

Influence of Moral Education Policy in Modern Japan: Philosophical Differences between Aritomo Yamagata and Arinori Mori

Atsuko KAWATA
Ochanomizu University

Abstract

This paper examines the philosophical differences between Aritomo Yamagata and Arinori Mori and how these differences have influenced the history of moral education in modern Japan. In 1885, A. Yamagata became the first Minister of Home Affairs and A. Mori became the first Minister of Education. The outline of moral education in modern Japan was established by the principles of the Imperial Rescript on Education (IRE) signed in 1890.

In addition to comparing the philosophical ideas of Yamagata and Mori from the perspective of the history of education, it is important to understand the current moral education problems in Japan. Mori was the first in modern Japan to officially advocate the importance of religious freedom; he also emphasized that the State should not violate freedom of thoughts of the People. On the contrary, Yamagata wished to control People's thoughts by manipulating the educational system; he applied moral education to the development of a militaristic ideology.

In 1889, Mori was assassinated by a thug who criticized his disrespectful act at the Ise Shrine. The establishment of the IRE was considered a form of denial of Mori's education policy. Thus, freedom of thoughts not guaranteed in Japan until the establishment of the Constitution and the Fundamentals of Education Act (FEA) after World War II. In 2006, the FEA was amended because the modern Japanese public seemed to have become immoral, which was not the case before World War II.

This paper attempts to discuss why the freedom of thoughts of individuals is often opposed to moral education in Japan.

Key words: Aritomo Yamagata, Arinori Mori, moral education policy, freedom of thoughts

Introduction

This paper describes the philosophical differences between Aritomo Yamagata (born in 1838) and Arinori Mori (born in 1847), and how these differences affected the history of moral education in modern Japan.

In 1885, Yamagata became the first Minister of Home Affairs and Mori became the first Minister of Education. The outline of moral education in modern Japan was established based on the principles of the Imperial Rescript on Education (IRE), signed in 1890.

There are many studies on Yamagata and Mori and their policies in separate research fields; however, there are few studies investigating any relationship or differences in their philosophical and political activities. This paper attempts not only to compare the ideas of both Yamagata and Mori from the viewpoint of the history of education but also to understand the moral and educational problems currently prevalent in Japan.

Such studies have not been conducted earlier because

of the following reasons:

① Differences in the contribution to education policy in the respective periods

In 1884, Mori returned to Japan from England and became the Minister of Education. Hirobumi Ito, who was appointed the first Prime Minister in 1885, promised Mori the rank. Mori was an active politician from 1884 to 1889 but was never directly involved with the establishment of the IRE. Hideo Sato (1981) explains that the criticism leveled against Mori's education policy partially led to the establishment of moral education principles such as the IRE.

After Mori's demise in February 1889, Yamagata became the Prime Minister at the end of 1889, and Enomoto was appointed as Mori's successor. Enomoto was ordered to revise the education laws in May 1890, leading to the assumption that Yamagata was involved in education policy only after Mori's death.

② Differences between the fields of research

There are many distinct studies on Yamagata and Mori in the research fields of political and educational history. However, Yamagata and Mori have rarely been

studied together.

Although opinions may vary by research field and among researchers, there are many interpretations of Yamagata's influence in preparing and establishing the IRE. In the first study on the IRE, conducted from the viewpoint of political history, Noboru Umetani (1962) states that Yamagata's militaristic nationalism provided an outline of education law. He also identifies Kowashi Inoue as being involved in preparing the Imperial Instructions for the Soldiers and Sailors (IISS; Gunjinnchokuyū), which he duly carried out at the request of Yamagata in 1882. Inoue was seemingly raised as "an ideologue of militaristic nationalism and the brain for Yamagata," who also took part in preparing and establishing the IRE.

Tokiomi Kaigo (1965a), advocating the history of education, opposes this view, trying to prove that Yamagata did indeed endeavor to establish the IRE. However, he could not conduct as same as when he had done for preparing IISS, because the Meiji Emperor himself had secretly ordered the Minister of Education to prepare the education principle in 1890 after the Local Cabinet Assembly was formed. As compared to Umetani, Kaigo underestimates Yamagata's influence in establishing the IRE.

Mori's policy has often been discussed in the realm of the history of education rather than political history. Hideaki Kinoshita (1982) as well as some other researchers¹, who studied Mori's military exercise, point out that Mori changed his policy to militaristic-nationalism in 1887. In studying Mori's contribution to the IRE in political history, Masatsugu Inada, who contradicts Kaigo's prescribed study, says that Mori's education policy as super-nationalist was consequently realized in the IRE. In contrast to these studies, Hideo Sato describes a common acknowledgement in the history of education—the IRE was formed based on the denial of Mori's moral education policy.

However, in a paper presented in 2003, Terumichi Morikawa examined the history of moral education in modern Japan as well as the history of ideological moral education that preceded the establishment of the IRE in 1890. His research mainly examines policymakers like Fujimaro Tanaka, Nagazane Motoda, Arinori Mori, Kowashi Inoue, Tetsujiro Inoue, and Kumaji Yoshida, all of whom contributed to establishing the ideology of moral education in modern Japan; however, Morikawa makes a slight reference to Yamagata.

In my Ph.D. dissertation presented in 2008, I demonstrated that Yamagata implemented his plan on local education policy through local government policies since 1884. It was stated that Yamagata was interested in and concerned with the education policy prior to Mori's death. It is thus essential and important to understand the relationship and the differences of the education

policies between Yamagata and Mori in order to clarify the processes involved in the establishment of moral education principles in modern Japan. Both Inada and Kaigo agreed that "If the Prime Minister were Hirobumi Ito and the Minister of Education were Mori, IRE would have never been proclaimed."

Furthermore, this paper discusses the relationship between the above-mentioned circumstantial examination and the problems of moral education that currently prevail today in Japan. The IRE is considered to violate the principles of a Nation with its own Constitution; this can be evinced in the following principle of the IRE: "The Nation power should never control the thoughts of the people." Yamagata and Motoda—the close adviser (*jiko*) of the Meiji Emperor—were primarily responsible for violating this principle, which they did by establishing the IRE. Inoue insisted that the procedure of establishment should be different from that of the political order of the government. In order to abide by the principles of a Nation with its own Constitution, it should be the message from the Emperor, without any signature of Prime Minister. However, in a Cabinet Meeting just prior to establishment of the IRE, it was decided that the Emperor would present the IRE to the government in the Court. Thus, Inoue's original idea was rejected. Nevertheless, Inada points out that the IRE, which was principally edited by Inoue, contained information that controlled the thoughts of the People.

In modern Japanese history, the Fundamentals of the Education Act (FEA) of 1947, which guarantees freedom of thoughts, was recently amended in 2006 because morality among the youth worsened after World War II. The FEA was prepared and forcibly implemented by GHQ; in other words, it was not regarded as an original law. In the 2006 amendment, several new issues were added, for example, "Respect for Japanese tradition," "Love for home province," and "Education at home." The main present problem of moral education in Japan is the restoration of morality, which the Japanese seemed to have lost after World War II².

On the other hand, some consider the principle of freedom of thoughts to be threatened again and that a militaristic policy will amend Article 9 of the Constitution, under the guise of the amendment of the FEA. In general, the Japanese seem to underestimate the respect for human rights, obligation as the Nation, and freedom, which they obtained after World War II. In addition, this situation seems to be similar to that of 1890 when the IRE was established. Applying moral education to militaristic nationalism and controlling the thoughts was common to these periods.

The relationship between the two Ministers needs to be examined and their policies and philosophies on moral education need to be compared. Further, the processes of establishing moral education principles need to be

clarified, especially taking into consideration that the freedom of the People was controlled by the State in Modern Japan. It is the blind spot in the historical researches and the weak point in the Japanese who tend to underestimate the human right to freedom of thoughts. Further, the above study should help in understanding the historical context of the problems of moral education currently prevalent in Japan.

Although only a few historical sources provide information about the relationship between Yamagata and Mori, with the exception of two letters³ from Mori to Yamagata, we shall try to find letters, diaries, records of discussions, and documented accounts of gossip for insight into the circumstances of the past. This could help create a new and more liberal future for the Japanese.

1. Yamagata's moral education policy

(1) Yamagata's moral education policy during the process of establishing The Imperial Instructions of the Soldiers and Sailors (IISS)

There are two studies on Yamagata's moral education policy. One was prepared by Umetani, which is prescribed in this paper (1962), and another, prepared by Michio Fujimura named "Yamagata Aritomo" (1961). According to Fujimura, Yamagata stated in a paper "Theory for Diplomatic Strategy of Japan (Gaikoseiryakuron)" written in 1890 (Oyama, 1966), "The power of the State, whether it is strong or not, depends on the loyalty of the people who love their parents and never hesitate to protect them by dying in their honor, if the People are not as devoted, no laws or rules can help maintain peace and safety in the State. The only way to secure the People's loyalty is via national education." Fujimura states "Yamagata succeeded in establishing the militaristic moral principle." Yamagata also said, "Loyalty is such an important aspect of national education that the People must be educated in the early stages of development so that what is learned becomes second to nature." A similarly expressed idea is mentioned in the IRE.

Yamagata ordered Amane Nishi, Kowashi Inoue, and Gen-ichiro Fukuchi to make a draft of the Imperial Instructions to the Soldiers and Sailors (IISS), which was put into effect in 1882. First, Yamagata appointed Nishi who had already made the draft for the Admonition of Soldiers (Gunjinkunkai) (Umetani, 1962). In the draft, Gunjinkunkai, Nishi states that laws and rules control only the superficial behavior of human beings, and one can easily ascertain their development. He said that "If soldiers, who resisted laws and rules, should be trained to obey them, they could choose to control their own thoughts by themselves." According to Nishi, "The thoughts are invisible; therefore, no punishment can be

meted out even if one has a rebellious spirit. However, it is easy to determine if one has real good faith." (Umetani, 2000, p.30) He also said that laws and rules could not control the thoughts of human beings; thus, the soldiers' loyalty can be secured by helping them obtain an education by their own initiative. According to Umetani, Nishi had a similar idea to the theory of the Emperor as an organ of the government (tenno-kikansetsu) (p.253).

However, Yamagata was not satisfied with Nishi's draft, thus appointing Inoue and Fukuchi to prepare the next draft. Fukuchi added some amendments to the draft written by Inoue and disclosed it to the public. The IISS mentions that "*Soldiers and sailors lacking in loyalty must be no better than mobs in case of national emergency, no matter how orderly or disciplined.*" Loyalty is thus described as the first duty of all and is considered to be more important than "order" and as "*with single-minded loyalty discharge your duty. Bear in mind that loyalty is weightier than a mountain, and your life lighter than a feather.*"

The drafts of IISS are today stored in the General Staff Office of the Army. There are 8 drafts, "draft 1-1," "draft 1-2," "draft 2," "draft 3," "draft 4," "draft 4-3," "draft 4-4," and "draft 5." "Draft 1-1" was written by Nishi, "draft 2" by Inoue, and "draft 4" by Fukuchi, but it is uncertain who wrote the other drafts.

It is not known who inserted the phrase "*Bear in mind that loyalty is weightier than a mountain, and your life lighter than a feather.*" The phrase was added to "draft 1-1" by Yamagata. This can be easily determined by Yamagata's signature at the end of the amendment⁴. It was Yamagata who thought the soldier's life is lighter than a feather and put the phrase in the statutory.

Umetani says that ordinary people became soldiers by following the conscription system and were trained according to the militaristic principles of the IISS. Loyalty to the Emperor was considered so absolute that devotion to the Emperor was regarded as the highest of all morals. This idea was brought to their local society on the return to their villages. It influenced society on a larger scale, thus repressing the democratic movement⁵.

As a result, it can be said that Yamagata was aware that political power can control the thoughts and lives of human beings. He wished that this ideology spread to all of Japan.

(2) Who inserted the militaristic phrase in the IRE?

The following phrase of the IRE is associated with the militaristic moral: "*should emergency arise, offer yourselves courageously to the State.*" It is not known who inserted this phrase in the IRE.

Kaigo (1965a) summarized the process as follows. "First, Yamagata and Takeaki Enomoto came to a consensus that the principles of education should be written by scholars; however, Enomoto did not

immediately create the principles despite an order from the Emperor in February 1890. Therefore, in May 1890, Yamagata replaced the Minister of Education with Akimasa Yoshikawa, who easily complied with him. The Emperor again ordered Yoshikawa to formulate the principles. Consequently, Yoshikawa began to search for some scholars and, at first, chose Masanao Nakamura, a scholar and professor at the University of Tokyo. However, the drafts prepared by Nakamura were severely criticized by Kowashi Inoue, the Director of the Cabinet Legislation Bureau, who said it might conflict with the different religious bodies. As a result, Nakamura's draft was rejected in June. During the same period, Motoda also prepared a draft "Principle for Education (Kyougaku Taishi)." Kaigo describes the process for establishing the IRE as follows: "After Nakamura's drafts were abolished, Inoue and Motoda prepared separately the drafts and made some amendments in cooperation."

As mentioned before, Kaigo carefully studied all the drafts; however, he has not paid enough attention to the militaristic phrase in the IRE. Based on Kaigo's studies, I have tried to examine how and why the phrase was inserted. The prescribed militaristic phrase was inserted in Inoue's first draft and neither was it changed nor were any words missing at the end. Kaigo has pointed out the presence of another draft that used the Cabinet's paper with the mark "Naikaku" printed above the phrase. Kaigo cannot identify the author of this draft, even though, he considers it possible that somebody in the Cabinet, Yamagata or Yoshikawa, wrote it (Inada contradicts Kaigo's opinion, saying this draft was the first of Inoue's drafts (Inada, 1971, p.199)). Kaigo also pointed out in a letter written by Yamagata to Inoue dated Sep. 26th, 1890, that Yamagata requested Inoue to insert one more phrase that appealed to the militaristic moral. However, the draft was not changed despite the letter; thus, Kaigo suspected that Inoue rejected Yamagata's offer because of insufficient time to include some words to the IRE before its proclamation. Kaigo says that Yamagata did not intend to add the militaristic moral phrase in the IRE because there was already another Rescript for Soldiers and other military commands (Kaigo, 1965a, p.352). Kaigo seems to think that Yamagata did not insert any militaristic moral in the IRE.

However, the existence of militarism cannot be denied; this resulted in military education training at that time. The phrase introduced a basic idea that the People should die for the State and the Emperor in the advent of a war. On the other hand, Inada says that Inoue wrote an alternative phrase: "Subjects (shinmin) should die for loyalty," which was written in a previous draft by Motoda (Inada, 1971, pp.207-208). Therefore, Inada thinks that Inoue modified Motoda's draft and has not considered the insertion of the military phrase. In my opinion, however,

there is a vast difference between loyalty to the Emperor as Subjects and a militaristic obligation to the State and the Emperor. Umetani has already pointed out that the following phrase in the IRE, "*always respect the Constitution and observe the laws; should emergency arise, offer yourselves courageously to the State,*" refers not only to personal morals, but also to social and national morals. "Therefore, what Inoue's draft means is remarkably different from that of Motoda's." (Umetani, 1962)

Thus, the liaison between Inoue and Yamagata resulted in the insertion of militaristic ideology in the IRE.

2. Mori's moral education policy

(1) Mori's philosophy of moral education

As mentioned before, Mori was the first in modern Japan to officially advocate the importance of freedom of worship; he also emphasized that the State power should not violate thoughts of the People.

There are a number of studies on Mori's moral education policy. In the earliest study on Mori by Kaigo and his colleagues, Kishii (1965) of the University of Tokyo says "Mori thought that the Government should make the integration of the People stronger in order to be ranked among the great world powers in international society and that the stronger People's loyalty became, the more competitive Japan would become internationally." Kishii concludes that Mori changed his policy of human rights and freedom to super-nationalism.

Masahiro Chiba studied the relation of Mori's moral education policy to super-nationalism, which was mentioned by Kiyoko Takeda (1957) and Takeji Hayashi (1986) in their papers. Hayashi states that Mori considered the Emperor to be "the unique fortune (muni no shihon)" in integrating the People systematically; thus, Mori's philosophy of education differed completely from that of super-nationalism, which compelled the People to devote their lives to the Emperor. As a result, Chiba agreed with T. Hayashi's opinion that Mori was the last person to resist super-nationalism at that time. As prescribed before, previous studies have commonly acknowledged that Mori's education policy opposed the nationalism of the Emperor's based on the IRE.

In his "Book for Ethics (Rinrisho)" (written by Mori in 1888, originally in Japanese), Mori insisted that "Individuals in a moralistic society have the freedom to practice their religion and live according to their own will; they control themselves. If such a moralistic society was realized, the gap between morality and the happiness of human beings would be reduced." Furthermore, Mori said in his paper "Religious Freedom in Japan" (1872, originally in English), "Everyone that lives are himself solely responsible to his Creator for all his thoughts and deeds. He who is deprived of the knowledge of this

responsibility, and the freedom to exercise it, can no longer be rightly called a man in the proper sense of the term" and "He cannot possibly assume to decide for another, without committing a serious crime of violence upon the right of the other. Nor can any government perform this service without prostituting its sacred office to one of transgression. The protection of the people in their proper rights is one of the most important among the many grave responsibilities with which the government is charged." These ideas of Mori differed completely from that of Yamagata who considered life of human being as "*lighter than a feather.*"

(2) Mori's theory of military exercise in the school curricula

Military exercise was introduced in school curriculums by the School Commands proclaimed by Mori in 1886. At the same time, military exercise, along with normal physical exercise, was adopted in secondary and normal schools (shihan gakkō: schools for rearing teachers). In primary schools, it was called "tairetsu taisō (physical exercise for forming ranks)" by Ordinance No.18 of the Ministry of Education. Military exercise was introduced in the primary school curriculum on January 12th, 1888 by Ordinance No. 2 of the Ministry of Education (Kinoshita, 1982).

In a speech at Tokyo Gakuinkaiin in 1879 "Theory of Education -the ability of body-(Kyōhikuron -shintai no nohryoku-)," Mori suggested the necessity of military exercise in normal schools. In 1882, he again insisted on the importance of military exercise as a form of national education for "training the body and temperament (kishitsu) of the People." At that time, Mori said that the purpose of military exercise was not to develop soldiers who would participate in wars during moments of emergency. However, Hideaki Kinoshita (1982) points out that Mori changed his idea about military exercise from the summer of 1887. In this year, Mori wrote two proposal drafts, "Proposal for Cabinet Meeting (Kakugian)" and "Proposal draft for Military Exercise (heishikitaisō ni kansuru jōsoan)." The former draft was instead written by Inoue. Mori said in the draft, "In the curriculum of the above secondary school, military exercise should be administrated under the Army, and the selected soldiers will teach the military exercise." Mori described the following in "Proposal for Military Exercise": "The training of military exercise would be useful for students when they became soldiers in the future and the Subjects (shinmin) of the Emperor should understand the obligation to protect their country." Although it is not clear whether the two proposals were actually offered, Kinoshita says that "Mori changed his idea of military exercise from training the body and temperament to education for militaristic purposes (Kinoshita, p.57).

It is uncertain why Mori changed his idea of education to military exercise. Inada describes the historical situation of the period as follows. Mori inspected a school, Seiseigaku in Kumamoto Prefecture, which had special curriculum for super-nationalistic gymnasium education in January 1887. After the inspection, Mori was greatly impressed by the school and expressed so to Inoue, who was born in Kumamoto Prefecture. Furthermore, in a letter written to Sasa on October 11th, 1886, Inoue described that he too, like Mori, had the same idea on the education policy of loyalty. Inoue and Mori became intimate friends from the end of 1886 to the beginning of 1887 (Inada, 1972, pp.127-128). Yukio Hisaki (1985) also describes the situation as follows: On November 29th, 1886 at a home party hosted by Iwao Oyama (the Minister of Army), Mori received a proposal from Yamagata that the Ministry of Education ought to be abolished and merged with the Ministry of Home Affairs. Mori replied, "Yes, it is reasonable at the present situation." It is unclear why Mori agreed with Yamagata's proposal. This can be seen in the same letter written by Mori to Yamagata and Hirobumi Ito on the same day.

Mori's ideological change to militarism can be evinced from the official record of the proceedings of the Privy Council (Sumitūin) in 1888. Mori seemed to introduce militarism in his education policy. For example, Mori proposed a draft for Article 32 of the Constitution at a Meeting of the Privy Council on June 27th, 1888, where the draft of the Meiji Constitution was discussed. Mori insisted that not only soldiers but also teachers should be restricted from making political speeches and becoming members of a political party, though his opinion was voted down in the meeting.

Mori began to make speeches in many local areas. In his speech, he proposed military exercise in normal schools in order to strengthen students' body and temperament so that they become soldiers in the future. He emphasized the importance of the education of "loyalty" in his speeches. However, there is no evidence of Mori and Yamagata holding similar views with regard to "*Your (human being's) life is lighter than a feather,*" as stated in the IISS.

Discussion

The following is an analysis of what was discussed in the preceding sections.

- 1-(1); Yamagata inserted the phrase "*Loyalty is weightier than a mountain and your life is lighter than a feather*" in the IISS.
- 1-(2); One phrase of the IRE, "*should emergency arise, offer yourselves courageously to the State*" was added to the first draft written by Inoue. However, there was another draft with the same phrase, which was written on the Cabinet's paper with the mark "Naikaku." Kaigo

thus says that somebody in the Cabinet, perhaps Yamagata or Yoshikawa, wrote this other draft.

- 2-(1); Mori was of the opinion that the State power should never violate the freedom of worship and thoughts of the People.
- 2-(2); Change of Mori's ideology that supports military exercise.

Many researches have detailed the ideological change of Mori. Why do researchers differ in their conclusions of Mori's philosophy? The reason seems to depend on the following: "Mori was a super-nationalist (Kokutaishugisha)," which Inoue explained as Mori's education policy after his death. Inoue said that Mori's super-nationalism could be clearly seen in the draft "Proposal for Cabinet Meeting." The draft, however, was not directly written by Mori himself, but by Inoue, as mentioned above. Sato points out that Mori's idea, which was stated in "Proposal for Cabinet Meeting," differed from Inoue's analysis of all the drafts (Sato, 2004, p.224). The crucial issue is whether the State and Emperor were the means to integrate the People or the Absolute Being, compelling the People to devote themselves to them. Consequently, with the establishment of the IRE, the People devoted themselves to the State and Emperor in adherence to the most important moral policy.

With regard to moral education in present-day Japan, one area of focus is to determine a method of educating students about public spirit. Many Japanese consider public spirit to be a devotion of something that belongs to them to society; for example, labor, providing volunteer services, etc. The most difficult problem of moral education in Japan is that the difference between devotion to the Nation and public spirit is not fully understood. Maintaining the dignity of the individual and the public spirit of cooperating with other people are equally important in constructing a democratic society. It is not only meaningless but also dangerous to choose either of them. I suppose that the dignity of the individual, which was mentioned in the Constitution and FEA in 1947 after World War II, has neither been advocated nor realized in Japan. The reason is that violent acts that harm the dignity of human beings such as bullying (ijime), suicide, and violence towards strangers among youngsters has increased and become widespread. With the amendment of the FEA in 2006, the Government intends to educate the masses about "public spirit" such as "Respect for Japanese tradition" and "Love for home land" as moral spirit, which was lost after World War II. However, it should not be justified to educate the youth about the spirit of devotion for the Nation in the same manner as that of the IRE to solve the above-mentioned moral problems. The concept of "devotion" has many dangerous features that would interfere with the freedom of the thoughts of human beings. The most important thing is to make known that

the dignity of the individual and public spirit is equally indispensable to human beings and society. Public spirit can coexist and work in tandem with dignity and the rights of the individual; on the contrary, devotion for the Nation is often opposed to the dignity of the individual. Returning to the moral principle of the IRE means that the social structure of the Meiji era is still in existence today in Japan. At that time, Mori's philosophical ideology was dominated by Yamagata's militaristic ideology. It was Yamagata who denied the People their right to privacy and their dignity of human beings, which the Nation could not violate, such as the freedom of thoughts and the right to live, which Mori had insisted upon.

Conclusion

Mori emphasized the importance of "freedom of will from the State power," but his philosophy was suppressed due to the establishment of the IRE. According to the IRE, the People were compelled to be loyal to the Emperor and his descents and also had to proclaim militaristic devotion to the State. It was Yamagata who was most eager to include militarism in the IRE. This paper clarified that Yamagata wished to insert the phrase meaning "The People should die for the Nation and Emperor" in both the IRE and IISS.

On the other hand, Mori changed his policy during the summer of 1887. In 1879-1882, Mori rejected the idea of military exercise for rearing soldiers; however, he began to change his policy and assert that change in his speech from 1887. What made Mori change? Although it has not been clarified, I suppose that it was inevitable for Mori to change his idea particularly in the policy related to militarism. In actuality, his other policies on local education or separating of education and religion were not changed. Therefore, it cannot be denied that Yamagata and Inoue's militaristic ideology influenced Mori. After Mori's death, Inoue said "'the Proposal for Cabinet Meeting' was written by himself at the request of Mori in the summer of 1887." From October 1886, Mori and Inoue began to cooperate closely. On 29th November 1886, Yamagata proposed to Mori that the Ministry of Education should be abolished and merged with the Ministry of Home Affairs. Mori could not refuse this proposal even though the Ministry of Education was not abolished consequently.

It is very important to study the effect of Yamagata's political power on Mori from the perspective of the history of education, because the two men lived during the same era when modern moral education in Japan had been reformed drastically. There are many commonalities with Mori's philosophy in the FEA, which was proclaimed after World War II, such as freedom of worship and dignity of individuals. However, it was

rejected and amended in 2006 because some people think that individualism has gained such dominance that traditional Japanese virtues are on the decline and public morality is at an all-time low in Japan. Behind this criticism, there is a process to strengthen nationalism through moral education. This can be done by abolishing Article 9 of the Constitution, which deals with the renunciation of war.

Why are individual human rights and freedom of expression opposed or denied by moral education in Japan? Why does moral education in Japan often relate to the militaristic policy and the Nation power? This is so because the Japanese are unable to ascertain a difference between public duty and devotion for the Nation. They rarely consider human beings as free beings in the thoughts, never violated by anything, even the Nation. That is the philosophical difference between Yamagata and Mori. To be sensitive to the gap developed due to differences in education philosophy between Yamagata and Mori, it is quite important to understand and solve the present moral education problems in Japan.

Notes

- 1 Takeda, Kiyoko. (1957), Kinoshita, Hideaki. (1982), Terumichi, Morikawa. (1990), etc.
- 2 This is evinced in the statements of the Ministers of Education, Kotaro Tanaka, Tamon Maeda, etc. after World War II and the movement to make "Respectable Human-Being (Kitaisareruningenzo)." Nakasato, Yoshimasa/Matsui, Hiroshi (1997) *Japanese Youngsters who have different nature from Other Countries -An Attitude Survey on Kindness and Moral of Secondary and High School Students of the World-*, Breinsha:Tokyo pp.124-125. *Women & Action* (2003) vol.248.
- 3 The first of the two letters is from Mori to Yamagata, dated August 6th, 1874, and called "An Issue about the Requirement of Reestablishing Jingikan (Ministry of Shinto)." The second letter is from Mori to Yamagata and Hirobumi Ito about the proposal from Yamagata to Mori on the unification of the Ministry of Education with the Ministry of Home Affairs, dated November 29th, 1886. The issue about the date is studied in detail by Sachio Hisaki (1985). Both the letters are published in *Complete Works of Mori Arinori vol.1 (1972)* by Toshiaki Ookubo.
- 4 See N. Umetani (2000) pp.284-285. Draft1-1 belongs to the Library of Imperial Household Agency.
- 5 See N. Umetani (2000) p.276.

References

Chiba, Masahiro. (1999) Arinori MORI on Moral Education and his "Religious Freedom in Japan," *Research Reports on Education of Kochi University*: Part1, No.58 (Originally in Japanese)

- Fujimura, Michio. (1961) *Yamagata Aritomo*, Yoshikawakobunkan: Tokyo (Originally in Japanese)
- Hayashi, Takeji. (1986) "Mori Arinori-Prologue for the Tragedy-," *All Works of Hayashi Takeji*, Vol.2: Chikumashobo: Tokyo (Originally in Japanese)
- Hisaki, Yukio. (1985) "Some Attempts to abolish the Ministry of Education in 1890," *The Educational Sciences Journal of Yokohama National University*, Vol.25. (Originally in Japanese)
- Inada, Masatsugu. (1971) *Study on the Process of Establishment of Imperial Rescript for Education*, Koudansha: Tokyo (Originally in Japanese)
- Inuzuka, Takaaki. (1986) *Mori Arinori*, Tokyo: Yoshikawakobunkan. (Originally in Japanese)
- Kaigo, Tokiomi. (1965a) *Study on the History of Establishment of Imperial Rescript for Education*, Tokyo: Kotokusha (Originally in Japanese)
- Kaigo, Tokiomi and others. (1965b) "Philosophy and Educational Policy of Arinori Mori" *Bulletin of the Faculty of Education, the University of Tokyo*, Vol.8. (Originally in Japanese)
- Kawata, Atsuko. (2008) Ph.D. Paper of Ochanomizu University: "Study on the Formation Process of Local Government Administrative Education System in Modern Japan." (Originally in Japanese)
- Kinoshita, Hideaki. (1982) *Army and Education from the View Point of Military Exercise*, Tokyo: Kyorinshoin (Originally in Japanese)
- Morikawa, Terumichi. (1990) *Way to the Establishment of the Imperial Rescript of Education*, Tokyo: Sangensha. (Originally in Japanese) (2003) *Way to the Ideology of National Moral Education in Modern Japan*, Tokyo: Sangensha. (Originally in Japanese)
- Nakasato, Yoshimasa; Matsui, Hiroshi.(1997) *Japanese Youngsters who have different nature from Other Countries -An Attitude Survey on Kindness and Moral of Secondary and High School Students of the World-*, Tokyo: Breinsha. (Originally in Japanese)
- Okubo, Toshiaki. (1972) *Complete Works of Mori Arinori 1.2.3*, Tokyo: Senbundo. (Originally in Japanese. The paper, "Freedom of Religion" was written in English by Mori)
- Oyama, Azusa ed. (1966) *Opinion Papers of Yamaga Aritomo*, Tokyo: Harashobo. (Originally in Japanese)
- Sato, Hideo. (1981) "A Reconsideration of Mori Arinori's Educational Policies," in Sato, Hideo. (2004) *Cultural History of Education I Structure of School*, Tokyo: Aunsha. (Originally in English on "East Asian Cultural Studies" Vol. XXI, No.1-4, September 1981. After that, it was translated into Japanese in this book.)
- Takeda, Kiyoko. (1957) "Mori's Image of Educated Human Being -about the Relationship between 'Individual' and 'the State'-," *Educational Studies*, Tokyo: International Christian University. (Originally in Japanese)
- Translation in English from Japanese of IRE; Iwamoto, Toshiro; Shimura, Kinichi; Tanuma, Akira; Namimoto, Katsutoshi. (1994) *Historical Sources for Studying Moral Education*,

PROCEEDINGS 09

March 2010

Tokyo: Hokuju-shuppan. (Originally in Japanese but IRE is translated into English in this book.)

Translation of the IISS to English from Japanese; Akira, Nakamura. (1985) "The Imperial Instructions to the Soldiers and Sailors Translated by Akira Nakamura," *Dokkyo University English Study*, Vol.26.

Umetani, Noboru. (1962) *Study on the Political History in the Previous Period of Meiji Era*, Tokyo: Miraisha. (2000) *History of the Establishment of The Imperial Instructions to the Soldiers and Sailors (Gunjinchokuyu)*, Tokyo: Aoshishuppan (Originally in Japanese)

Women & Action. (2003) "Sources: The Chronological Table about the Process from The Amendment of Fundamental of Education Act and the publication of 'Notes of the Mind (kokoro no noto),'" *Women & Action*, Vol.248.

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank Professor Toshihiko Yoneda (Ochanomizu University, Human Developmental Science) for fruitful suggestions to my studies. I would like to thank Ms. Krystyna Oda for English correction and also to convey my special thanks to Professor Hiroshi Kawata (my husband) for discussion and continuous support for me.

Author Note

Atsuko KAWATA, Ph.D.

Associate Fellow, Research Center for Human Development and Education, Ochanomizu University

E-mail: kawata.atsuko@ocha.ac.jp