

The Making of the Mainstream Discourse of Sex Education in Japan: The Role of a Japanese Periodical *Sex Education Today* (1972-1983)

Hiroko HIROSE

This paper elucidates the making and the characteristics of mainstream discourse of sex education in Japan, by examining a commercial periodical *Gendai seikyoku kenkyuu* (*Sex Education Today*) published by Nihon Seikyoku Kyokai (the Japanese Association for Sex Education, JASE) from 1972 to 1983. The dominant discourse of sex education was transferred from that of ‘Purity Education’ policy, which was introduced by the government after the end of the Second World War, onto the sexology-oriented sex education lead by JASE. *Sex Education Today* played a crucial role in this transfer, by transmitting sex education knowledge from both inside and outside of the country energetically. This magazine also played an important role in the building of the structured school sex education curriculum, which acted as an official curriculum until the government guideline was published in 1999. In spite of this remarkable influence of this magazine, it has only rarely been examined by scholars. Based on its findings, this paper further suggests that, it was not only ‘extreme’ sex education but also the mainstream sex education generally, which was targeted in the campaign of criticism raised in the 2000s.

Keywords: sex education; discourse; Japan; *Sex Education Today*; JASE

The purpose of this paper

This paper elucidates the making and the characteristics of mainstream discourse of sex education in post-war Japan, by examining a periodical *Gendai seikyoku kenkyuu* (*Sex Education Today*) published by Nihon Seikyoku Kyokai (the Japanese Association for Sex Education, JASE) from 1972 to 1983. Based on its findings, this paper further suggests that, it was not only ‘extreme’ sex education but also the mainstream sex education generally, which was targeted in the campaign of criticism raised in the 2000s. The time when this periodical was published, was the turning point of the dominant discourses of sex education, from that of the ‘Junketsu Kyoku (Purity Education)’ policy to that of sexology-oriented sex education, which places importance on biological and anatomical aspects of sex. This periodical played a significant role in shifting the dominant base of discourse. However, until now, this magazine has only rarely been examined by scholars, even in Japanese literature.

One of the biggest events about sex education in recent Japan is so called ‘sex education bashing’, which is a campaign of criticism raised in 2002 (Hirose 2013). This paper recognises that this campaign was targeting not only ‘extreme’ sex education but also mainstream sex education generally. The examination of the mainstream discourse will enable us to confirm this. Among a number of sex education NPOs in Japan, JASE is the core organisation and is occasionally introduced in English literatures (McLelland 2015, Fu 2011). However, in order to understand the nature of the campaign of criticism, it is equally necessary to spotlight a nationwide NPO ‘Ningen to Sei Kyoku Kenkyuu Kyougikai (The Council for Education and Study on Human Sexuality, Seikyokyo)’. Seikyokyo was

established in 1982 and has been active in promoting school sex education, holding their four ‘Key words’, science, human right, independence and coexistence.

It is known that JASE and Seikyokyo were confronted each other, and this conflict was mirrored into the opposing relationship between their leaderships; Tanomura Yuuki (1923-2009) representing JASE and Yamamoto Naohide (1932-2000) representing Seikyokyo. They are explained as the two greatest based on different sex education understandings (Nishigaito 1993: 187). Tanomura, as a former teacher, became a head teacher after working for a board of education. He devoted much to popularising sex education, collaborating with the central government as an advisor for their sex education policy. He joined JASE from its early stages, and substantially led the association since the 1980s. N. Yamamoto¹ also joined JASE from its early stages, and established Seikyokyo in 1982 after working as a teacher. Both contributed articles to *Sex Education Today* based on their teaching experiences.

It was Seikyokyo that was targeted by the campaign of criticism in the 2000s. The preliminary stage of this campaign initiated in the 1990s when Takahashi Shirou criticised sex education practices by members of Seikyokyo as ‘extreme sex education’, because their teachings, Takahashi claims, contained information about contraceptives and intercourse, etc. in a positive approach. Takahashi is a right-wing academic, who sympathises, for example, Valerie Riches in the UK (Takahashi 1993), who is well known to have led the Responsible Society (The Family and Youth Concern), fiercely criticising sex education led by FPA. The conflict between Tanomura and N. Yamamoto was amplified by the appearance of Takahashi, because, Takahashi criticised N. Yamamoto at the same time cooperated Tanomura in publishing a book (Tanomura & Takahashi 1993).

A series of criticisms led by Takahashi in the early 1990s was an opposition to the positive spotlights on sex education after the revision of Japan’s national curriculum, Course of Study, in 1989, a revision which was sensationally labelled as the beginning of the first year of sex education by the media. Although the change in this revision was minor in its content, authorised health education textbooks were for the first time provided. Members from Seikyokyo were given a high profile in the media under a favourable spotlight on sex education. Takahashi attacked this positive move.

N. Yamamoto categorised Takahashi as one of the purity education promoters, and wrote indignantly that his criticism was ‘an abusive ideological campaign led by dogma’ (Yamamoto 1994: 10). N. Yamamoto categorised Tanomura as one of the ‘purity education promoters’, as well (Yamamoto 1994: 21). Their relationships were then pictured as N. Yamamoto vs. Tanomura & Takahashi.

This configuration, however, misleads us when we need to understand the comprehensive framework of the discourse of sex education in Japan. It is ineffective to explain the nature of the attack in the 2000s. Although, the framework of N. Yamamoto vs. the ‘purity education promoters’ in the 1990s is similarly observed in the campaign in the 2000s, the target this time was expanded from Seikyokyo to other providers, including those teachers associated with JASE. Tanomura interpreted this expansion as chaotic and unreasonable. He irritably complained by saying that the campaigners targeted not only ‘extreme’ sex education but also other sex education boundlessly, and regretted that whole sex education became stagnant (Tanomura 2004, 2006).

Tanomura should be regarded as closer to N. Yamamoto than to Takahashi in their basic

understanding of sex education. Both Tanomura and N. Yamamoto stood on the mainstream position of sexology-oriented sex education, which was created in the early days of JASE, and was still in place. Takahashi would not approve of sexology-based sex education. The clear disagreement between Tanomura and N. Yamamoto was, for example, the attitudes towards the teaching about intercourse. While N. Yamamoto insisted that teaching sexual intercourse was the essential topic, for any age group, Y. Tanomura insisted that a teacher must be careful in teaching sexual intercourse to elementary school pupils. The difference observed between Tanomura and N. Yamamoto should be understood as variations within the mainstream discourse.

JASE, which was substantially led by Tanomura, was involved in the expanded campaign of criticism in the 2000s, because the nature of the attack was not the criticism against so called 'extreme' sex education led by Seikyokyo but against the mainstream discourse of sex education generally, regardless of whether the campaigners were aware of this or not. To confirm this, it is necessary to clarify the nature of the mainstream discourse of sex education in Japan.

The discourse of sex education before the settlement of JASE

Sex education in post-war Japan began with the official document 'Shishou no torishimari narabini hassei no boushi oyobi hogotaisaku (Measures for the regulation, prevention and protection of private prostitutes)' approved by the Jikan kaigi (meeting by all vice-ministers) on November 14 in 1946, a year after the end of the Second World War. This document aimed 'to thoroughly realise the intention of the abolition of legitimate prostitutes as well as of all the boundaries on them, and to prevent the appearance of, so called, 'Yamino onna (women in the dark)'. Following this notification, Shakai kyouiku kyokuchou (the chief of the Office for Social Education) in Mombushou (the Ministry of Education) released a document 'Junketsu kyouiku no jisshi ni tsuite (On Purity Education)' in January 1947. Junketsu Kyouiku Iinkai (The Purity Education Committee), followed by Junketsu Kyouiku Bunka Shingikai (the Purity Education Division Council) and Junketsu Kyouiku Kondankai (the Purity Round Table Conference), was set up to advocate the Junketsu Kyouiku (Purity Education) policy.

This policy led by the Office for Social Education in the Ministry of Education, expanded its concern from prostitutes' issues to juvenile delinquency then to education for ordinary young men and women (Saitoh 2012). In parallel to this policy, sex education was planned for school and practiced in health education. However, sex education was not visible behind the Purity Education policy (Tanomura et.al. 1993: 14). In the 1960s, the Purity Education policy ended after the Purity Education Round Table Conference was closed. Sex education publication and new activities were left unorganised until the next move.

The settlement of JASE and the publication of *Sex Education Today*

The establishment of JASE changed the scene. JASE was established on the approval of the Minister of Education, and was 'the first and only corporative body for sex education in Japan' (Mamiya 1981). One of the most popular publishers for education, Shogakukan, was the backer of this project. The core founding members were a sexologist Asayama Shinichi and a medical critic Muramatsu Hiroo, whose

liberal thoughts as scientists developed JASE's philosophy. A psychologist Mamiya Takeshi, who was a former member of the Purity Education Round Table Conference, also joined JASE from the beginning. The ex-Minister of Health and Welfare, Uchida Tsuneo, took the directorial position, and the ex-Minister of Education, Kennnoki Toshihiro, became one of the auditors. Asayama, Muramatsu and Hayashi Shirou who represented from Shogakukan formed the senior board of directors.

JASE stated its purpose as follows (JASE 1972: 3).

Values and customs related to sex have diversified rapidly, in this transfiguration, not only Japan but some modern countries are experiencing a large break between young people and adults with their sexual consciousness and behaviour. We have no arena of dialogue as a measure of common understanding. In such a situation, it is strongly awaited to obtain desirable consciousness of sex in each place, such as home, school, and society, and to develop research for proper education

JASE was established with approval of the Minister of Education. We aim to develop research on sex to contribute to promote a better society, through pursuing the following: 1 building databases of materials from inside and outside Japan by doing basic survey and research on sex education; 2 organising conferences, lectures and training sessions; 3 publishing magazines, books and materials on sex education.

We have built connections with bodies and associations in Europe, the United States and other countries. We wish to contribute to society by providing information, materials and by developing researches as a representative association of Japan.

One of their main projects was the publication of *Sex Education Today*. *Sex Education Today* was published as a commercial periodical from 1972 to 1983 backed by Shogakukan counting 58 issues, quarterly from Issue 1 to 16 and bimonthly from Issue 17 to 58. For each volume, 2000 copies² were issued targeting schools, local government offices, sex educators and medical professionals. This magazine, publicising real-time information from JASE, vitally distributed new knowledge of sex education. The contents of this magazine consisted of information for basic understanding of sex education, overseas sex education information, sex education school curriculum, governmental topics on sex education, problems related to sex education, surveys relating to sex education, history of sex, general topics and opinions on sex and so on.

The base of sex education set on sexology

Sex Education Today set its basic framework of sex education on sexology, from the outset. The keynotes were presented in articles appearing serially in the first and the second issues. One was the landmark symposium 'Seikyouiku towa nanika (What is sex education?) (Asayama et.al. 1972a, b)' and the other was two pieces of L. A. Kirkendall's special contribution articles, 'Gendaishakai ni okeru sei no yakuwari (The role of sex in modern society) (Kirkendall 1972a)' and 'Gendaishakai ni okeru seikyouiku no yakuwari (The role of sex education in modern society) (Kirkendall 1972b)'.

The participants of this symposium were Asayama, a teaching professional Kurokawa Yoshikazu and Mamiya from JASE, plus an academic Tada Michitarou. Tada was invited to this symposium because of his work in *Sei (Sex)* (Matsuda 1971) published in the previous year, which showed the

negative tone against sex education. Therefore, his position in the symposium was to oppose it.

This symposium presented topical subjects for the new stage of sex education, repeatedly referring to aspects of sex education, which were social, physiological and biological. Asayama, Muramatsu and Kurokawa valued knowledge from sexology, and accordingly, placed importance on biological and anatomical aspects of sex. However, Tada opposed it saying that the understanding of sex and sex education from the aspect of science or biology is an attitude of ‘the limited civilisation dominated by enthusiasm for science’ (Asayama et.al. 1972a). Tada added that, it was difficult to teach about sex at school, because, while, sex had an emotional element as its essence, school was an arena rather to teach analytical academic knowledge.

In spite of their different aspects to sexology, their common understanding of the obstacles to teach biological knowledge about sex was a sense of shame. They demonstrated two types of shame; one regards sexual intercourse as a shameful act and will work as an obstacle to sex education, and the other is a shared sense in Japanese culture for respectable human relationship on sex. And what should be removed, they said, was the former type of shame (Asayama et.al. 1972a).

Another core topic raised in the symposium was the understanding of the peculiar setting of sex in Japanese culture. Tada made mention of Sweden saying, ‘in Sweden, they seem to have wide freedom, but the reality is they have a solid morality that underpins the monogamous system’, and said ‘on the contrary, the control is rather loose in Japan’ (Asayama et.al. 1972a: 24). Asayama similarly referred to ‘Gedo (heresy)’ culture widely practiced in Japan. He said, ‘Japanese culture comprises of co-prosperity of the face and the back’, and said ‘there was freedom in “Gedo” in the “back” world. Gay and anything were OK there’ (Asayama et.al. 1972a: 9). The sexological aspect would shape and transfer the ‘Gedo’ elements to ‘disorder’ field for examination. This symposium shows the founders were struggling to modify sexuality elements practiced in Japanese culture into a sexology-oriented sex education framework.

Keynotes by L. A. Kirkendall but not by Senji Yamamoto

Actual ideas for sexology-oriented sex education were employed from overseas knowledge. L. A. Kirkendall took the role to present the whole framework of sex education; how to understand sex and how to build sex education. His special contribution articles ‘The role of sex in modern society’ and ‘The role of sex education today’ were carried in the first and the second issue. They contain 10 subjects that were clarified by sexual science those days, and 10 subjects for sex education problems so far.

The ten subjects Kirkendall presented for knowledge based on sexual science are,

- 1, the essence of sex should not be understood related only with sexual consciousness or sexual activities, but also whole activities,
- 2, the significance of being a man or a woman for each individual covers his or her entire life,
- 3, sexual behaviour represents his or her personality,
- 4, sexual desires are normal phenomena,
- 5, masturbation for any age groups should be accepted,

- 6, sexual activities are responsible for participants and there are no reasons to be bothered by others,
- 7, personal relationships do not last long only with physical fulfillment,
- 8, sexual activities between opposite sex are occasions for unifying personalities and even can be a ceremony to praise happiness of life,
- 9, institutions such as marriage do not mean anything for sexual activities, and
- 10, ‘adultery’ cannot be reformed with force or fear (Kirkendall 1972a).

Those pieces of knowledge presented a liberalism aspect but yet lacked aspect to understand sexual minority. Ten subjects Kirkendall presented for sex education problems so far are; that sex education

- 1, hasn’t been sexuality education but rather education about reproduction or moral,
- 2, may suggest certain types of behaviours but lacks adaptive aspects,
- 3, has stuck to the fixed idea of ‘truth of life’ knowledge education,
- 4, has ignored the idea of active thinking and decision making,
- 5, has had negative attitude and tried to avoid or to be away from sex,
- 6, was tended to be understood as indulgence to solve any moral problems,
- 7, hasn’t been discussed in public but stealthily,
- 8, has been very often considered to be the responsibility of merely parents or merely teachers,
- 9, has taken too much importance from statistical figures but from individual lives, and,
- 10, has been understood as mastery performance and relies on only a limited number of professionals (Kirkendall 1972b).

In addition, Kirkendall outlined ten basic rules suggested for sex education, which are; sex education, 1, is all life experiences, 2, is life-long education. 3, is parents’ attitudes, 4, is a life philosophy, 5, is a study on family relations, 6, is the embodiment of life respect, 7, is indispensable for healthy development, 8, does not make unreasonable secrets, 9, is guidance, and 10, values motivation rather than activities (Kirkendall 1972b). These pieces of information enable us to understand the framework of sex education the magazine held.

Apart from the content Kirkendall presented, we should note the fact that *Sex Education Today* invited Kirkendall for its beginnings instead of Yamamoto Senji (1889-1929), who had produced high-quality research on sexology in Japan. S. Yamamoto is a well-known sexologist, who emphasised the importance of scientific understanding of sex and gave university lectures very early on; his publication of *Seikyouiku (Sex Education)* (Yamamoto 1932) is one of his most popular works. A JASE’s founding member Asayama, who was also one of the three winners of the first WAS (World Association for Sexual Health) Award in 1979, appraised S. Yamamoto by saying ‘S. Yamamoto’s *Sex Education* and sexual surveys were far more advanced works than those in Europe and the U. S. (Asayama 1973)’. However, S. Yamamoto joined the dissident movement, and was purged from his

university. At the end, he was assassinated by a right-wing enthusiast. It may be a wise choice for JASE to rely on a newcomer American instead of the icon, who had the image of being a communist political dissident. This enabled JASE to obtain its advantageous position during the period of the cold war and under the Liberal Democratic Party Government.

Transferring dominant discourse from ‘Purity Education’ to sex education

The relation between the Purity Education launched after the war, and the JASE led sex education should be clarified. They were not totally discontinuous. This can be said from the fact that Mamiya, who was a former member of the Purity Education Round Table Conference, and had published a book *Nihon no junketsu kyōiku (Purity Education in Japan)* (Mamiya 1969), joined JASE from the beginning. In spite of its out-of-date image, the Purity Education policy intended to overturn the old male-dominated relationship in order to promote a democratic society after the war. One of the five works in the Purity Education series published by the Ministry of Education, *Danjyō no kousai to reigi (Male-female association and etiquette)*, presented progressive ideas for the time, emphasising the importance of the democratic and healthy relationship between men and women favourable to co-education, which was widely introduced in Japan after the war as a democratic system (Ministry of Education 1950). Koyama Shizuko suggests that the Purity Education policy was the other side of the democratic co-education system (Koyama 2014: 32).

However, the differentiation was emphasised at the time of JASE foundation. Tanomura pointed to the incompatible elements contained in the Purity Education policy, saying

The first Guidance for the Purity Education (by the Purity Education Committee) was well written telling young people about what they would encounter. But its supplement made the situation confused. The chairperson of the Committee explained about “purity” there (Tanomura 1993: 14).

The chairperson wrote in the supplement that ‘sexual intercourse only between a married couple can be accepted as purity’ (Ministry of Education 1949). Asayama also argued in his book *Seikyōiku (Sex Education)* that it was not good for this policy ‘to employ the terminology “purity education” instead of “sex education”’ (Asayama 1967: 3). Because, he says, the word ‘purity’ recalls the physical virginity of women and a male-dominated sexual morality (Asayama 1967: 4).

The reason why the Purity Education policy employed the terminology ‘purity education’ was later explained by Shakai Kyōiku Shingikai (the Council for Social Education) at the Ministry of Education. They said it was because the terminology ‘sex education’ was not yet popular, therefore, this word might be taken narrowly from its impression (Ministry of Education 1955). However, apart from the intention of the policy makers, the word ‘purity’ reminds us of women’s virginity as well as of male-dominated sexual morality, as Asayama suggested (Asayama 1967).

In March 1972, when the Ministry of Education was not able to ignore the argument on the purity education and sex education, they released an announcement on the terminology. In this announcement, the Ministry of Education declared that purity education and sex education had no differences; they said,

The Ministry of Education understands that the meanings and philosophies of purity education and sex education are not different in their essence, and that their purposes and contents are not distinctive. The Ministry of Education will, therefore, pursue official works based on the understanding that the purity education and sex education are synonyms (Ministry of Education 1972).

Sex Education Today Issue 11 (1974.12) ran an explanatory article about terminology. Introducing the comment by the Ministry of Education, the article added that the cause of the confusion was not only because of the matter of nuance of the words or the fields they covered, but also of the gradual transition of aspects and attitudes for desirable sex education shared in society. Issue 11 (1974.12) as well reported a survey result on the usage of the terminology in local sex education guidebooks from 40 prefectures and municipalities. The result showed sex education was used in 28 guidebooks and purity education in 9. The official terminology usage for sex education is always a topic in this field in Japan, until now (Hirose 2013).

In such a terminological situation, *Sex Education Today* clearly employed the terminology ‘sex education’. This fact demonstrated the new starting point of the magazine which distinguished itself from the Purity Education policy.

Building school sex education curriculum

Building a curriculum for school sex education was one of the key projects for JASE and *Sex Education Today*. The curriculum proposed by JASE together with articles on curriculum studies by professionals is carried in every issue of *Sex Education Today*, covering from kindergarten/nurseries to high school and special schools. When the *Seikyouiku Shidou Youkou (Sex Education Teaching Guidance)* was launched by JASE in 1979, special sections were secured in every issue of the magazine from Issue 39 (1980.4) to 49 (1981.12), carrying articles suggesting actual teaching plans based on the guidance. This guidance, in substance, functioned as an official guidance for sex education nationwide until the Ministry of Education published *Gakkou ni okeru Seikyouiku no Kangaekata Susumekata (How to View and Practice Sex Education at School)* in 1999. Both Tanomura and N. Yamamoto, deeply participating in building or introducing the guidance to schools, contributed a number of articles as experts.

Teaching about sexual intercourse was a chief subject in curriculum matters in the magazine, and drew much attention. This topic is featured in Issue 17 (1976.8), 18 (1976.10), 24 (1977.10), 25 (1977.12), 26 (1978.2), and 45 (1981.4). In the Issue 18, ‘Karikyuramukenkyuushirizui: shou-chuu-kou niokeru seikou no shidoukenkyuu (De-bugging-your-ccurriculum series: Studies on teaching sexual intercourse to elementary, junior and senior high school students)’ consists of four articles, one is by Tanomura, who presents a general framework for teaching intercourse, followed by three detailed articles, which cover elementary, junior high and high school.

Tanomura points, in his article, that there are sub factors, which children need to obtain before they learn about intercourse, and then insists that teaching should not be given in a solitary state but should be given in a structured curriculum. The article on elementary schools reports that a teacher dealt with this topic in the ‘my birth’ section for lower age group, in the ‘children’s births’ section for middle

age group and in the 'mechanism of fertilisation' section for older age group. The article on junior high schools points out that classes without teaching intercourse tend to generate an apathetic atmosphere in the classroom. The article on high schools, which is written by N. Yamamoto, shows the tendency that students think it is OK to have sex if they love each other.

A serial articles 'Tankishuuchuu rensaikouza: watashinara kono shudai wo kou shidousuru (Serial intensive course: This is how I treat this subject)', in Issue 23 (1977.8), 24 (1977.10) and 25 (1977.12), contain articles on teaching sexual intercourse, for its elementary section. An article, which writes about the elementary school division of the 7th JASE summer seminar and the 8th National Sex Education Conference by Nihon Seikyouiku Kenkyukai (the Japan Sex Education Research Group) in Issue 25, elucidates the atmosphere held in the both venues. The report says that it seemed seminar participants felt it was difficult to teach intercourse. The article introduces arguments saying that there were many opinions such as 'It's not easy to find satisfactory teaching contents' (Issue 25: 137).

Issue 26 (1978.2) carries 'Field report: Guidance in a junior high school: What is sexual intercourse for human being?', and Issue 45 (1981.4) carries N. Yamamoto's article about a way to teach sexual intercourse to high school students based on the Guidance by JASE.

Considering a number of field studies and trials, Tanomura reaches his position, where he insists that it is crucially necessary to be sure about children's readiness in learning when teachings happen, and that elementary school pupils are too young to accept facts in learning intercourse. He warns teachers must not handle this topic without confirming children's development stages; various problems will occur, otherwise (Tanomura, Takahashi 1993). On the other hand, N. Yamamoto reaches his position, where he insists that this topic is the essence of sex education. He, therefore, encourages all teachers to become eligible to teach intercourse (Yamamoto 1994).

Conclusion

Sex Education Today published by JASE, thus, transferred the dominant discourse of sex education from that of the Purity Education policy onto sexology and employed a framework picturing the Purity Education and JASE's sex education as opposite numbers. The magazine's intentional usage of the terminology, 'sex education' demonstrated the start of an alternative project in sex education in Japan. At the end, this project formed the mainstream of sex education in Japan. The notable is the role of *Sex Education Today* in building a structured curriculum for school sex education. The curriculum knowledge accumulated into articles in *Sex Education Today* was effectively utilised in editing the *Sex Education Teaching Guidance* by JASE, and its idea and contents were again distributed through the magazine nationally.

Tanomura later recalled the morale and excitement shared by people in those days, when the magazine was launched. He says,

There were a chaotic atmosphere and trial and errors among attendants of the seminars, and they had impressions that they were liberated, with the background of sexual emancipation trends. It is true, that such was fun. I mean, they had some senses of mission and felt responsible to break down the

feudalistic and closed Japanese society. At the same time, they were not actually sure about what they should be free from, and could not make a clear focus on the target (Uno et al. 1995: 24).

Mamiya similarly points that the transition of sex education base from the Purity Education to anatomical and biological sex education was also modified. He recalls that, in the National Sex Education Research Conference in 1986, it was confirmed that sex education should be shifted from the one, which give too much weight on the physiological aspect, to sexuality education. Sexuality education, he states, gives balanced weight on physiological, psychological and social aspects, and overcomes forcing somebody of sexual value, knowledge and attitude but supports him or her to make their own decisions (Mamiya 1995: 19).

The mainstream discourse of sex education built in the 1970s continued to be updated adjusting to social changes. Acquiring a new concept of sexual minority is one of their improvements. Parallel to the development of the mainstream discourse of sex education, the conflict between N. Yamamoto and Tanomura became obvious. However, this conflict was an incident within the mainstream. The campaign of criticism against sex education occurred in 2002 targeted the two, not because the campaigners failed to focus the target, but they targeted the mainstream sex education.

Note

1, Initial is added only to Yamamoto, in order to differentiate two Yamamoto.

2, Information from JASE.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI grant Number 24351018. All translations of publications, from Japanese into English, are the work of the author. The Japanese version of this work is published in *the Annual Bulletin of Institute of Social Science Senshu University (The Shakaikagaku-Nenpo)* No.50 (2016).

References

- Asayama, S., 1967, *Seikyouiku (Sex Education)*, Chukoshinsho
- Asayama, S., 1973, 'Yamamoto Senji cho 'Seikyouiku' no gendaiteki igi : Kaisetsu (Commentary of *Sex Education* written by Senji Yamamoto), *Sex Education Today*, Issue 4 (1973.2)
- Asayama, S., Y. Kurokawa, M. Tada, T. Mamiya, and H. Muramatsu, 1972a, 'What is sex education?', *Sex Education Today*, Issue 1 (1972.5)
- Asayama, S., Y. Kurokawa, M. Tada, T. Mamiya, H. Muramatsu, 1972b, 'What is sex education? 2', *Sex Education Today*, Issue 2 (1972.8)
- Fu, Fuiyan, 2011, The bumpy road to socialize nature: sex education in Japan, *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, Vol.13, No.8
- Hirose, H., 2013, 'Consequences of a recent campaign of criticism against school sex education in Japan', *Sex Education*, Volume 13, Issue 6
- JASE, 1972, 'Setsuritsu no goaisatsu (Greeting for the opening)' in *Sex Education Today*, Issue 1 (1972.5)

- Kirkandall, L. A., 1972a, 'Gendaishakai ni okeru sei no yakuwari (The role of sex in modern society)', *Sex Education Today*, Issue 1 (1972.5)
- Kirkandall, L. A., 1972b, 'Gendaishakai ni okeru seikyouiku no yakuwari (The role of sex education in modern society)', *Sex Education Today*, Issue 2 (1972.8)
- Koyama, S., 2014, 'Junketsu kyouiku no toujou – danjo kyougaku to danjo kousai (The appearance of Purity Education – Co-education and male and female relationships)', in Koyama, S., K. Akaeda, E. Imada, ed., *Sekushuariti no sengoshi (Post war history of sexuality)*, Kyoto University Press
- Matsuda, M. ed., 1971, *Sei (Sex)*, Chikuma Shobo
- Mamiya, T., 1969, *Nihon no junketsu kyuoiku (Purity education in Japan)*, Meiji Tosho
- Mamiya, T., 1981, 'Wagakuni no seikyouiku wa naze teichaku shinaika (Why doesn't sex education in Japan become stable?)', *Sex Education Today*, Issue 45 (1981.4)
- Mamiya, T., 1995, 'Atarashii jidai no seikyouiku wa kakuritsu shitaka (Whether the sex education for new era has established) in *Wagakuni no seikyouiku 25nen (25 years of sex education in Japan)* by JASE & Zenseiren
- McLelland, M., 2015, 'How to Sex'? The Contested Nature of Sexuality in Japan', *The SAGA handbook of Modern Japanese Studies*, SAGA
- Ministry of Education, 1949, 'Seikyouiku no arikata (The way of sex education)' supplemented to *Junketsu kyouiku kihon youkou (Purity Education Basic Guidance)* by the Purity Education Committee
- Ministry of Education, 1950, *Danjo no kousai to reigi (Male-female association and etiquette)*
- Ministry of Education, 1955, 'Junketsu kyouiku no hukuuyutettei ni kansuru kengi (A proposal on the thorough diffusion of purity education)' (18th March) by the Council for Social Education
- Ministry of Education, 1972, 'Junketsu kyouiku to seikyouiku no kankei ni tsuite (On the relation between purity education and sex education)' awarded on 30th March
- Nishigaito, M., 1993, *Seikyouiku wa ima (What sex education now is)*, Iwanamishinsho
- Saitoh, H., 2007, '*Danjo no kosai to reigi no kiso kenkyuu (A preliminary study of the textbook: male-female association and etiquette)*', *Journal of Kyoto Seika University*, No.33
- Saitoh, H., 2012, "'Junketsu kyouiku shisaku" mokuteki no bimyou na kakuchou: junketsu kyouiku iinkai kaisai izen no shakaikyoiukyoku kanryou no hatsugen kara (A subtle shift in the scope of "purity education" policies: A study based on statements by Social Education Bureau officials prior to the convening of the Purity Education Committee)', *Journal of Kyoto Seika University*, No.41
- Takahashi, S., 1993, 'Oubei no seikyouiku (Sex education in Europe and the U.S.)' in *Gendai no esupuri (Espri Today)*, 1993.4, Shibundo
- Tanomura, Y., 2004, 'Dai 34kai zenkoku seikyouiku kenkyuu taitkai kaisai no goaisatsu (Foreword for the 34th National Sex Education Research Conference), in the handout *The 34th National Sex Education Research Conference* in Yamaguchi Prefecture
- Tanomura, Y., 2006, 'Dai 36kai zenkoku seikyouiku kenkyuu taitkai kaisai no goaisatsu (Foreword for the 36th National Sex Education Research Conference), in the handout *The 36th National Sex*

Education Research Conference at Kobe University

- Tanomura, Y., S. Takahashi ed., 1993, *Education of sex and life (Sei to seimei no kyouiku): Gendai no esupuri (Espri Today)*, 1993.4, Shibundo
- Uno, K., N. Kubota, Y. Tanomura, and S. Miyahara, 1995, 'Zadankai: seikyouiku no kako, genzai, mirai (Round table discussion: the past, present and the future of sex education)' in *25 years of sex education in Japan* by JASE & Zenseiren
- Yamamoto, S., 1923, *Seikyouiku (Sex Education)*, Naigai Shuppan
- Yamamoto, N., 1994, *Seikuo: sono riron to kyouiku jissen (Sexual intercourse: theory and practice)*, Ayumi Shuppan