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The study on the history of education, now includes not only the study on the educational system, but also the study of the relationship between teacher and pupil, and between pupil and pupil. It is important to develop the paradigm of the study and teaching of the history of education.

The objective of the history of education is to provide a vision for the future of the educational structure, but in order to do this one must elucidate the history of educational reform. This is because educational reform is the resolution of discord between education and society, and because the process for this resolution shapes the outline of the history of education. It is important for us to study the history of educational reform.

In order to nurture educational thought, one needs to develop a radical way of thinking that is critical and creative, and this requires that one ascertain how, in each era, the relationship between education and society was harmonized, how the authority of the nation-state intervened in this harmonization of education and society, and how the general population participated in this harmonization. To put it another way, one must determine how education is defined by society, and analyze how the relationship between education and society was harmonized. It is the crucial role of the history of education to examine this problem not only on the level of one’s own country, but also on a world level.

The study of the history of educational reform is also an approach to the creation of pedagogy in a transitional period. Therefore it is time to introduce a new theory as Pedagogy. Limning the image of the future society and the image of the new man after social change, and fostering the ability to live in a self-reliant manner in that near-future society—and doing this based on a discussion of the crisis of society—is the pedagogy in transition at which Rousseau hinted.1

To put it another way, pedagogy in transition is helping the learner acquire independence and freedom. The ability to live in self-reliance in society is not an individual, personal matter, but is socially defined.

By what is it defined? It is possible to offer the following elements.

First, increasing productivity and the characteristics of labour (including development of science and technology)
Second, a system of managing production
Third, one’s lifestyle.

It is a matter of concern to research in the history of education as to what extent the essential goals of education since the beginning of the modern age have been achieved: guaranteeing the right of children to survival and the right to learn (the right to an education), and to realize for all children and youth the development of character, individuality, and ability. When our perspective in harmonizing the relationship between education and society is fighting against all discrimination, inequality, and violence of man against man, we must study how the foregoing three defining elements have operated, and what kind of educational behaviour and educational groups (human relationships within groups) have been created. This is the objective of the history of education as a teaching subject.

How have the foregoing three defining elements operated?

The ability of the individual to be independent in society is, first of all, determined by the character of the labour which has been bound by the developmental stage of productive capacity. In order to live in self-reliance as a working person in an industrialized society, and in order to secure one’s right to work, one has to obtain the knowledge and capabilities relating to labour as it has been defined by advances in science and technology. But in actuality productive capacity and formal education have been linked by the view that people are labour resources. That is to say, that the kinds and extents of the abilities considering the objectives of education have been defined by the industrial structure and the developmental level of productive capacity, and personnel allocation plans have been formulated in accordance with this.

However, in order to overcome all discrimination and oppression, realize the liberation and development of all people’s characters, and make it possible to live self-reliant in society, people who work must stop passively supporting the production process, and must obtain the power and control to dominate the means of production. If the nature of labour changes owing to advances in science and technology, this is reflected in formal education, which performs the function of producing and allocating human resources. However, if education and learning for the purpose of eliminating discrimination and oppression do not likewise reflect the transformed character of labour, it will not be possible to realize the social self-reliance of the learners. Furthermore, another task for education and learning is not only to have the capacity for adapting to advances in science and technology, but also to develop the capacity for humanizing labour (for example, the ability to become aware of problems and solve them).

The most important matter is that people become universal people who change their own talents in response to continually changing labour demand. This means that people will become aware of problems and solve them. Such is the way to realize in modern society the “freedom” and “independence” advocated by Rousseau, and is truly the meaning that Krupskaya gave to polytechnical education.

---

The matter of how many people can achieve what extent of self-reliance is, in other words, the extent of the ability of individual children and young people to achieve the self-reliance in society, is also limited by the next social elements.

The following are some examples of the elements needed in order to take charge of production in modern society.\(^4\)

(a) Formulation of production plans, by companies and labour groups, and the determination of investment in plants and equipment.
(b) Selection of certain types of machines when introducing machinery.
(c) Decisions regarding the operating time and speed of machinery when selecting machines, and what kind of guiding principle the determination should be based upon.
(d) Guiding principles for the organization of work (for example allocation of workers, etc.).
(e) Personnel administration: The mechanism for appointing and promoting administrators, including the head of the enterprise.
(f) Personnel administration: Hiring and dismissal.
(g) Allocation of an enterprise's earnings to wages, salaries, and bonuses; employee welfare; and investment in plant and equipment.
(h) Providing assurance of opportunities for re-education and education and study for raising qualifications.
(i) Choices in the kinds of jobs, work, and labour.

We can know by these elements, what kind of self-reliance is needed. The most important matter is the increasing extent of participating in production control.

People have the possibility for determining how they will accept advances in productive capacity and administration systems on the basis of their own cultures and lifestyles. That is to say, they can also be the people in charge of determining the way they live. They have, based on their lifestyles, a certain educational intent. Should their lifestyles change, their educational intent will also change. In accordance with advances in formal educational systems and changes in their lifestyles, there have been heightened demands to realize many of their educational objectives by means of public education. As the chief elements that change lifestyle, we can mention urbanization and industrialization. These changes of lifestyles reflects on the demography (for example the movement of population and population dynamics), which suggests the change of educational intent.

There is need to analyze the following as elements which define how people are in charge of their own lives.

(A) For political culture: (1) centralization or decentralization of power, and (2) whether or not collective operation will be autonomous.
(B) For family relationships: (1) male and female, and (2) parent and child.
(C) For school culture: (1) teacher and pupil, and (2) pupil and pupil.

As indicators that show how people take charge of their own lives, one can offer the content and methods for self-expression (for example cultural activities), and concepts regarding children’s education and methods of realizing those concepts.

The process by which education is created is one which determines the following two states; first, the state of educational behaviour, second, how the educational groups are determined. It is the process of deciding to whom and to what extent we shall guarantee the education that provides the ability to live in self-reliance in society, and of carrying through with the decision. The problem is: Who shall decide, and how?

The foregoing elements (A, B, C) acquire an important meaning in the process by which education is created. As you recall, in the period, in which men gained superiority over women, society educated only boys of the bourgeoisie. In a power-centralized society utilitarian and bureaucracy are created. This sets up an educational system which makes use of one’s educational intent, but not one which reflects the core of education.

An important matter is in what way people gain control of their own lives and production.

Should there be disharmony between lifestyles and educational behaviour, that is, when it becomes apparent that there is disharmony between the educational demands and public education, then it is conceivable that the people should solve the problem by participating in educational reform.

Gelpi says: “where there is the possibility of popular participation in the administration and management of a society, the workers themselves must face the problems of managing the educational system, and of its efficiency.” That is to say, production control systems are deeply concerned with the possibility of educational planning. The main focus is for us to get people participated in their own educational planning. To do this we must create a more democratic state.

Bernstein suggests the tendency that human relationship surrounding production control and school culture are apt to have parallel relations. It’s true that production and education are respectively autonomous. But inhabitants’ participating in educational planning connects the former and the latter. Furthermore the democratic school culture will easily grow in societies where political culture is decentralized and autonomous.

An important matter is increasing the extent of control of one’s own lives and production. Therefore it is important to recognize the process in which we gain control and determine our lives. Adult education plays a role in this process.

The history of education—in particular the history of educational reform—must elucidate how these three elements of advances (1 force of production, 2 production control systems, and 3 lifestyle) work and how they have determined the educational behaviour (for example the educational process, educational objectives, and teaching methods) and educational groups (culture and operation of schools and classes, and school management). It is also important for us to manifest opportunities offering the possibility of popular participation in the creation of education.
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