti-state historians as we know. In spite of the

**Figure 3. Types of the State-Education**
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presentation of le Goff and others, the full efforts to study such problems have not yet been made among socio-historians. If we'd try this study from the dimension of history of ordinary occurrence and history of mentality, that is to say, from the line of socio-history, what figure of educational history would appear? We social historians can not help doubting at the explanation seen among historical psychologist such as deMause, known in Japan—logic to explain state historical incident by deep personal psychic elements—, but at the same time social-historians do not keep the field dealt by psychogenists in the darkness of agnosticism. Now, let's think what the Figure 3 and the Figure 4 show us.

For instance, when we put the process of development of the State-Education which occurred among the people living in Japanese islands into order applying this socio-historical paradigm, what division of eras would be possible? In my book "Theory of Subject Matter and Educational Tool" (1979), I tried to make the period distinction of my own at that time for the purpose of a hypothesis to study educational history. Though I'd used new historical data related to the primary field, such as demography, I did not come to a level to grasp the province of social history and there were some inappropriate terms in my theory. But I still presume that the general frame work of my theory was right.

Independence of a direct family from a medieval community and the shift of family life for children to be a daily one, which was a step for the opening of 'century of education,' had proceeded since the 16th century or the 17th little by little in Japan, though there was regional time lag in term of centuries. When it came to the 18th century, there was a situation, which we could guess that new behavior of child-rearing and teaching conduct different from traditional one appeared partially among families, the new leader of mankind life. It was exactly this time that political power of Tokugawa during the Kyoho had begun the State-Education and either style in the Figure 3 was established. It was made up on the two bases: control of child-rearing in family and control of 3 Rs school. Thus the second epoch on the history of formation of education and the first epoch of formation of the State-Education would be set not on the political period of Satcho (Meiji) in the 19th century but on Tokugawa during the Kyoho in the 18th century. The next epoch

---

8 J. le Goff, "les mentalités; une histoire ambigue", in Faire de l'histoire III, direc. le Goff, P. Nora, 1974.
was the period from 1910 to 1920, when educational Malthusism which had been suppressed by populationism of public power, came out clearly under the public education system although it was yet based only on certain part of classes. And the next, the period of sudden change came during 1960's, when said movement was expanded to all classes including workers and farmers and accompanied by the school explosion.

In the period division made by some social historians in Europe, we can see rough ones for example, the old time and the modern time or pre-modern and modern. To see from the viewpoint of social historian, there is no wonder that social history sets epoch by unit of century. But I think it is not sufficient, from the standpoint to make social history, as history of daily occurrence, develop to be social history that can integrate state history into its view. It is necessary that period division of state history be reformed by period division of social history.

When education is organized into public education, public educational systems relate and compete through the relation between states. So, it will become difficult to inquire into the way education occurs to be in just one country, separating it from other countries. That situation asks for comparative consideration moreover not only diachronic comparative studies but also synchronic comparative in domain of historical consideration. In the comparative consideration so far, comparisons of educational system, curriculum and moreover educational thoughts between units of state administration such as America, Japan, USSR, China has been superior. Educational history becomes world educational history which is an assembly of each country's educational history and also world children's history will become world's children's history which is an assembly of each country's children's history. In a country, educational history of a country becomes an assembly of each prefecture's educational history and also each prefecture's children's history. There are indeed vast quantities of this kind of researches having been achieved, keeping high level of positivity going into details. But when the comparison itself and the reason why difference between ladder system and dual system, the assimilate form and the separate form and others were realized, though they were called after the same name of public educational system, are questioned, the answers were, to tell the truth, unexpectedly unsophisticated. What has been said as the answers are for example tradition, character of race, difference of political system, native culture, cultural lag and so on. These concepts indeed explain everything. But after all, it tells nothing at all, I think.

To social history, these concepts are the very objects of recognition to be explained rather than concepts to explain something. Social history set the primary field as the objects of historical recognition as well as the secondary field and state history. The primary field is shifting along with such 'la longue durée (long wave motion)' that theorist of tradition and of nativity make an error of regarding it as unhistorical element and is "the phenomenon too close to nature and biology" (Ariès) for historians to set as the object of consideration. And social history explains that the world of tradition etc. is a historical world changing with its own time and expanse in every moment, that is to say, tradition and native culture have its own history. Through this path, social history will find ways to explain the reason why the State-Education (public educational system) are varied in their form among ethnic nations and regions.

The Figure 3 has a clue to characterize public educational system of each country from the different viewpoint from the previous ones and to make new historical map of differences
and similarities among them. The Figure shows that one educational sphere can be divided into two educational national boundaries, or that on the contrary two educational spheres can be enclosed into a single educational national boundary. Here are some examples. Until at the beginning of this century, public educational systems in Europe and America had the separate form in educational systems of the colonies as common characters. This shows us that public educational systems in Europe and America were type B. And also the case was the system of qualifying graduate unit. On the other hand, disputes on the affairs that the dialect of Okinawa was suppressed at schools and recognition of regionality in disputes on education of northern Japan, both reflection on public school education in Japan during 1930-1940's, show that Japanese public educational system of that time was type C and at this point, Japan had a similar point with France. Public educational system of Japan has been considered to be a typical type A. But I wonder if we can see it so simple as that. Silent classes in history would tell the truth someday.

IV. Socio-Historical Theory of Education and Theory of Development of Proto-Personality

Native seashores and virgin forests has diminished from the earth. Artificial space is now not enough on her limited ground and is going to spread out into the outerspace. We adults live in this artificial space. Even if people visit diminished virgin forests and desserts occasionally, they are nothing but visitors. But still then, children appear before us from immemorial past and the world of primitive nature. Reflections showing the growth and development of a fertilized egg of human being tell us how they reach the artificial cultural world from the natural world through long historical time that living human beings had traced. Their walk will not finish in the womb, in case of human being and it continues after their birth. Portmann's theory of Nestfuchter-Nestocker is still right as far as it teaches us the character of constitution of human beings' birth. In this meaning, children of the human beings are barbarians in the cultural world and uncivilized men on the stage of developing of human species in any time. They can not reach our ripen human beings' stage without tracing all cultures one by one which belong to the different categories than the ones we adults are get used to now. We have to let them trace them firmly without scamping. To make its process and its actual stages clear, we need the idea and methods of ethnography and demography on this part which have been overlooked and painted out in the wall of dailiness although it is the daily active art that intends to work on the process of individual development somehow. And we must pick up the aspects of development which lie hidden in the depths of each behavior.

I dare say that the constitution of individual development controlled by this unknown teaching conduct system is very much different from the schema of development explained popularly. Because of significance of this schema which human being and animal hold jointly and which is common to the development of human being in the cultivated areas and uncultivated areas, this schema is more basic and must be made clear. But now scientific study on it is not enough, because modern science including pedagogy was, till now,
sticking to the difference between human beings and animal too strongly. Even though studies on development has considerable accumulation, studies on the said development is unexpectedly few. Although children around us live in high industrial society, they are the uncultivated men in the cultivated society. So, the theory of development that can take the standpoint of the art of teaching-learning for making them independent into its view should not appear without being based on this theory of development of Proto-Personality.

Let's examine the case of R. Hubert which I mentioned before as an example of modern pedagogy. He adopted the popular method that devises stages of individual development into early childhood, adolescence and period of maturation roughly and next subdivides each period, for example, period of infant, middle childhood, etc. According to Hubert, the course of development is the process in which "parasitic" and "sensuous" behavior during the period of infant develops to be a "technical and mechanic and also constituent one". He says that the mental process is a sloughing process from "egocentrism," in which subject and object, word and action, oneself and others are undifferentiated, in his mentality and at the same time, a process of discovering objectivity in the outer world. Based on such a schema of development, Hubert makes his pedagogical system. The basic data of his schema are the studies of J. Piaget, H. Wallon, S. Hall and others, and they are the most basic thoughts as the common knowledge for the theory of development. His explanation has many points that make us understood our educational experiences. And the goals of school education today are based on this schema or coincide with it, consequently.

But there is a question. What will become of "parasitic" and "sensuous" actions and of psychic structure, in which subject and object, word and action, oneself and others are undifferentiated, and which is specialized as the character of the first stage of development, in the process of human development? Are they going to be disappeared as they "differentiate"? If then—as it is a pedagogical common knowledge to stand on that view point—the teaching conduct system which intends to teach child reserving undifferentiated psychic system will have to be a very uncultivated method. Ordinary, in societies controlled by shamanism, for example, in society of Tibet even now, they think highly of following two competence: (1) virtue of independence to take care of oneself and (2) ability to integrate all the data which man can feel and know and to reach to conclusions speedily without analytic explanation of the process of its reasoning (it makes the distinction of intellectual, moral and physical education unnecessary), and they builds up the art of teaching-learning after these virtues. It is said that sort of theory or idea of teaching conduct value is the one that goes well with the working behavior or form among hunting and nomadic societies that are said to be incapable of foreseeing the future working program. (On the contrary, in agricultural or industrial societies, especially in the latter, they can foresee the future working forms). If we bring the old psychology of development into the said teaching conduct of hunting or nomadic society, as the only one theory, the very curious conclusion would come out as follows: That kind of teaching goal is primitive and supresses the possibilities of human development into the stage of infant. But actually, in the society of Tibet, they esteem men in his prime age than they do with infants and aged persons.

In the societies where we live in, do the said two viewpoints which characterize the idea of value of shamanism become worthless? Maybe, we can not say so. Independency is also the value of civilized industrial society and we don't think of reasons and results of each action we make. Supposingly actions based on intuition somewhat have values and if it is so, the teaching conduct to bring up such abilities would become necessary somehow. It is also the fact that separation of word and activity is a value in some domain and under some conditions. We are apt to consider, for example, the standing point of historical philosophy like Hegel's, which regards substantially undifferentiated shamanism as a savage thought without conception of "God," as the one that goes with civilized society. Or we put "the lack of abstract conception among the uncultivated" in question. But the standing point of "civilization" and "abstract conception" is the standing point where, although, people have words, for example, like "thing" which implies desk and electric bulb generically and "incident" which implies earthquake and revolution likewise, they don't have a word that implies desk and man beside it and they can't have words that imply earthquake and damage or revolution and success generically.\(^{11}\)

Thus there is not necessarily only one aspect to be picked up as the schema of development. It comes from that the basis of development of abilities can be varied in accordance with where and what functions of a cerebral cortex is activated, to say like a scholar of physiology of cerebrum. There were theories which intended to extract the second schema. A. Hallowell's theory of "Protoculture" was one of these. He recognized that there were behavior acquired by individuals and transferred socially through some kinds of animal behaviors and named it "protocultural behavior" from the viewpoint to make stages on "evolution" of behaviors of animals including human beings. This was the characteristic of his theory. "Proto-cultural behavior" can be seen among some animals as well as human race living now. As far as it is a culture obtained or learned by a subject, there must be some kind of "ego" and the history of its own. Thus "initial development of the ego process"\(^{12}\) at pre-lingual or languageless stage can be assumed logically. Hallowell intends to explain the mechanism of "evolution" of culture and personality that are found among living things on the earth. Darwin had tried the same problem at one time. Hallowell says that theories of today, to explain "the relation between learning and culture leave vague part because they have not analyzed it carefully from the angle to study the relation between it and evolutions of the structure of personality, of the direction of recognition and of motivation."\(^{13}\)

"Egocentric language" which is the first language of a child is not what Piaget had thought to diminish in the process of child growing up to adult. It survives as "inner speech" and develops. It is a long time ago that one of the pioneers of historical psychology which is twin brother of social history, Vygotsky, criticized in this way the theories of development till that time taking Piaget's schema as an example.\(^{14}\) But the structure of development of consciousness and behavior of man which is typified by "inner speech" had


\(^{13}\) Ibid., p. 252.

not been studied thoroughly. It is very important for the theory of educational development to make clear this process of human growth covered equivocally with modern civilization.

Socio-historical study of education can't be achieved without systematizing that untouched theory of development into the other educational theory of development. And this kind of study may be an effective weapon to criticize the teaching conduct and to correct their errors, which are now a phenomena of civilization or a form of state which is bent by the distortion of culture and social structure and is capable of destroying the basis of humanity which is a link in the chain of nature.
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