

Critical Pedagogy of Writing:

Evaluation of Possibilities and Limitations in the Context of Authoritarian Japan¹

Rika Yonemura

University of California, San Diego

Marxist pedagogy of writing was a grass-roots educational movement that spread in the northern rural areas of Japan in the 1930s and 40s when the authoritarian military regime was reaching its full power. While the imperialistic capitalist development of Japan progressed, the peasant population in northern Japan was crucially left behind in feudal social relationships and exploited as a source of cheap and disposable labor to support rapid industrial expansion. The goal of Marxist pedagogy of writing was to raise the consciousness of peasant children about what constitutes their economic and social oppression, what is behind the dominating force that keeps them in poverty, and how to change their circumstances.

Marxist pedagogy of writing attempted to nurture a critical subject through the act of writing. Hypercritical of progressive education that regarded children as innocent and imaginative beings, Marxist pedagogues taught children to write what they saw, felt, and experienced in the crude reality of quotidian life with unabstracted, and concrete vocabulary of their own.

In Marxist pedagogy, writing is a technology that constructs the child's "eye" to see the external, objective social relations that shape everyday life. Furthermore, children's writings were shared and exchanged, becoming a tool of connecting the individual's perception to a collective realization. Marxist pedagogy aimed at developing critical collective agents who took an active role in organizing and challenging the existing social relations in the rural village.

This paper argues that despite its theory of liberation, the social meanings of Marxist pedagogy were ambivalent in the context of the Japanese authoritarian regime. While it was driven by the desire for critical individual consciousness, it was in constant danger of being appropriated by the state to elicit rural people's "voluntary" cooperation.

The critical agency that pedagogues attempted to establish was consequently interwoven into a state subject—the state subject who voluntarily rationalized and re-organized village life for increased productivity and a more "democratic" order in rural societies, only to unify the rural into the capitalist-state power. The very sphere of everyday life had become an object of the invisible form of state power, not an autonomous and freeing space.

The contexts of Freire's pedagogy and Japanese Marxist pedagogy are distant temporarily and geographically. Nonetheless, they have many theoretical commonalities. Both were critical of the massification process that silences people and hinder their genuinely active and critical involvement in a democratic social order. Furthermore, both stressed the centrality of "lived experience" as the basis for conscientization of the human subject and transformation of the social structure. The purpose of this paper is not to stress pessimism toward pedagogy of writing by demonstrat-

1. ©Copyright 2004, by Rika Yonemura. Presented to the 1st Annual Conference-Workshop of the Social Theory Forum, UMass Boston, April 7, 2004 (Panel: "Pedagogy and Praxis in the International Sphere"). **Contact information: ryonemura@ucsd.edu**

ing its failure in Japan's case. By using the Japanese historical case as an example, I hope to point out a caveat for the theory of liberation in the face of an increasingly subtle form of state power and mobilization.

IN THE CREVASSE OF CAPITALISM: CRITICAL PEDAGOGY IN RURAL JAPAN

1920s Japan experienced rapid-paced urbanization, industrialization and capital accumulation after the WWI. While Japan advanced its imperialistic program, the impoverishment of the village economy became a pressing social problem. Hard hit by the Great Depression and the following agricultural depression, Japanese village economy from the 1920s on experienced continuous waves of economic hardships. The problems included a high occurrence of tenant-landlord conflicts, income difference between the rural areas and metropolitan areas, inefficient farm management, the lack of collective organizations by farmers, and the outflow of the young population to big cities.

The ultimate cause of these problems was the large divergence in the degree to which the agricultural villages and metropolis adapted to capitalism (Nam, 2002, p.75, and Nakamura, 1983). The state monopolized capital accumulation, and big cities such as Tokyo and Osaka enjoyed the fruits of economic development. City-dwellers were exposed to the "modern" way of life, popular culture thrived and people enjoyed entertainment such as movies, radios, and popular magazines. On the other hand, the rural population, which still comprised more than half of the Japanese population, was suffering in a stagnated agricultural economy, persisting feudalistic village social order, and lack of any kind of cultural activities that their city counterparts were enjoying (Itagaki, 1992, Harootunian, 2000).

The marked imbalance between urban and rural resources was caused by the capitalist development without the accompanying disintegration of the peasant population (Oouchi, 2000). Agriculture was virtually left out from the capitalist development of other industries. The impoverished peasants served only as a pool of cheap, temporary, and disposable labor for city jobs, but an excess of these workers overwhelmed the job supply in cities in the 1930s. Adding to the economic problem, there was a moral problem associated with villagers flowing into cities. Women villagers were "sold" as factory workers, or in the worst case, as café waitresses, which sometimes meant selling oneself to prostitution.

Marxist pedagogy of writing emerged as a criticism to capitalist development that left out the rural peasants, and sought to provide a solution to it. Historically, pedagogy of writing (in Japanese, the *Tsuzurikata* movement) developed as part of the progressive education movement that spread in Japan from the 1910s.¹ *Tsuzurikata* in Japanese literally means writing and composition of sentences and expressing ideas. The *tsuzurikata* movement was characterized by its loose network of practitioners, artists, and pedagogues who expressed sympathy to what the pedagogy of writing attempted to accomplish. Its influence was widespread, welcomed by many teachers across Japan, in inner city and rural areas alike, although what teaches expected from pedagogy of writing differed markedly between inner-cities and the rural areas, as I will show soon.

From the onset of the movement, *Tsuzurikata* pedagogy emphasized the expressive writing ability of the child based on concrete, everyday experiences. Writing embedded firmly in the "lively," "authentic" experience of the child in the immediate surroundings was celebrated. What pedagogues and practitioners understood "everyday experiences" to be, however, diverged. The early *tsuzurikata* was initiated as an aesthetic movement in literature education. The pioneer of *tsuzurikata*, Suzuki Miekichi, states that:

The worst thing in our current teaching of writing is that, when selecting the topic, the teacher completely ignores whether students have or do not have experience necessary to write about that topic. More often than not, the teacher chooses a topic of which only few students have experience. In that case, the latter students have to struggle to use their imagination and come up with something to put on the paper... It is simply meaningless to force children to write about abstract concepts. For example, some teachers still give an essay topic such as "Perseverance" "Spring" or "Our national flag"... You can write a fact. However, you cannot write a concept and notion. Even if you could, it would end up as mediocre, ordinary writing without any value whatsoever as written work. (Suzuki, 1935, p.504)

1. Progressivism became a nationwide movement in the 1910s. It was prompted by people's cry for a democratic order resisting against the authoritarian social order inherited from the Meiji period. The progressive education movement resulted in multiple organizations and activities all over the country, including curriculum and schools with the child-centered approach, enlightenment movements for peasants, and various magazines and books approaching the quotidian life of children.

At its beginning phase, the aim of the *tsuzurikata* movement was to discover “genuine and primordial experience” in the medium of the children’s senses. Advocates such as Suzuki resisted too much rationalization and abstraction in the “old” education that created a split of the wholeness of the individual child. According to Suzuki, it is only through retrieving the primordially of senses in concrete, everyday experience that we could combat the numbing effects of over-rationalization.

The Marxist pedagogy of writing emerged as a critique of romanticism in the early *tsuzurikata* movement and critically interpreted the dialectical interaction between the writing subject and object in order to help village children cope with the harsh reality of the village. Marxist pedagogues, who witnessed the social reality of rural Japan, expressed their frustration with the urban-oriented progressivism.¹ In the wide gap in quality of life between the city and the village, the romanticism accepted in urban areas made no sense to rural educators who faced a completely different reality.

The Marxist journal, *Hopposei Kyoiku* (The Education of the North) was first published in 1936 through the collaboration of teachers in impoverished rural villages. Many of the editors and participants in the journal were influenced by thoughts from the Leftist labor movement and from Marxism. The inaugurating issue of the journal in 1936 declared that, “there is no other region in Japan other than northern Japan that is more culturally left behind. There is no other place as in northern Japan where oppression of the feudal social relationship still strongly persists and constrains the consciousness of people, where the harsh, dark, and cold weather plagues people there with poverty” (in Nagahama, 1994, p.53). The mission of the journal was to “discard useless liberalism, and standing on the wild enthusiasm of the northern people, and actively integrate the village life.”

This paper focuses on the Marxist pedagogue Kokubun Ichitaro, the editor of *The Education of the North*. He was a schoolteacher himself in a rural village in Yamagata prefecture. He was greatly influenced by the proletariat and realism literature as well as Soviet pedagogy, and imprisoned for the alleged affiliation with the Leftists under the authoritarian regime. After the defeat of Japan in the Pacific War, he continued his educational activities and spread the pedagogy of writing.

Kokubun disclosed the appropriation of children by the capitalist imperialistic regime that “forced young children into feudalistic agricultural labor, or the capitalist structure of production under inferior labor conditions.”² At the same time, he was hyper-critical of progressive educational movements that took for granted the consumerism in the urban context. Kokubun argues:

We *tsuzurikata* teachers helped children write their everyday life as it is, and be aware of what kind of reality they were immersed in. We thought it especially important to let children realize that they were not petit-bourgeois consumers, but living Subjects/producers (*seisanteki seikatusha*) (Kokubun, 1948, p.306)

Kokubun rebuked Suzuki’s view on the primordially of children’s sense as the bourgeois mystification of the self: Instead, Kokubun attempted to overcome the discourses on the a-priori presumed innocence of children by understanding rural children as the subject of production. An idyllic notion of childhood, although celebrated by bourgeois capitalists in the urban areas, was too “abstract and imaginative” (Kokubun, 1948, p.309). Kokubun draws attention to how the same “objective” reality has completely different meanings to urban and village children. For the children of farmers, “imagination and dreams” are always crushed and stamped on by reality. Kokubun shows evidence of the double-bound social structure of capitalism and rural patriarchies in children’s writings. “A small, cute rabbit with red eyes” for urban children is a “commodity” for village children that they keep and breed for money. The bales of rice, no matter how beautifully a village child may be able to describe it, is after all the annual tribute for the landowner. Kokubun accuses urban progressive thought as a “device made by monopolizing capitalists and their ideologues to fool people to divert their criticism from reality” (Kokubun, 1948, p.309).

Witnessing the harsh reality in the village, *tsuzurikata* teachers came to realize that children’s minds were not determined by their primordial properties, but “directly shaped by the external world, social relations, and the status of culture” (Kokubun, 1948, p.311). This realization led them to organize the existing relationship between children’s minds and the surrounding environment. Marxist pedagogues believed that making children write the “reality of life”

1. That Marxist pedagogy developed in the context of rural villages suggests the uneasy position of the rural society in the imperialistic development of Japan. In Japanese historical development of capitalism, excess labor force was accumulated in the form of impoverished village population. Rural-city unilaterality urged Marxist pedagogy into their critique of bourgeois culture and capitalist oppression.

2. Kokubun, 1948, p.306

is the only way to the goal. Kokubun writes:

...*tsuzurikata* teachers devoted themselves solely to one goal: to help children express the reality of life. They did not ask only for artistic perfection of their writing. What is characteristic about our *tsuzurikata* teachers was that we wanted children to learn about life through writing. It made children hope for better society, better future and more beautiful and richer culture. We made children think how they could actually enjoy the fruit of such a society. For that purpose, we tried to help children grasp the law of nature and society.

The teachers understood *tsuzurikata* as a method to nurture the 'eye to see everyday life' (*seikatsu wo miru me*). To watch everyday life with this eye, express everyday life with the language of everyday life (*seikatsu no kotoba*), produce the texts, and based on the text, further improve the 'eye to see everyday life.' This is how we envision our children to grapple with life. (Kokubun, 1948, p.304)

Kokubun noted that, "the only way to overcome the weakness of subjective, self-expressive arts is by achieving an objective and concrete recognition of reality" (Kokubun, 1974, pp.169-170).

In Marxist pedagogy, the "recognition of everyday life" was a concomitant process with the "organization of everyday life" (Kokubun, 1948, p.314). He envisioned the "organization of everyday life" in an analogous manner to collectivism in Soviet education. Organization of life pursues a double-task: Organization is the process in which individual awareness is generated through an encounter with reality. At the same time, the individual reality of each child is developed and enhanced both by the "point of views and ways of thinking of the collective body" (Kokubun, 1948, p.141), and the "multiple relations between human and nature, and human production" (Kokubun, 1974, p.161). The ultimate goal of pedagogy of writing is to "socialize individual perception of objective reality" (Kokubun, 1974, p.165) and "make an individual person a social being" (Kokubun, 1974, p170).

Marxist pedagogy aimed at the construction of a critical subject, by defining writing as the site of interaction among the three elements: the subject of writing (the writer), the act of writing (*tsuzurikata* text), and the object of writing (everyday life). Writing is a medium through which the consciousness of children is awakened to critically observe the immediate living condition. The act of writing is the objectification of everyday life, and human subjectivity is created in the course of grasping the objective reality, and sharing of the individually confirmed reality. The prime task of Marxist *tsuzurikata* was geared toward everyday educational practices for constant cultivation of children's critical eyes for the improvement of the village society and life.

CO-OPTATION OF SUBJECTIVITY IN RURAL JAPAN IN THE 1930S

The Marxist *tsuzurikata* movement was an attempt to organize the life of village children in order to cope with the harsh reality stemming from the uneven capitalist development of the Japanese State. Examination of these discourses of critical pedagogy in the light of the broader social context of rural society in the 1930s, however, reveals that pedagogy of writing was in an unwitting resonance with the gradual co-optation of the rural areas by the state.

From the 1920s on, there was an emergence of a numerous number of farmers' self-organization movements. The movements by farmers progressed in collaboration with the state attempt to centralize power and absorb the spontaneous moves from the rural areas. I will point out the parallel in the subjectivity formation project between Marxist pedagogy of writing and the ideology of self-empowerment rampant in rural society. Questioning why the potential of Marxist pedagogy was circumscribed, I argue that the relationship between the state and Marxist pedagogy was not necessarily the one of opposition and mutual negation, but had a point of commonality in their desire for an autonomous subject.

Facing the rural problems, the Japanese State, instead of delving into the root of the problem—the contradictions in capitalism—attributed the problem to the internal illness of the rural society, and embarked on a rural village reform project. The Farm, Mountain, and Fishing Village Economic Revitalization Campaign, the largest-scale state intervention in the rural economy in prewar Japan, took effect in 1932.

The campaign plans consisted of helping farmers cope with debt, gain access to low-interest credit, and join in local agricultural cooperatives. Besides the economic aids, the campaign also professed spiritual reform of the village: to raise the spirit of the “self-empowerment” and “self-reliance” of farmers. The officials were very critical of the old-fashioned farmers who were selfish, stubborn, shortsighted and easily misguided by the immediate interests in their everyday toil. The official who initiated the Revitalization Campaign pointed out that, “The state alone cannot realize the improvement of the agricultural product market network and control the price. Farmers, in collaboration with the state, should stand up and fight for themselves” (Kodaira, 1929). For the smooth implementation of the campaign, the officials deemed it indispensable to evoke spontaneous, voluntary involvement of farmers in the reconstruction of the village. In other words, the campaign aimed at re-creating the village into a rationally managed, and spontaneously organized community in order to cope with the problems of villages trapped in the crevasse of capitalism.

However, the revitalization project did not simply stress rationalization of village life. The campaign was marked by the ideology that fabricated an illusion of cultural homogeneity between urban development and the rural backwardness. The state official putting forth the campaign argues:

We have to polish up the Japanese spirit through this campaign. We create the true farmers who are subjects of the Emperor, which is the way the true peasant is supposed to be...As obvious in the cases of foreign countries, excessive commercialism in agriculture has brought about a devastating consequences of agricultural depression. We have to check the rise of individualism among peasants...the core of this country, Japan with the Emperor in the center, is a big collective living organism. Agriculture is the very fundamental of the practices of the life of the state. (Ishiguro, 1938, in Nam)

The state plan of village reorganization was a negation of capitalist reorganization of the village, but pushed village life toward the transcendental cultural symbol, Japanism and the Emperor. The Revitalization project, therefore, is not to be understood only in terms of “leveling up” of the rural: it aimed at covering up the obvious economic and social split between the city and village by the overarching culturalism.¹

The attempt to create the new way of involvement for the village population in the community was not a one-way vector from the state. Smith (2001), in her analyses of the agricultural crises in the 1920s, argues that the village people were actively involved in the rationalization efforts of the village life, and often the state and the local actors held a common perspective about the causes and the solutions to agrarian problems (Smith, 2001, p.14). Smith demonstrates that the force of self-revitalization was rampant in rural villages in the 1920s, and local intellectuals among village

1. This remodeling of the rural presents another instance by the State, coordinated by the society, in translating the uneven reality into a fabricated sense of unity of the national community. Harootunian (2000) points out various instances in discursive practices that attempted at overcoming “the spectacle of social division and observable unevenness between city and countryside, metropole and colony, and class and gender, manifest in dangerous ‘internal competition’ by employing a folding operation that aimed to transform the negativity of unevenness produced in history into the positivity of cultural evenness.” (p.214)

youth played important role in spreading the ethics of diligence, self-discipline, and self-governance of the community as a way out of the stagnation of the rural community. Nam (2002), by examining the diaries of village leaders, also points out that the locals in the village in the 1930s found in agrarianism an antithesis and a point of resistance against capitalism and westernization, the two big evils that they thought entrapped the rural villages in shattered economic and morale status. Village leaders involved in unionization of farmers built the village reconstruction schema on the moral, philosophical, and cultural significance of farming as the fundamental basis of the state, contending that devotion to agriculture is an expression of patriotism and reverence to the Emperor (Nam, 2002, p.176).

There was a crucial correspondence between the state-initiated campaign, and the farmers' spontaneous re-definition of *raison d'être* of the social function of farmers. And this correspondence did not come without a price. Voluntary efforts and organizations established by many leftist movements and by locals were co-opted by the political and economic totalization by the military regime.¹ The organization of the village made it possible for the state to get a handle on what was previously illusive and ungraspable due to the lack of bureaucratically organized structures. The Revitalization Campaign destroyed the despotic power of landlords over tenants, and the state came to have more control over crop production and distribution. The Campaign also sought to revive harmony in the village life and settle the resentment of farmers against uneven economy by leveling up the agrarian pride of farmers. All that was not realized as a result of coercion or top-down administrative implementation, but by tapping on the spontaneous desires and actions initiated by farmers for organization and rationalization of village life.

It is not the intention of this paper to delve into the details of fascist control of authoritarian Japan. I rather would like to draw attention to the fact that the merger of the state-local initiatives crystallized as an image of the "new" image of the farmer; the "new" farmer who is proud of his/her agrarian mission as a producer of staples, who is diligent and actively participates in community building, and whose significance is measured not by profit but by his/her contribution to the basis of the nation-state.

The vision of Marxist pedagogy of writing was in a resonance with this image of the agrarian individual that both the state and locals strived to create. It is true that some Marxist pedagogues condemned the emperor system, and the exploitation of the state-capitalism. They were seen as the enemies of the state, and were oppressed and imprisoned. However, the anti-capitalist criticism of Marxist pedagogy found its discursive niche in the agrarian movements.

I have already shown that the crafting of the anti-capitalist farmer was the basis of the Revitalization Campaign. Overcoming selfishness, and promoting agrarian pride approximates the "Subject-producer" that Marxist pedagogy contrasted to the superficiality of petit-bourgeoisie.² The rational, diligent "modern" image of the farmer that rural movements promoted paralleled with the idea of Subject that Marxist pedagogy supported. Concepts such as the "organization of everyday life," and collectivism remind us of the rationalization reform of village life that the campaign put forth. The subjectivity that Marxist pedagogy tried to create in the village was of course the *critical* subject, whose awareness penetrated the layers of objective reality. However, the conscious subject who objectified the relationship between self and reality comes infinitely close to the self-monitoring individual who objectifies and rationalizes ordinary everyday life, which was exactly what the re-organization project aimed at.

The possibility of Marxist pedagogy was also limited because it was not critical enough of the relationship between the state and labor. Kokubun held that children's healthy development had to be ensured because they "will grow to be the next generation of intellectual, and physical labor power, and therefore they have to be protected by the name of the state."³ Kokubun aggressively criticized the exploitation of the agrarian villages by capitalism. But his argument leaves room for a "desirable" relationship in which force of production the state subjects and the state thrive in a collaborative, unexploitive manner. In his ideal vision of such a relationship, just like any orthodox Marxist, Kokubun also believed in and essentialized the utopian vision of unexploited, true labor.⁴ When essentialized labor, or "farming as vocation," made up the spiritual column of the village reform through which the state elicited spontaneous cooper-

1. There are numerous numbers of researches on the incorporation of the rural into the fascist regime through the revitalization project.

2. The formation of the subject in *tsuzurikata* thus expressed approximates "the technology of the self" by Foucault. Foucault argues that, when an individual acts according to a prescriptive system operative in society, the concomitant operation of subjectification and objectification of the self is involved. Foucault argues, "Of course all moral action involves a relationship with the reality in which it is carried out, and a relationship with the self. The latter is not simply "self-awareness" but self-formation as an "ethical subject," a process in which the individual delimits that part of himself that will form the precept he will follow, and decides on a certain mode of being that will serve as his moral goal. And this requires him to act upon himself, to monitor, test, improve, and transform himself. (Foucault, 1970, p.28)

3. Kokubun, 1939, p.25. His essentialization of labor is also apparent in his argument that "Children are the next generation of force of production. From the perspective of reproduction, their acquisition of skills has to be guaranteed." (Kokubun, 1947, p.313)

ation of the people, the critique of Marxist pedagogy had to be greatly circumscribed in its critical potentiality.

By stressing the synchronization between the pedagogy of writing and the co-optation of the village by the state, I by no means imply that the state's attempt to make a good imperial subject and the struggles of pedagogues were in harmonious agreement from the beginning and in a-priori co-optation.¹ It is not true either that the cunning state was strategically maneuvering the Marxist movements. The relationship between the state and leftist pedagogy in wartime Japan is best grasped in their common desire for the creation of the modern, autonomous individual, as seen in the Revitalization Project. For this reason, the pedagogy of writing stopped short of being truly critical of the essence of the state power of the authoritarian regime. The fruit of the movement was extracted, and appropriated by the state in the form of people's spontaneity and voluntary involvement in the time of the state emergency.

In fact, practices of pedagogy of writing were progressively appropriated as a method for the mobilization of the young population when the war with China and the United States deepened. Ironically, the principle of the Marxist *tsuzurikata* movement to base the subjectivity formation on "objective" reality could not work as a breakwater against the abstracting power of the military regime. The authenticity of "objective reality" was no more axiomatic and a-priori, when it faced the constant authentication of cultural symbols that fortified the crafted nation-state beliefs.

For example, a *tsuzurikata* pedagogue, in 1940, introduced a genre called the "*tsuzurikata* of condolence," in which students wrote letters to the soldiers in China sent from their hometown. This pedagogue exalts this practice saying that, "A project such as this is not only a single *tsuzurikata* organization but also directly expresses the will of the state" (Minechi, 1940, p.273). This pedagogue regards patriotism and national flags as perfectly legitimate themes for writing, and says that patriotism and the Japanese spirit "already exist as an objective fact" (Minechi, 1940, p.280) and thus the Japanese spirit does not any more remain as an abstract notion inappropriate for *tsuzurikata*.

This shift of nationalistic ideology from an abstract, amorphous idea to an objective political "reality," represents the problem inherent in the project of Marxist pedagogy. Despite its attempt to base true autonomy on the immediate relationship between the concrete reality and the unmediated self, the very concrete reality was not protected against the state which came to possess power for representation that defines what the objective, the real, and the immediate is. The aspiration for the "whole self" which was supposed to be the kernel of the new subjectivity, therefore, was incorporated into the state system mobilization.

CONCLUSION

There are many commonalities between the power relationships that Freire tried to conquer, and the social situation in which Marxist pedagogy was born in Japan. Both fought against economic, social and cultural oppressions within both the pre-capitalist and capitalist relations of dominance. They promote a similar method to revive subjectivity of the oppressed population. The act of writing in Marxist pedagogy corresponds to the notion of "coding" (Freire, 1970) of reality in Freire's pedagogy. However, it is at the same time true that the Marxist *tsuzurikata* stands in very distinct historical, social and economic contexts from Freire's pedagogy. There is no doubt that the roots of Marxist pedagogy in Japan is to a great extent affected by the historical and international environment in the interwar period, when Marxism and socialism appeared as a solution to social problems.

Freire himself states that concrete practice for critical consciousness is bound to the specific epochal, geographical, and cultural context (Freire, 1970, p.84), and the success and failure of a critical pedagogy depends on the specificity of historical and social conditions the practice is dealing with. That makes me hesitate to present the case of Japan as a point of evaluation of Freire's critical pedagogy. What the examination of the case of Japan does suggest, however, is a caveat for theory of liberation. The paper has shown that the clear demarcation between the oppressed and the oppressor cannot be axiomatically assumed in the subjectivity formation in rural Japan. Power of modern state lies in its capacity to extract the autonomy of people, and utilize the autonomy of the subject. The state possessed the power to represent and define objective reality, which Marxist pedagogues held as the basis for critical consciousness. The an-

4. For the critic of essentialization of labor in orthodox Marxism, see Postone (1993). It is because of Kokubun's preservation of the healthy state-labor relationship that he could carry on his argument to the post-war era, even to the 1960s rapid economic growth when ethical working subject came to have importance again.

1. In fact, the Ministry of Education explicitly criticizes the *tsuzurikata* educational movement. The guidelines for the National School Act, in the section of the guidelines for teaching the Japanese languages in *tsuzurikata*, states that "bears a naturalist influence and deviates from the way education should be," obviously referring to Suzuki's *tsuzurikata* pedagogy. The guideline also bashes on the Marxist *tsuzurikata* saying it "makes students write the triviality of their family problems, forcing them to be paralyzed in their sense of shame." (The Ministry of Education, 1940, p.25)

swer to the question—where we can find the point of genuine resistance and liberation—has to take into account the modern condition of power in which we live.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ministry of Education, Japan. (1940). *Kokumingakkou Kyosokuan Setsumei Youryo*. Tokyo, The Ministry of Education in Japan.
- Foucault, M. (1990). *The Use of Pleasure: The History of Sexuality*, Random House.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Continuum.
- Harootunian, H. (2000). *Overcome by Modernity*, Princeton University Press.
- Itagaki, K. (1992). *Showa Senzen/Senshu no Noson Seikatsu*. Tokyo, Sanryo Shobo.
- Kodaira, K. (1929). *Doitsu Nomin no Funto to Waga Noka no Jikaku*. 24.
- Kokubun, I. (1948). “Tsuzurikata Kyoshi no Jidokan.” in *Atarashiku Surukoto, Yutakani Surukoto*. Tokyo, Shinpyosha.
- Kokubun, I. (1974). *Kodomo wo Toraeru*. Tokyo, Shinpyosha.
- Minechi, M. (1940). *Tsuzurikata Kyoiku Hattatsushi*. Tokyo, Keibunsha.
- Nagahama, K., Ed. (1994). *Shiryō Kokka to Kyoiku*, Akashi Shobo.
- Nakamura, T. (1983). *Economic Growth in Pre-war Japan*. New Haven, Princeton University Press.
- Nam, S.-H. (2002). *Showa Senzenki no Kokka to Noson*. Tokyo, Nihon Keizai Hyoronsha.
- Ouchi (2000). *Nihon Keizairon*. Tokyo, University of Tokyo Press.
- Postone, M. (1993). *Time, Labor and Social Domination: A Reinterpretation of Marx's Critical Theory*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, K. (2001). *A Time of Crisis*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.
- Suzuki, M. (1935). *Tsuzurikata Dokuhon*.