Kobe University Repository : Kernel

PDF issue: 2026-11-12

Review Seminar of Educational Progressivism, Cultural Encounters and Reform in Japan (I): Record of Speeches

Shorb, Patrick
Kenklies, Karsten
Yamasaki, Yoko
Sakuma, Hiroyuki
Kawaji, Ayako

(Citation)
教育科学論集,26:53-63

(Issue Date)
2023-02-28

(Resource Type)
departmental bulletin paper

(Version)
Version of Record

(JaLCDOI)
https://doi.org/10.24546/0100482192

(URL)
https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14094/0100482192

KOBE UNIVERSITY

Review Seminar of *Educational Progressivism, Cultural Encounters and Reform in Japan* (I): Record of Speeches

『日本における教育的進歩主義、文化的邂逅と改革』書評セミナー（I）
――講演の記録――

Patrick Shorb*　Karsten Kenklies**　Yoko Yamasaki***　Hiroyuki Sakuma****　Ayako Kawaji*****

パトリック・ショーブ　カーステン・ケンクリス　山﨑 洋子　佐久間 裕之　川地 亜弥子

（*関西国際大学・教授）（**Senior Lecturer for Education Studies, University of Strathclyde）
（***武庫川女子大学・元教授）（****玉川大学・教授）（*****人間発達環境学研究科・准教授）

Keywords: progressive education 進歩主義教育, New Education 新教育, education 教育

1. Preface

Ayako Kawaji

This paper is a record of the review seminar on *Educational Progressivism, Cultural Encounters and Reform in Japan* (Oxon: Routledge, 2017), held on 15th October 2022 at Kobe University, Japan. It consists of an opening address, a transcript of speeches and a closing address. Throughout this paper, the transcript is subject to additions and deletions based on future research presentations.

The seminar was made possible after we asked Dr Patrick Shorb and Dr Karsten Kenklies, the book reviewers, to deliver a lecture and they kindly agreed. We would like to thank them both sincerely.

The record was emailed to all participants, including the two speakers, for confirmation before publication. It reflects requests for correction, but the final responsibility lies with Kawaji, the editor of the record. For some Japanese terminology, the editor has added English translations and explanations, whilst the original Japanese word is in square brackets ([ ]).

We would like to thank Dr Shorb and Dr Kenklies for their presentations and would like to take this opportunity to thank all participants.

2. Opening address

Yoko Yamasaki

Good afternoon, everyone. I would like to thank you all for attending this seminar at Kobe University today. There are a total of 15 scholars, 9 participants in person and 6 participants online. The book *Educational Progressivism, Cultural Encounters and Reform in Japan* featured in today's seminar was published in 2017. Five years have passed since it was published.

To remember a little bit, I prepared this handout.

The first page is for an invitation leaflet for the Progressive Education Series I received from Dr. Peter Cunningham in 2014[i].

The information of 5 volumes which have been published in this series so far are collected from page no. 2 to no. 5. Please read them later if you are interested in[ii].

Well, we have already received reviews from two historians. These are the important sparks of today's discussion, two wonderful and inspiring historians here.

Professor Patrick Shorb of Kansai University of International Studies, I met at the annual conference of the History of Education Society UK in Winchester, in 2016, when he worked at Akita International University, and Dr. Karsten Kenklies, who is from Germany, worked for nearly

thirteen years in Jena and has worked at the University of Strathclyde in Glasgow since April 2016.

They will present some questions based on their reviews to us. I've read theirwebsites and I realized that there is a common key concept like contextualisation or contextualizing I was so inspired. Our friend Dr Peter Cunningham from Cambridge, who has supported us during all the time, from my proposal to Routledge, editing all documents and contributing the preface, may also attend.

Anyway, this seminar was originally planned for Spring 2020 but was postponed due to the Corona pandemic. Thanks to the efforts of Dr. Ayako Kawaji of Kobe University, Dr. Kenklies' visit to Japan was realisd, and we are finally able to hold this event. I'm sure today will be a good time to look back at our book again to think about some significant concepts and technical terms in the field of history of education, in which it'll be possible to offer a meaningful opportunity for us to realise what is nurturing, schooling, and learning for both children and adults. I would like to conclude my remarks with the hope that interesting and encouraging discussions will be developed.

3. Building upon *Educational Progressivism, Cultural Encounters and Reform in Japan:* or What should the Next Routledge Volume on Japanese Education History Look Like?

Patrick Shorb

As a frontline practitioner it has been useful witnessing the implementation of state-supported or sometimes state-encouraged reform initiatives. One of the things that I've always noticed (about) these bench markings of local practice is how they almost inevitably conceive of "global" standards of education based on Anglophone world models. I'm simplifying it somewhat but I think that is perhaps something to remark on and perhaps talk through. Certainly, in my own research, I am always thinking about what are the ramifications of this current situation.

I would say that my experience does have some blind spots, but I hope I can make it up with some insights as a *jissen-sha* (practitioner [実践者]). I do approach this talk with humility and hope it will raise questions more than to provide set answers. Thank you very much all for giving me the time.

I want to spend 10 minutes talking about why I think the current volume matters, and then maybe just add a few comments and reflections on these points. Overall, the goal of the work --to break down stereotypes of Japanese education (as Kenklies-sensei states better than me in his own review)-- is successfully accomplished. Japanese education isn't just simply a stereotype of *nyushi jigoku* [literally translates into entrance examination hell , 入試地獄]; "Hello Kitty" Bento boxes, high PISA scores, and of course, the ever present *jugyo kenkyu* [lesson study, 授業研究]. There is definitely more to this. I think these essays are basically a pre-war and more internationally focused complement to Tanaka Koji's *Sengo Nihon Kyoiku Hohoronshi* [*Educational Methods Theories in Postwar Japan: Curriculum and Instruction*,『戦後日本教育方法論史』]. I think they do play to different audiences, but combined, they serve as an incredible *nyumon* [入門 for thinking about Japanese educational *jissen* (practice [実践]) in the modern period.

Let me summarize briefly some of the things that really impressed me about some of the individual essays. I hope any omissions will not be taken personally. I learned from all of them. Yamasaki-sensei's overview does a really good job in a very compact space of comprehensively and compellingly making the case for why Japanese education reform, *shin kyoiku* [New Education, 新教育], does matter. She articulates why the movement is much more significant than the specific headline names might suggest. I really liked Kuno-sensei's Chapters 2 and 11. They put Lesson Study in a new light. It's not just the creation of some *koku-dai* [national university, 国大] education professors in the 1960s. (Although the more I thought about it, I guess, Nara-jo is now considered a *koku-dai*. So, maybe it's *koku-dai* professors more in the 1920s through 40s?) But seriously, Kuno's work underscores how Lesson Study is based on a 100-year tradition of life-centered reflective teaching practice. Certainly, Shigematsu is the culmination of this, but Kinoshita-sensei and his efforts are also a very useful backstory as well. Similarly. with Kira-sensei's and Nishioka-sensei's works, they show how biography --building off of Jane Martin's work-- can really be a useful vehicle for framing educational change. Obara was the easier demonstration of this because, of course, he has this very specific *Zenjin kyoiku* [literally translates into whole person education, 全人教育] approach to education. But what's striking about reading Sakuma-sensei's work is how Obara knew *everyone* and seemed to have met absolutely *everyone* during his life. I think that really is an interesting part of the mix. Certainly *Zenjin kyoiku* very much is Obara's own creation, but it is likewise a product of his unique biography –of how he was able to cross a lot of

different educational and disciplinary spaces. I think that's an interesting thing that maybe we can discuss later.

These essays really inspired me because they emphasized the centrality of educators, not just the state as drivers of education. There can be a danger in writing about education, particularly Japanese education, that focuses on the top-down initiatives of the state. Even my own work can be influenced by this tendency. Therefore, I do like the fact that these works combine to emphasize that – and I do apologize to von Clausewitz-- education is NOT just "politics by other means." I do think that there can be a tendency in some English-language treatments of Japanese education which fall into this trap. Please don't get me wrong. I do think politics and policy matters when we talk about education. Perhaps we can talk about that later. But I do think that aims AND means, both have a place. I do think means can create their own educational reality. I think Professor Cave's --the other Peter, I guess, here today-- his work certainly speaks to that as well. I do think it's important to balance these competing issues about macro-level policy with on-the-ground practice, and how the latter can often shape, and sometimes undercut the former.

Finally, I guess the other thing that really struck me about this collective volume is how doing education history well, particularly Japanese education history, requires many different skill-sets at once. This includes a mastery of the primary sources, familiarity with broader Japanese history, and an expert knowledge of broader education discourses. There is actually a pretty small group of people who can do all of this at the same time. This volume is therefore very important in allowing education historians from around the world to actively learn from and engage Japanese education historians. I hope this will enrich the conversation moving forward. You can probably tell from my accent that I am an American. One of the common pastimes of American education historians is the hand-wringing over the death of American education history, with all its budget cuts to education faculties and licensure programs. I do think one of the things that is heartening about the present volume is that it shows that education history in Japan is not quite on the ropes as the US. My suspicion is that the *Kyoiku Shigakkai* [the Japan Society for Historical Studies of Education, 教育史学会] will exist in 20 years!

I want to shift gears though, and talk about how we could imagine an EPJ (Educational Progressivism in Japan) 2.0, and what it would look like. If such a volume were ever to happen, what are some of the lingering issues that might be interesting to pursue at even greater depth?

I think Karsten does a really good job of getting us to think about progressivism and taking the terms we use seriously. I don't want to get too deep into that. "Progressivism" certainly does have an Amero-centric cast to it. I don't want to use that as a significant criticism per se, but it's certainly something to think about. I will defer to Kenklies-sensei on some of the conceptual issues of invoking "progressivism" and how that might compare with "new education."

But if you do focus on US progressivism, certainly Dewey becomes a potential focus of conversation. For example, Herbert Kliebard's work, *The Struggle for American Curriculum*, underscores the ways that using Dewey, or invoking Dewey, was diverse and often contradictory. All of the four interest groups Kleibard describes: - the humanists, the developmentalists, the social efficiency theorists, and the social meliorists, all appropriated from and were chastised, in turn, by Dewey. I do think that it's useful to raise Dewey as a lodestar for thinking about education practice. But it can also create as many issues. Indeed, I think "Dewey" is as interesting for being a site of contestation over what "Deweynism" might mean as he is as the formulator of any coherent theory of practice per se. That could be something just to think about as well. Moreover, focusing on Dewey risks overlooking the potential influence of America's radical tradition. It is for this reason that I think Fujiwara-sensei's work on Rugg's influence on Oikawa was important and useful. I had always thought of Oikawa more as a propagator of social efficiency theory (if not, as Hashimoto-sensei tells us, necessarily a practitioner in practice).

Indeed, one of my future research projects is to explore the diversity of "encounters" Japanese educators had with foreign ideas beyond Dewey. If you only concentrate on Dewey even within the American context, you might risk missing some of these other potential engagements. George Counts, of course, in 1946. Theodore Brameld, too. He was very much engaged with Japan in the early 1960s. He could be considered an articulator of the Neo-Kantian tradition in the US, and how he almost found soulmates in Japan. Certainly, he talked to Obara. He talked to Kaigo Tokiomi as well.

More broadly, when we focus on Dewey, and perhaps later Bruner, we close ourselves to the other potential influences that did influence the evolution of Japanese education discourse. Of course, when we talk about American education's impact on Japan, it's very easy to overlook Soviet education and its impact. I think

Yamasaki-sensei already mentioned Makarenko, and Krupskaya's impact. Certainly, Soviet influence on the works of Yamashita Tokuji would be interesting too. Yamashita sits at a convergence of German, later Soviet, and –by his affiliation with *Seijo Gakuen* [a private school established by Sawayanagi Masataro, 成城学園]-- "new education" as well. I think those are alternate pathways worth interrogating further.

This leads to another key point: the need to take the German influence on Japanese education discourse seriously. In many ways, German education, particularly its discourse of *bildung*, has served as the punching bag of modern Japanese education history. As someone coming from an American perspective, I say this almost as a *mea culpa*. American commentators, and domestic educators who have sought to shape postwar Japanese education, have frequently contributed to this discourse. Even the German figures often highlighted – e.g. the Meiji educator consultant, Emil Hausknecht, contribute to this almost caricatured image of this influence. Otherwise strong analyses by American historians of Japanese education have tended to portray the Herbartian five-step method and the early 20th century influences of Natorp and the Marburg School as little more than abstract gobbledygook and a straw man to the dynamism of Anglo-American progressivism. And of course, there is also the continuing influence of Nazi Germany in the 1930s; something that we should come back to later. And then in the post-war, Horio Teruhisa's broadside against *kyoyo* (*bildung* [in German, 教養]) education further delegitimizing German discourses as elitist and impractical.

I think some of these concerns regarding German education influence are worth considering. I also do appreciate EPJ 1.0, for taking Decroly's influence on Oikawa and German influences on Obara seriously. At the same time, I do think that it is time to take *bildung* seriously in Japanese education as well.

I think of Rebecca Horlacher's recent revisionist work on *bildung* as one reference point. While she recognizes its elitist, statist aspects –and even its reactionary components—she at the same time emphasizes how it has been multifaceted, and potentially supportive of radical pedagogies. *Bildung* could alternately support the student development approaches of Pestalozzi; the active, empathetic hermeneutics of Dilthey (including his conceptualization of *Verstehen* -"understanding"—as translated by the *rikai* of "apperception," 理会); as well as the social analysis that you see with the Critical Theory of the Frankfurt School. These are all important ways of thinking about the German tradition.

Of course, I don't want to overlook the work already done in this area within Japan. Watanabe-sensei is here today – and Sakuma-sensei has done some work on this. Saito Naoko, Ito Toshiko-sensei, and others all have done some really, really interesting work in this, particularly with regards to the Kyoto School. My own research interests focus on the *Seikatsu Tsuzurikata* [Daily Life Writing/ Expressive writing, 生活綴方] movement. I'm still just digesting Ouchi Zenichi-sensei's work on this. There is a lot that I still have to read in the Japanese literature. I don't want to say that such research on German influence on Japanese education isn't happening, but maybe it hasn't quite reached the English language works on Japanese education history as widely as it should.

I realized I am running short of time. Maybe I'll be a little bit more brief in my final comments. I do think it is worth being more critical of the American progressive tradition as well. I'm maybe setting up a straw man and I defer to those who have spent more time thinking about US progressivism and its impact in Japan. I'm willing to be disabused of some of my ideas. But I think of the work of David Labaree, who was a professor of education history at my education school in the U.S. One way he has summarized 20th century US education history is as a battle of administrative versus pedagogical progressivism; and in the end, it was the administrators who won. Maybe a possible counter to this battle of administrative and pedagogical progressives (as argued by the current volume), is that the pedagogical progressives managed to exert more influence in postwar Japan. I am not fully convinced this is the case. At minimum, it's at least worth noting that the "administrative" influence from behavioral psychology and social efficiency is really an important part of US progressivism too. So, I do want to at least just raise that issue moving forward. The current state of US education, with its emphasis on value added models, common core standards, the charter school marketization of public education etc. could also arguably be a part of this as well.

I can talk about that more in the comments, but I know I've already gone over my time. So, let me just end with that. Let me just conclude by saying I think this volume was an incredibly valuable step in giving global audiences a glimpse of the dynamic aspects of Japanese education history. Perhaps future efforts could emphasize a somewhat broader scope of what "change" is. Reform certainly is important, but so also is emphasizing how encounters are not always smooth. I hope these discussions continue in whatever form they might take. I really want

to thank Yamasaki-sensei for everything.

Thank you very much.

4. Words that Bind: A few remarks about intercultural educational dialogue

Karsten Kenklies

Thank you very much for the invitation to Japan. It should have happened 3 years ago. But here we are now, at last. I am very happy to be back. I had to wait so long. So, it's quite nice to be back. If you were to know the weather in Scotland right now, you would understand why I am ecstatic to be in Japan right now; but that's of course not the only reason.

I have been engaged with Japan or been interested in Japan for almost 30 years now. I still do not speak fluently Japanese, which is of course a limitation. Everything I do basically rests on experiences that I have made in Japan, by extensive traveling, by talking to lots of people, by engaging in things like karate-do, and similar activities, but not much by studying original literature, only in translation, which is quite an important comment in relation to everything I wish to talk about in the next few minutes. I will talk about "Words that Bind", i.e. I will present a few remarks about intercultural educational dialogue.

What I will do first is to spend some time, not very long though, on the actual book that we have been talking about. Patrick already made some very important comments about it, so I don't have to add much. I will then give a few examples of intercultural encounters. Those are examples from my own practice, my own life as a researcher, and as someone who often visits Japan.

I will then talk about the hermeneutic spiral between systematic pedagogy and historical pedagogy. This already should raise some questions, at least with our native English speakers, because usually they do not know what systematic pedagogy is as it is something very German. I will then talk about one example, about Georg Kerschensteiner, to show clearer what I mean with the spiral between historical and systematic pedagogy. Some of you may actually know him. He was a German *Reformpädagoge*. I deliberately do not say 'progressive educator'. I hope you will understand at the end why I am refusing to call him a 'progressive educator'. Some further remarks will conclude my presentation.

Let me begin with some words about the book. Patrick has already highlighted some of the things I would mention. The most important for me is: The book has a high significance for the international historiography of progressive education, because in my experience, people usually do not know much about Japanese education in general, let alone about progressive education or historic positions of Japanese education, neither in practice, nor in theory. Even those of my colleagues in the UK, or at my university, who know something about the history of education, or are interested in progressive education, do not know anything about Japan. So, when people use the word 'progressive education', they have someone like Dewey in mind, and then maybe Kilpatrick, and that's about it. It has something to do, of course, with knowledge, but also with categories, with labels.

There are, for example, reasons why someone like Alexander Neill, the founder of the Summerhill School, is usually not called a 'progressive' educator. Those reasons are important to remember when we use words like 'progressive education', or when we label the things that we describe as 'progressive education' or 'progressivism'. More about that later.

In general, I was really delighted to see the book getting published. And I was delighted to review it because it opened a window, for many people in Germany but also in the UK, that was closed for a very long time.

Reading the book, of course, we can have many discussions about individual educators introduced in the book. Those discussion will, for most of the people, have to rely on the expertise of the authors because we don't know much about the individual persons. One of the reasons why we don't know much is that hardly anything has been translated, which just makes it very difficult for people from outside to access anything from Japan.

Of course, I know translating is difficult. I have just spent over 5 years with an American colleague to translate a German pedagogical text from the early 19th century (F.D.E. Schleiermacher) into English. That was not easy, and I would probably never do it again. But because there hardly are any translations from Japan, we don't know much about Japanese pedagogies. We have to rely on you, on those people who actually speak Japanese, and those few non-native speakers who speak Japanese, to make us acquainted with all this.

Today, I am especially interested in more general questions about how we do history of education, rather than talking about individual positions in the history of education. The first question that I had in relation to the book, was about the comparative framework. Why would you call this 'progressive education' or 'progressivism', and not, for example, relate those positions to the German

Reformpädagogik? Although both could maybe be described as 'new education movements' they were very distinct from each other. Is it really helpful to use English categories or labels, just because English is the main language of the book? What if other labels, other categories from other languages would actually fit better? The reason why I was asking this question is that I was under the impression that many positions that had been described in the book, and a lot of the political circumstances in which those educators have worked, were much closer related to their German counterparts rather than the Americans. They faced the same kind of problems. Problems, usually to do with politics.

Neither Japan nor Germany was a democratic state at the beginning of the 20th century. There was an emperor in Japan. There was a Kaiser in Germany. Some of the *Reformpädagogen* (the German 'new educators) were very closely related to this: They embraced and welcomed this kind of political system. As were some of the Japanese educators in Japan; some of them were heavily nationalist; some of them were racist, and basically fell in all the traps that you can fall in if you deal with or live in this kind of situation. Relating that to the American or English side (through labelling them as 'progressive educators'), I think lots of the things that we should talk about when we talk about Japanese (and German) education at the end of the 19th, beginning of the 20th century, just get brushed under the carpet because we do not see much of the downfalls of those people.

Of course, there are reasons, and Patrick hinted on it by talking about Germany, why this connection is not so much emphasized anymore. And that has something to do with the reasons why those two countries went together in – or even initiated – a horrific war, which they both lost together. From the Japanese side, then, it seems that part of losing this war also meant to exorcise itself from Germany, and to basically cut off all ties with a country with which it used to be very close together, especially in terms of education.

That is only one question. I do not want to engage with that too strongly today. But I think that's an important and an interesting question in terms of the broader discussion when we talk about historic positions, which also goes into the direction of what Patrick already talked about. Should we not also talk about the things that did not work? Should we really only present the things that seem to be nice? But not everything was acceptable, and not all the people who are now famous were only nice according to our contemporary standards (and maybe not even with regard to the standards of their own times).

The second question is connected to the first one, but emphasizes another aspect: the conceptual and historical shifts caused by translations (e.g. by calling something 'progressive education' rather than *Reformpädagogik*). This is something I would like to talk about a little bit more today. The question: What happens if we translate? What happens if we have to choose categories to describe what we are doing?

I want to begin with some examples. 2016, I moved to Scotland, so I suddenly had to speak English all the time, not only in my everyday encounters, but also to my colleagues and my students, most of which are either native-speakers, or speak yet another language as first language. That was not, and still is not, always easy, and it took a while for me to understand, where exactly the problems lie. When I then attended the WERA Conference in 2019 in Tokyo, not only I was reminded how hot Japan is in Summer. But it was also a moment of great surprise. It added to my general feeling of puzzlement, and raised my awareness for what happens if you have an intercultural dialogue. Suddenly, I understood better what happened to me in Scotland.

What happened at the conference in Japan? I went to a talk by someone about Japanese adult education. The person was describing the difficulties of establishing adult education in Japan, and everyone in the audience (mostly Japanese scholars) seemed to be in agreement. However, I was sitting there thinking: Why is adult education a problem in Japan? I did not really understand. In my view, Japan has some of the oldest and best-established traditions of adult education. Why are we now speaking about the fact that adult education is difficult to establish in Japan?

As I realized, this problem was the result of different understandings of the notion of 'adult education'. My understanding of adult education is broad, is not confined to institutionalized education. However, what the Japanese presenters were talking about were difficulties in establishing schools for adults, like further schools, where adults can learn, e.g. how to use a computer, or use the internet. When I think about Japanese adult education, I think about tea ceremony, karate-do, or martial arts in general, about haiku poetry and calligraphy. Those are long traditions in Japan. And many people are involved in them, many up to a very high age. So, I do not see any reason to question the success or the possibility of adult education in Japan, or of what usually is called 'life-long learning'. Coming from such a perspective, I then asked the

presenters about their views about those traditions of teaching and learning in Japan.

Asking for those traditions, the scholars in the room were looking at me a little bit puzzled. But then gradually, they kind of realized where I was coming from. And then, suddenly, everyone was excited that they seem to have found a tradition of adult education in Japan. That was one example for me that really showed: If we talk about 'education', i.e. from an Anglophone perspective on education, we are bound by the English understanding of this English word 'education', and because of the assumed meaning, people are often solely interested in schools, or other forms of established institutionalized learning, and support and guidance of learning. On the other hand: If you come from Germany like myself, it is not necessary that you are primarily interested in schools, or schooling, when talking about pedagogical matters. I am hardly ever interested in schools; I do research on something else that nevertheless is very pedagogical. Why that is, I hope, you will understand better at the end.

Something similar happened when I attended the conference of PESGB (Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain). Whenever my colleagues talked about education, they talked about schools. Only when I asked directly for what is usually called 'informal education', i.e. teaching and learning outwith schools, reflections were presented as afterthoughts. When I then asked for the connecting characteristics of formal and informal education, i.e. for the one thing of which informal and formal are two kinds – 'education' – there was no answer except to say that in general, 'education' is learning, which is a very broad understanding, in contrast to the usual, very narrow perspective of 'education' as being the same as 'schooling'. There is nothing in between. For someone with a German background, the in-between is everything that counts.

Again, I realized, it is very hard to talk to my colleagues because whenever I use the word 'education', I can see in the faces of the people who listen to me that they think about schools. However, I do not want them to think about schools, because for me, the notion of 'education' signifies a specific human relationship that aspires to support people in their learning and transformation – no matter where this happens. And because I would like talk about things like, for example, education through (not in) a gothic cathedral. To the English mind that does not make much sense because that is not a school, and therefore that's not education at all, is it? Lots of problems in discussing. Lots of translation problems here. Indeed, this is the same problem that I then had when I read the Japanese book.

Because it has been translated into English, people had to choose words. The word available in English, the main word for pedagogical discussions, maybe the only word, is 'education'. The term 'pedagogy' itself is very unspecific, and not used by many (which is why I have begun to use it much more often, as the vagueness precludes people from making rushed assumptions about its meaning). So, using a notion like 'education' comes with a certain ballast in English. It has a very specific meaning, and many people have very strong ideas about what education is when I use the word 'education'.

Those are the examples of my own intercultural encounters. Let me now talk a little bit about the spiral between systematic pedagogy and historical pedagogy. What historical pedagogy is should not be difficult to understand. Being engaged in historical pedagogy means to work on a description of pedagogical structures as presented in human artifacts, like texts, pictures, and objects. That is what people usually do when they do historical pedagogy (or, as it is usually called in an Anglophone context: the history of education, except that in English, the history of education is again predominantly concerned with schools, whereas what I mean with historical pedagogy would reflect historically on all pedagogical structures, events, situations, artefacts everywhere, not only in schools).

Now, systematic pedagogy is much more difficult to explain – maybe because it does not exist in an Anglophone context. What is that? Systematic pedagogy for me is a philosophically guided and historically informed discussion of fundamental notions of pedagogy. Why does it not exist in English? Because this is the part of Education Studies where Education Studies, as an independent academic discipline, reflects on itself and the notions it is based on. Maybe it is easier to understand if you think about sociology. It has the fundamental notion of 'society', around which many discussions are centered. The debates around the notion of 'society' build, define, and set apart the academic discipline of sociology. The same does not happen in Education Studies in English. That can easily be recognized through a closer look at the English language: You can be a sociologist, and you can be a psychologist (both are acknowledged academic disciplines), but you cannot be an educationalist, which is a good way of showing that education is not an *–logy* (derived from the Greek word *logos*, which in modern languages denotes a systematic complex of theories, i.e. an academic discipline) in the same way as the other two, i.e. sociology & psychology.

So, in English, Education Studies is understood to be a field of research to which different people contribute, people usually coming from outside, i.e. other disciplines. They are sociologists; they are historians; they are psychologists, or members of other disciplines. And they talk about schools. It is the school, the institution, the building called 'a school' that unifies them, that unifies their interests. On the other hand, in a German context, Education Studies (or as it is called in German: *Erziehungswissenschaft*) is built around a definition of what is 'pedagogy', or what is 'education'. This definition – as mentioned above – is usually related to an understanding of pedagogy & education being specific personal relationships, which can be found across all cultures and throughout all spheres of cultures (i.e. not only in buildings called 'schools'), and all research in Education Studies is founded upon such a definition. That is the reason why there is a specific group of researchers within *Erziehungswissenschaft* who are concerned with exactly those foundational definitions, as it is those definitions that decide what is and is not of interest to the academic reflections and research done within the academic discipline *Erziehungswissenschaft*.

Now, historical pedagogy and systematic pedagogy are of course related because historical pedagogy offers to systematic pedagogy the material to reflect; it offers texts; it offers objects and artefacts that systematic pedagogy can use to reflect on fundamental notions. However, looking into the other direction is even more important. Systematic pedagogy offers the lenses for identification of those examples or instances that historical pedagogy is concerning itself with: Only if you have developed a notion of, for example, 'pedagogy' or 'education', you can use it to identify in complex historic circumstances or in different cultures those objects or situations that you are interested in. If one does not have such concepts to guide a view and to shape a perspective, the world is just far too big. This is why Hans-Georg Gadamer took those so-called preconceptions or prejudices for being so important: Without them, we would see nothing, as we would see literally everything. It is the notion of 'education' or 'pedagogy' that those who do historical pedagogy (or history of education) have in their minds that guides them in their look into history or into a different culture. The same is, of course, true for translations: If one tries to translate, let us assume from Japanese into English, it will be one's own understanding of a certain concept (in Japanese) that grounds decisions to translate this Japanese word with this specific English word (which is thought to represent at least roughly the same meaning as the word in the original language). It is the ideas in one's head that make one translate certain things in a certain way. However, since two languages are never congruent, i.e. never exactly translatable into each other, it is the meaning of the individual words that binds the translator: Whatever word one chooses to translate another word, it will have a slightly (or vastly) different meaning than the one that is supposedly translated. This cannot be avoided, which makes it even more important to know about those shifts of meaning when translating. So, for example, translating *kyoiku* [教育] as 'education' binds one to the original meaning of the word 'education', i.e. it binds one to a discourse on schools, almost inevitably. This is what happened in the book as well: All chapters do predominantly talk about schools and school-reformers, as if indeed pedagogy or pedagogical reform would only happen or has only happened in schools.

This then is my question: What would be a historic understanding of *kyoiku*? Has it always been bound to school? Or did it use to mean something else, something broader maybe than school-bound education? I do not know because I do not know enough about the etymology of *kyoiku* and the way it was used in Japanese language throughout the ages. I can only ask my Japanese colleagues. How did people understand *kyoiku* before Japan adopted the Western school system? How did people understand *kyoiku* before they decided to participate in English conversations, for which they had to translate their original Japanese words into a different language with its specific limitations?

Of course, those problems are not only your problem as authors of the book. They are in general our problem as historians or intercultural pedagogues. We all are always bound into a hermeneutic spiral, because we keep moving forward between systematic pedagogy and historical pedagogy – the definitions we have are used to identify the things we are interested in when doing historical pedagogy. And the other way around: Doing historic-pedagogical research then reflects back onto our original definitions, which now begin to change. And with this change, we start anew with historical research, and look for something else, and see something new. We just keep circling, and there is no end to this. There is no truth about any of this. Nothing of this is about truth, or the true definition. All of this is about self-understanding, about developing understanding, about continuity and change. When our definitions change, what we see in history changes. Then what we see in history will change our definitions. And that, again,

changes what we then see in a new history. We just keep changing, and the process of research keeps moving. (This is the point where my students usually get very frustrated because they realize that there is no final truth to be had here, and that there is no end to this academic research. Of course, students usually want to have an end, have certainty, at some point. But I always say: No, there is no end. We just stop at some point, interrupting for a moment the eternal spiral in which we are trapped, in the knowledge that it just continues.)

To clarify what I have said so far, I wanted to present a little example, very quickly. The example is Georg Kerschensteiner. He was one of the most famous German *Reformpädagogen* (this is the German word for what usually is called New Education or Progressive Education). He's probably most famous for being credited to have invented the *Arbeitsschule* or work school, so including manual tasks, manual labor as part of fundamental education. He, interestingly, wrote a book called *Theorie der Bildung* (Theory of *Bildung*) – and in this book, he shows an interest in Japanese culture that is of great interest to the questions I am dealing with here.

Patrick already mentioned that Germans like to use this pedagogical word: *Bildung*. *Bildung* is indeed one of the three central notions that map out the German discourse on what we may call 'pedagogy'. They are *Erziehung*, *Bildung*, and *Unterricht*. *Erziehung* usually refers to the intentional external influence to initiate, support, guide a person's learning and transformation. *Bildung* refers to intentional formation of the self through the self and, more generally, through the culture and for the culture. And *Unterricht* is the specific method, instruction, usually used in institutionalized forms of *Erziehung* and *Bildung*, (usually a school or a university).

As you can see, in an intercultural perspective, none of those notions can easily or correctly be translated as 'education'. It doesn't make much sense. Those notions do not refer to an institution. *Erziehung* is done by parents, peers, friends, grandparents, coaches, mentors – everyone really. When I talk to students, I usually use the coach as an example of someone who assists learning and transformation; the coach teaches, and tries to initiate self-formation, tries to initiate learning. *Bildung* also happens everywhere and to everyone. Only *Unterricht* is a specific notion usually used for institutionalized forms of guidance and supported learning (which does not need to be a school or university: also regular piano lessons at home would be called *Unterricht*).

Those three concepts are in my mind when I speak to my Anglophone audiences. However, although I have to use the word 'education', because there is not another notion that comes as close, none of those notions is well-translated as 'education'. Which is one of the reasons why my audience is likely to become confused: Because what I say now about 'education' does not really fit with what they have in mind when they hear the word 'education'.

Now to Kerschensteiner's concept of *Bildung*. Here is a longer quote: **„*Bildung* is the individualised spiritual & intellectual (= *geistige*) way of Being that arises out of the encounter with those significant cultural artefacts in which the immanent eternal values have taken on an external form, and that itself either already represents a harmonious unison of eternal values, or is intrinsically driven to become such a harmonious unity. […] *Bildung* is an in breadth and width individually shaped sense for significant eternal values awakened by those objects representing human culture."** (*Theorie der Bildung*, 1926: 18) (roughly translated from the German original)

Reading this, it is very hard to see those words in modern textbooks on education, which I think is a shame. There is an emphasis on the individual that has a relation to something universal and eternal. And there's something about cultures and social groups as conditions for, and therefore also goals of, individual development. *Bildung* is not only about the development of the individual but also, through it, of all culture, society, and even humanity.

This has to be kept in mind when we now have a look on Kerschensteiner's relation to Japan. Interestingly, in his long book *Theorie Der Bildung* (Theory of *Bildung*), there is a lengthy section on Japan, which is why I have chosen him as example for today's seminar.

What becomes apparent immediately: While Kerschensteiner is looking from a pedagogical perspective at Japan in his book, he is not interested at all in Japanese schools or universities. There is nothing about Japanese schools or universities in his text. He is, on the other hand, interested in cultural practices in which he sees prime examples for self-formative influences that correspond to his notion of *Bildung*. Those of you who know me and the things that I am personally interested in will probably not be surprised to hear that Kerschensteiner is interested in tea ceremony. This is what he is interested in, not schools, not universities or nurseries.

Kerschensteiner is probably only acquainted with tea ceremony through Okakura Kakuzo's (Okakura Tenshin's) *The Book of Tea*, which some of you may have read and which was published in English first, after which

a translation into German was published. And I think the translation into Japanese was even later. That was the only source from which Kerschensteiner knew about tea.

Now, Okakura himself does not call or interpret tea ceremony as a pedagogical process or event or act. But Kerschensteiner's *Bildung* perspective enables him to interpret tea ceremony as an example of *Bildung*. He did not take that from Okakura. But because he had a certain idea of *Bildung* and pedagogy and education, he was able to be pedagogically interested in tea ceremony. And he interprets tea ceremony as a pedagogical process, a pedagogical event. For him, tea ceremony is the ritualized preparation and drinking of tea in a highly stylized tea-room; it is a ceremonial celebration that enables individual expression and transmission of cultural and eternal values, which is the foundation for the existence and the perpetuation of the Japanese cultural community. And this is where he sees the pedagogical characteristics of tea ceremony.

Education does not only happen in schools, at least not for Germans. It happens in almost all spheres and realms of culture. In almost all instances where culture is presented as culture, it is meant to be pedagogical, educational, formative. A presentation and representation of culture usually is done with pedagogy in mind. Whether or not we show paintings and other artefacts in museums and galleries, or stage theater, or produce TV shows, or organize and participate in cultural rituals – everything is about presenting and transmitting of culture. And all that is pedagogy, is *Erziehung* and/ or *Bildung*.

For Kerschensteiner, the tea-room – in its elegant beauty, simple immaculacy, and equally binding and liberating and redeeming orderliness – becomes the role model for all places devoted to enabling *Bildung*. This is how he describes it. And this is why for Kerschensteiner, tea ceremony becomes a foremost pedagogical event – a view, that I personally share and that has been confirmed by my own participation and practice of tea ceremony.

There are maybe two questions here. Firstly, can tea ceremony really count as *Bildung*? As you know, tea ceremony has changed throughout the centuries. Can it be described as process of *Bildung* independent from Okakura's romanticized description? You may know that Okakura description of tea ceremony is very romanticized. It has little to do with the reality – at least not with the reality as Okakura found it in his time. And secondly, has maybe Okakura written his Book of Tea under the influence of European pedagogical conceptualizations in the first place? Which is my suspicion.

The first question, I think, can be answered with a resounding yes. The original form of tea ceremony as it was established by Sen no Rikyu in the 16th century, can be described as a process of *Bildung* (I have written about this elsewhere).

The second question, I cannot answer right now. I think this is still open for investigation. And I invite everyone to engage with this interesting question about intercultural transfer. Maybe someone already has published something on it. And I just don't know, which of course is very possible.

One interesting fact needs to mentioned as well: It was only after Kerschensteiner's interpretation of tea ceremony as a pedagogical phenomenon that Nitobe Inazo published a paper on Teaism or *Der Teeismus*, in the leading journal of the German *Reformpädagogik*: *Das Werdende Zeitalter* (which is the German version of The New Era). After Kerschensteiner interpreted tea ceremony as pedagogy, Nitobe was allowed to publish something on tea in a German pedagogical journal.

Some concluding remarks:

- Historical analyses are based on culturally embedded theoretical notions. The hermeneutic circle between historical pedagogy and systematic pedagogy is unbreakable. We always oscillate between those perspectives.
- Translations of pedagogical & educational (and all other) notions come at a high price. They are necessary, but they hide important aspects if one is not aware of the limiting characteristics of individual notions in each language.
- An inter/trans-cultural comparative pedagogy needs to be highly sensitive to the notions used in its comparisons. Hermeneutic complications must not be ignored or brushed over as so often done in empirical comparative studies. The difficulties are great, but it is necessary to engage with them. And worthwhile.

5. Closing Address

Hiroyuki Sakuma

The end of the seminar came quickly. Three hours flew by. We are always made to think about untranslatability. So, it is important to continue this discussion. Dear colleagues

and participants, I believe that during the seminar all of us have obtained fruitful discussions and information based on book reviews by Shorb-sensei and Kenklies-sensei. Shorb-sensei and Kenklies-sensei, I thank you from the bottom of my heart for sharing your real knowledge of deep insight. I would like to extend my sincere gratitude and appreciation for all of the dedication provided by the Yamasaki-sensei and Kawaji-sensei, and the staff members for organizing this event, and ensuring it runs smoothly and successfully.

Finally, dear all, I'm sure you are all looking forward to our further research, exchanges, and collaborations; of course, so I am. The effects of the corona are still ongoing, but I am sure that we will have further opportunities for discussions over drinks. That is *nominication*.

I would like to close by wishing you all further successes and development, and that this seminar will contribute to the improvement of education worldwide.

Thank you very much.

References

Kenklies, K. (2021) Review of: Yoko Yamasaki & Hiroyuki Kuno (eds.) (2017) *Educational progressivism, cultural encounters and reform in Japan*, in *History of Education*. 50, 1, pp. 139-141.

Sakuma, A. (2019) Book introductions : *Yoko Yamasaki and Hiroyuki Kuno (ed.) Educational Progressivism, Cultural Encounters and Reform in Japan*, in Research Journal of Educational Methods, 44, pp.125 (in Japanese).

Shorb, P. (2019) Review Article: *Educational Progressivism, Cultural Encounters and Reform in Japan*. Edited by Yoko Yamasaki and Hiroyuki Kuno, Routledge, 2017, in *Education Studies in Japan: International Yearbook*, 13, pp.169-171.

Notes

[i] It is currently not available to be checked on the Routledge website.

[ii] See the following webpage of Routledge: https://www.routledge.com/Progressive-Education/book-series/PROGED (accessed 20 January 2023)