

# The Consequences of the Taisho Era's Child Drama Trend and the Resulting Causes of Tsubouchi's Endorsement of the School Drama Ban

Takeo FUJIKURA

## Abstract

Shoyo Tsubouchi (1859-1935) was the first person in Japan who endeavored to promote child-participating drama with educational justification both through his writing and demonstration activities during the Taisho Era. His main child drama concept, Kateiyo Jidogeki or Child Drama for Domestic Presentation, was his unique strategic configuration of child drama that attempted to divorce the image of child drama from that of the negative conventional adult theatre practice which was prevalent in Japan at the time.

Tsubouchi's endeavor became a major impetus to the Taisho child drama trend, especially in the school setting. However, the result of incorporating his theory into the Japanese school system ultimately led to a series of government interventions which resulted in the Minister of Education, Ryohei Okada's prohibitive ordinance of 1924 which was known as the School Drama Ban. Surprisingly, Tsubouchi approved the minister's school drama ban.

This article investigates the content and the consequences of negotiations surrounding the incorporation of Tsubouchi's dramatic activity into the schools among teachers, government, and Tsubouchi himself in the midst of the Taisho school drama trend. The article examines both the influence of Tsubouchi's child drama concept and the conflicts within Tsubouchi himself that culminated in his approval of Minister Okada's ordinance.

## Background of the Issue

Child drama in Japan did not receive special attention as a field independent of adult theatre until the beginning of the Twentieth Century.

It began with a production of adapted European fables in 1903 and grew gradually, producing indigenous drama for an audience of upper middle class families in a few major cities. Two of the obvious and important characteristics of early Japanese child drama in the Meiji Era were 1) It was always performed by adult professional actors with an infusion of adult taste and national ideology, and 2) The content and the form were to a great extent dictated by the mode and styles of Kabuki. This was due to Kabuki's popularity during the Edo era under the government's isolationist policy.

One more important point to be remembered is the Japanese society's strong antipathy against commoners' dramatic activity despite Kabuki's popularity. Shizuko Koyama illustrates the complex Japanese attitude toward dramatic activity in that, though drama itself was looked at as a sign of deterioration, household conduct, such as "taking children to see [what was thought to be] 'vulgar' plays or variety shows, singing worldly folk songs [usually of love affairs] or playing the shamisen or koto had been the customary habits of the Japanese at least until the late Meiji Era" (130). Indeed, it was quite natural for Japanese people to see and discuss a dramatic production with household members even though the production was done by professional players who were labeled as "kawara kojiki" (riverbed beggars - a derogatory term often applied to Kabuki players). It is fair to say that, in actuality, play appreciation was tacitly left to private pleasure within a family or to the discretion of an individual. However, it was not an issue to be seriously discussed or encouraged in formal public context.

This attitude toward actors can clearly be seen in the definition of "Kabuki-mono" or "Kabuki people" in the *Kabuki Encyclopedia*. This source indicates that those people who were involved in theatre activity were referred to as "people who are prodigal ruffians or grotesquely fashioned non-conformists who are outcasts of the feudalistic system" (Hattori et al. 120). They were the people who made a living exposing themselves, and, in Japanese connotation much influenced by Confucianism, disgracing themselves. In this sense, they were often compared to prostitutes who were considered to make their living in the same way.<sup>1</sup>

Thus, it is quite understandable that there was a distinct boundary between these outcasts and common people just as there was a distinct difference between the social classes. Theatre activity by commoners,

especially by children, was considered appalling because those participants went beyond the borders of the commoners' life and into the world of outcasts. It was unorthodox to pursue drama in the educational scene because it was the business of outcasts, "the riverbed beggar." It was quite natural that dramatic activities by children were out of the question.

In 1912, Japan entered the Taisho Era. During this era, there was an increasing influx of contemporary foreign thought, and trends towards child-centered movements and women's liberation activities were enhanced and appreciated. Though the negative view on dramatic activity continued, there was a gradual shift in people's view on the significance of child-centered activity and family education centering on women as the children's educators.

During this transition, Shoyo Tsubouchi (1859-1935) became the first person who insisted upon the significance of child drama for educational purposes in Japan. In 1921, he began endeavoring to disseminate child drama designed to be performed by children using their own initiative without adult direction. He also gave child drama a new position as part of home education with mothers as the facilitating agent. His main strategic concept for the promotion of child drama, called "Kateiyo Jidogeki" (Child Drama for Domestic Presentation), was his attempt to confine children's dramatic activities to the home setting with parents and siblings as the only audience thereby discarding all the ostentatious elements of conventional adult drama and encouraging children's creative initiative. He also incorporated many American and European predecessors' theories to support his theories of child participating drama and protect them from social prejudice.<sup>2</sup>

In his first treatise on the subject, *Jidokyoiku to Engeki* (*Child Education and Drama*) in 1923, he elaborated on many advantages of children's dramatic activities, frequently referring to American examples while simultaneously warning against the risks of misleading children by the conventionally negative Japanese conception of drama. Along with this treatise, Tsubouchi created and published several play collections for children so that his concept of child drama could be practiced by children. In addition to his writing activities, Tsubouchi embarked on actual demonstrations of his child drama using adult actresses and touring several major cities in Japan.

Due to his lack of practical experience with children and some of the social restrictions of the time, both his theories and practice kept vacillating.<sup>3</sup>

Nevertheless, as a result of his endeavor, school drama became extremely popular and there arose a school drama trend throughout Japan. Many teachers and leaders of child drama began to arbitrarily interpret his concept to suit their own tastes and needs.

Eventually some of the schools began to assume an extreme performance style. Several schools began producing large-scale extravagant public performances with admission charges, while other schools began to give performances sponsored by companies. During each of these extravagant public performances, government surveillance was conducted in order to prevent the schools' deviation from educational principles. Subsequently, these government interventions resulted in the Minister of Education, Ryohei Okada, issuing in 1924 a government ordinance which was commonly known as the School Drama Ban. Surprisingly, Tsubouchi, who had been striving to promote child drama activity approved of the minister's school drama ban.

In this article, I will investigate the content of the Taisho school drama trend as ramifications of Tsubouchi's child drama endeavor and analyze these hegemonic struggles among teachers, government, and Tsubouchi thus clarifying the negotiations surrounding the incorporation of dramatic activity into the schools. In doing so, I intend to reveal the conflicts within Tsubouchi himself that culminated in his approval of Minister Okada's ordinance.

## School Drama Trend: Its Contributing Factors and Influences

When Shoyo Tsubouchi's *Kateiyo Jidogeki Dai Ni Shu (Child Drama for Domestic Presentation II)* was published in March 1923 and *Jidokyoiku to Engeki (Child Education and Drama)* in April 1923, the popularity of school drama production approached a climax.

In addition to Tsubouchi's activities, several other factors had contributed to the popularity of school drama. In 1917, an elementary school teacher, Kuniyoshi Obara, began incorporating drama into his elementary school teaching in Hiroshima for students' "integral growth as human beings" (*Nihon Gakkogeki Kyokai* 436). He was later hired by Masataro Sawayanagi at the Seijo Elementary School in Tokyo.<sup>4</sup> In April 1923, the same month as that in which Tsubouchi published his *Jidokyoiku to Engeki*,

Obara published *Gakko Gekiron (Theory of School Drama)*, in which he legitimized the effects of school drama on children. Along with Tsubouchi's book, Obara's text became a leading force promoting school drama activities. As Obara acknowledged later in an interview for *Shonen Engeki*, he was much "influenced by Tsubouchi's 'Child Drama for Domestic Presentation' Concept" and used the content of Tsubouchi's articles as a source of inspiration and guidance for his book (Ochiai "Obara Kuniyoshi Sensei ni" 30).

Obara's *Theory of School Drama*, with its justification of drama activity, paralleled Tsubouchi's child drama theory with a few exceptions. The major difference was that Obara, coming exclusively from a school environment, never considered confining the school drama to a closed environment. This difference foreshadows the inevitable incorporation of parents and other adults as audience, something Tsubouchi at first did not anticipate.

It was mostly "at gakugeikai (school subject demonstration meetings) or at some anniversaries" where school drama was produced (Nagano 24). One of the original purposes of gakugeikai was to facilitate "participation of parents" as witnesses of school activities (Yamamoto and Konno, *Kindai Kyoiku* 349); its emergence reflected a new social recognition of katei's (home's) supplemental role to schools. Gakugeikai aimed at "broadening the communication between the school and katei (home) by having the parents participate in school activities" (349-351) or, as Yamamoto and Konno stated, the government originally "aimed at not only indoctrinating the children but even their parents through gakugeikai" (*Taisho Showa Kyoiku* vol. 2 197).

Since Japanese school drama evolved in close interconnection with parental participation, its tendency towards open performance in catering to an audience of many parents was inevitable. Tsubouchi had initially envisioned child drama performed privately in front of an intimate family audience, but there were hundreds or even thousands of unfamiliar parents present on occasions such as gakugeikai, and it could not avoid assuming an air of a public open performance. Obara could anticipate this inevitability, but Tsubouchi seemed unaware that eventually the audience would become a huge obstacle to the realization of his published ideal for child drama.

Given Taisho New Education's main concern of "the encouragement

of children's self-initiated activities" (Nakano 10), drama came into the limelight as one of the most meaningful activities of *gakugeikai*. Tsubouchi's endorsement and demonstration productions satisfied Taisho New Education's search for a legitimate new educational means, and child participating drama began to be practiced by such progressive teachers as Obara, making school drama one of the most thriving activities in private elementary schools. Beginning with Seijo Elementary School, many private schools, especially in the Tokyo Metropolitan area, began energetically incorporating drama activities in *gakugeikai*. Gradually, this trend was adopted in public schools as well.

Another major factor that influenced the trend toward school drama was the rising popularity of Takarazuka Shojō Kageki (Takarazuka Girls' Operetta Company). The Takarazuka Girls' Operetta Company produced many of Tsubouchi's child drama pieces. At first, Tsubouchi praised their creed as "an appropriate method to nurture and cultivate children's cultural taste through their interest in operetta" ("Airashiki Shojō Kageki" 455). However, from the mid-Taisho Era on, this company gradually revealed "commercial entertainment enterprise characteristics," including the gaudy theatrical elements typical of large-scale theatres (Nihon Gakkogeiki Kyokai 434). In fact, though it was called a "girls' operetta," it was actually adult women's entertainment business. Witnessing them Tsubouchi criticized, "they are too erotic and grotesque without much innocence but filled with adult air and taste" ("Nanigotomo Omotoshite Yonenki Kara" 5). Ironically, this "erotic and grotesque" quality "filled with adult air and taste" satisfied a certain demand of *gakugeikai*. Yamamoto and Konno maintained that *gakugeikai* embraced a carnivalesque aspect as an emotional outlet for people who often lived a routine life (*Taisho Showa Kyoiku* vol. 2 170-172). The *gakugeikai* was "extremely popular" among the local people and sometimes its festivity went beyond the government's tolerance (170)<sup>5</sup>

Ordinances that banned school excesses, even in the Meiji Era, cited *gakugeikai*'s wild festive atmosphere. In 1909, the Minister of Education, Eitaro Komatsubara, issued a major school drama ban. According to the content of this ordinance, although drama was not a regular subject demonstrated at *gakugeikai* in the Meiji Era, it had become a popular side activity produced "for the purpose of enlivening the atmosphere"

(Komatsubara). Gakugeikai was embraced as an outlet for people’s potential festive energy, and drama or drama-like activity was the most fitting means for this emotional explosion. The ordinance also stated that this tendency was “not limited to urban areas,” that cases “were reported in local schools as well” (Komatsubara).

The Takarazuka Company’s extravagant stage sets and costumes appealed to the popular desire for this kind of festivity, especially in the Taisho Era, an age of consumption that enjoyed the influx of many Western goods and ideas. In contrast to Tsubouchi’s original, somewhat ascetic and non-decorative ideal of child drama designed only to encourage children’s imagination, Takarazuka Girls’ Operetta Company exerted great influence by unleashing the desire for the extravagant visual aspects of dramatic performance. Consequently, despite Tsubouchi’s objections, the Girls’ Operetta Company gained extreme popularity, impacting teachers and children all over the country. While in principle, Takarazuka’s commercially-based stage factors directly conflicted with Tsubouchi’s ideal child drama concept, the reality was that Tsubouchi’s demonstrational performances, with their elaborate rendering on the stage, looked no different from Takarazuka’s luxurious productions.<sup>6</sup> As a consequence, it is easy to imagine that many Tsubouchi advocates used the Takarazuka stage as their school drama model, complete with its gaudy costumes, heavy makeup, and product orientation, sometimes even charging admission.

## Ramification of School Drama Trend: The Child Drama Debate

The school drama trend, together with other free art movements, inspired the formation of two major art education associations. In April 1923, Geijutsu Kyoikukai (the Committee for Art Education) was established in Tokyo, followed in July of 1924 by Geijutsu Kyoiku Kyokai (The Art Education Association) in Osaka.<sup>7</sup> The Geijutsu Kyoikukai was organized with Masataro Sawayanagi as the chairman and Tsubouchi served as a member of the advisory board. The committee dealt not only with drama but with art education in general and began publishing the monthly journal, *Geijutsu Kyoiku (Art Education Journal)*. Similarly, the Geijutsu Kyoiku Kyokai published *Geijutsu to Kyoiku (Journal of Art and Education)*. Although

these two journals published articles on art education in general, school drama was their major topic.

One significant phenomenon apparent in the articles was that child drama, including school drama, was finally being discussed seriously and openly from multiple perspectives. Not only had it become a topic for open discussion, but a new alternative had arisen for its presentation: domestic-style drama. Many constructive discussions went beyond simply listing the pros and cons of child drama, and this advancement was no doubt due in part to the influence of Tsubouchi's "Domestic Child Drama Theory."

In late November 1922, *Tokyo Nichi Nichi Magazine* published a special serialized feature on the theme, "Should Children be Encouraged to Perform on Stage?" In one issue Sozo Kurahashi expressed a strong objection to children's participation in the public open stage.<sup>8</sup> While appreciating the substantial significance of child drama and hoping that it be practiced appropriately at schools and in *katei* (home), he disapproved of "expos [ing] children to the pleasure-seeking eyes of adult strangers" ("Butai ni Tatasrukoto wa"). His concern was that children experience unnecessary stress when confronting an audience of adult strangers. He offered six reasons why open drama was not appropriate for children.<sup>9</sup> These were similar to what Tsubouchi had anticipated in his book such as misleading them to imitate professional actors and fostering children's self-conceit. In conclusion, Kurahashi expressed great respect for Tsubouchi's decision to include the word "kateiyo" (domestic purpose) in the name of his child drama concept and opposed showcasing children not only in theatres but also in any public performance. The only place where child drama can be beneficial, according to Kurahashi, was "within *katei*, kindergarten, elementary schools, and [among] familiar friends" ("Butaini Tataseru Koto wa"). The influence of Tsubouchi's domestic drama concept was clearly reflected in this discussion.

Kurahashi's article was one of the earliest published discussions wherein the alternative of closed drama, as opposed to open drama, was suggested by a school teacher. This issue of child drama would be further expanded, and a variety of other constructive opinions and observations would be proposed.

For example, the journal *Josei* (*The Woman*) in March 1923 published articles under the title, "Jidogeki wo Jido ni Enzeshimeru kotono Kahi"



(Pros and Cons of Children’s Participation in Child Drama). These five articles presented various alternatives, personal experiences, and objective observations.<sup>10</sup>

Later they were reintroduced in an abbreviated form in the first issue of *Geijutsu Kyoiku* (100-106) and the discussion continued in several other journals. With Tsubouchi’s new alternative of closed child drama on the table, the content of the child drama debate was certainly enriched and became more constructive, leaning towards a better compromise than simply criticizing all child drama.

## Diversified Implementations of Child Drama

While heated discussion continued over potential compromises in the child drama debate and as more and more schools began to incorporate dramatic activity into their school events, another important issue, how to define “educational,” began to emerge. While most educators agreed on the educational significance of child drama and the need to divorce its image from that of professional acting, no agreement on the definition of “educational” was reached in any of their discussions.<sup>11</sup> The definition of “educational” eventually became a crucial point of dispute that led to the disintegration of school drama activity.

On the one hand, Genzo Ichikawa, the principal of the Fuchu Daiichi Girls’ School, contended, “As far as it [child drama] follows the direction of teachers and their principal, there should be no problem” (“Ni Jouken ga Soroeba”). Others similarly implied that what is “educational” most likely depends upon the judgment (or interpretation) of each school teacher and/or principal. As a result, among the school drama productions promoted as “educational,” there was a variety of approaches and renderings, some of which were considered questionable. As *Geijutsu Kyoiku* commented in June of 1923:

…there are many productions whose purpose is questionable… we should keep in mind that if we take this phenomena as a fashionable rage and deal with it simply as a carnival-like event, an important aspect of this art education will be forgotten inducing harmful effects (“Gakkogeki no Mondai”)

In fact, this kind of arbitrarily rendered definition of child drama led both to a series of governmental interventions and a drastic shift in Tsubouchi's attitude about child drama. But before an examination of these two results, we should take a closer look at some of these teachers' interpretations.

At the pinnacle of school drama, in June of 1924, *Kyoiku no Seiki* (*The Century of Education*) published a special issue titled "Gakko Geki no Riron to Jissai" (The Theory and the Practice of School Drama). Among the articles contributed by teachers, there was a great range of opinion regarding the direction child drama should take. Entaro Noguchi, for instance, reported that while he insisted upon educational consideration for school drama, other teachers argued that there is no need because it would "spoil drama" and that "the sole act of seeking to achieve the essence of drama will inevitably yield educational effects" ("Shin Kyoiku to Gakko Geki" 18).

Teachers such as Haruo Chiba often interpreted school drama strictly as an art-pursuing (or art-oriented) endeavor. Chiba was "extremely moved" by the artistry achieved in Tsubouchi's child drama demonstration at the Yurakuza Theatre and insisted that child drama should aim at pursuing "[Genuine] Art for children" (17). Chiba even criticized Tsubouchi's emphasis on ten favorable effects of child drama in *Child Education and Drama*, contending that these effects were unessential (16). He argued against Tsubouchi's remarks: "Ideal child drama for children should be pursued from more genuine and pure motivation [than what Tsubouchi discussed]. We should depart from his [Tsubouchi's] discussion and rather draw on his demonstration performances" (16).

Another teacher, Seishi Shimoda<sup>12</sup> strongly advocated "kyoshitsu-geki" (drama as a classroom method), or "gakushu-geki" (learning through drama) insisting that teachers should expand drama from a conventionally literature-based art form to one that embraces all subjects. Drawing on Harriet Finlay-Johnson's *Dramatic Method of Teaching*, he concluded that drama should be utilized to teach all school subjects ("Jido no Seikatsu to Gakkogeki" 44).

In contrast, Hiroshi Shigaki, an initiator of "kyoshitsu geki," (drama as a classroom method), insisted that genuine school drama should be totally distinguished from "kyoshitsu geki" and handled as an art (Shigaki, et al, "Getsurei Yawa Kai- Gakkogeki wo Chushin to Shite" 132).

Acknowledging the significance of “kyoshitsu geki,” he contended that “it [drama as a classroom method] should not be called ‘drama’ but be distinguished as dramatized education” and that one should not expect any artistic aspect from “kyoshitsu geki.” (132).

Thus, child drama or school drama came to be divided into various opposing orientations. Reinforced by the ongoing interpretations of “educational-ness,” child drama became further split within each group; its complexity seemed endless. In a discussion among elementary school teachers led by Yasaburo Shimonaka under the title, “Kodomo Shiba Gokoro” (Dramatic Spirit of Children), the participants agreed that there is value in children’s dramatic, playful spirit. Comparing this spirit with that of a carnival, they then further agreed to identify educational dramatic activity with carnivals:

Shimonaka: …It is a mistake to overemphasize the intellectual aspect of children by ignoring their emotion and instinct.

Sakurai: Gakugeikai and undokai (athletic meeting), all these names already sound too formal. They all should exist simply as carnivals.

Shimonaka: That would truly be educational. Such events could truly help promote children’s life energy.

Yamaguchi: There should be such a school carnival among annual events (140)

Thus, the examination of “educational-ness” led some to define “gakugeikai” as a carnival event, an outlet for children’s emotional outbursts, and to treat educational drama as a means to create merrymaking. This definition was perhaps most responsible for eventually inciting government surveillance.

## **A Struggle Over Educational Hegemony: The Government’s Stance Toward School Drama**

As school drama diversified, government officials began to see friction between their policies and some of the ways school drama was handled, and their concern about it increased. Many schools began producing their school dramas outside the school setting, opening them to the public. Some advertised their productions in newspapers. In turn, the government began to

negotiate with school drama advocates.

A close examination of the development of *gakugeikai* illustrates what the government envisioned as the ideal demonstration as well as the goal of *gakugeikai*: the reproduction of a particular character that we might call the faithful agent of national ideology based on the spirit of Rescript of Education as described in nationally assigned textbooks which aimed to promote an Emperor-centered nationalistic system. In this system, there was no place for children's freedom of self-assertion or emotional manifestation; seriousness and sincerity in children's attitudes were the essential factors.

With the dissemination of the new education movement in the late Taisho Era (early 1920s), these regimented demonstrations had been gradually replaced by school drama wherein educational significance was defined by intellectuals calling for child-centeredness, genuine emotional liberation, and self-initiated activities. Of course, the conservative faction of the government took a wary attitude towards this change. When school drama presented at *gakugeikai* was merged with a local recreational spirit, it began to generate the air of a local carnival entertainment. The resulting emotional outbursts were regarded by the totalitarian government as dangerous signs of deteriorating behavior. The government began to watch for any festive activity that might induce children's emotional liberation; eventually it began to exert a strict surveillance on some of these productions.

On March 17, 1923, the Toyo Kasei Girls' School held "Doyo Geki Taikai" (Fairy Tale Drama Concert) at the Yurakuza Theatre in Tokyo. This performance featured the students of the Girls' School, including kindergarten children. According to the May issue of *Geijutsu Kyoiku*, the house was "packed to the doors" and the performance was "received quite successfully" ("Doyo Geki Taikai" 22). However, the article also stated: "Because they encouraged children to perform on a public stage with an admission charge, it seemed as if they were exploiting the children to make a profit" (22).

According to *Geijutsu Kyoiku*, on the day after the performance, the principal of the school, Fukuo Kishibe, was summoned to the Ministry of Education and reprimanded for this event. Kishibe, a leading advocate of art education insisted that children should have pure motivations for acting on stage. Clearly the government disapproved of his "educational perspective"

which encouraged “children’s excitement” in front of a public audience. This intervention warned that the government would pay more serious attention to school drama in the future.

In the May issue of *Shakai to Kyoka*, (*Society and Edification*), a journal published by Monbusho Shakai Kyoiku Kenkyukai (the Social Education Study Group of the Ministry of Education), the government surveyed prominent teachers and other key figures on the advisability of school drama and introduced the responses under the title, “Gakko Geki ni Kansuru Iken,” (Opinions on School Drama). The questions were: “1) Is school drama acceptable or not? 2) What are the negative effects of school drama and things that should be improved? and 3) Are there other points of concern you wish to express?” (Monbusho Shakai Kyoiku Kenkyukai 43).

Among the twelve respondents to the questionnaires, only one, Masanori Ohshima, an assistant professor at the Tokyo Imperial University, fully objected to school drama because he witnessed that “Children did not seem to be enjoying their experience and I [Ohshima] felt sorry for them” (44). However, Kuniyoshi Obara of the Seijo Elementary School totally approved of it. While acknowledging the fact that there were still some defects in school drama practice, he insisted, “Everything has certain defects” and if school drama is not approved, other subjects cannot be approved either (45).

The other ten also acknowledged the educational effects of school drama and expressed approval of it. The situation was very different from that in 1909 when the last major ordinance against school drama was delivered and drama was thought to be something that would “definitely lead to the demoralizing of school life promoting the air of frivolousness” (Komatsubara, “Gakko Fuki”). This difference could be attributable to the publication of Tsubouchi’s and Obara’s books endorsing school drama’s educational significance.

On the other hand, the majority of the respondents endorsed school drama only on the condition that it be conducted “appropriately” and “educationally.” They identified the defects of school drama as: 1) lack of appropriate leaders; 2) inappropriate quality of material; 3) its open performance with accompanying commercial orientation; 4) elaborate sets, costumes and makeup; and 5) poor quality of audience. At the same time,

four of these people, including Ohshima, confessed that they had either never or only once or twice seen school drama, and were unfamiliar with the actual activity (44-47).

Thus, in this government journal, school drama was discussed and judged idealistically by inexperienced people from a conventional Confucian-based view who denounced it so far as it was identified with professional entertainment. Supplementing the survey results, Seishiro Aoki, a literati entrusted by the Ministry of Education, contributed an article titled, "Jidogeki to Jido" (Child Drama and Children), wherein he elaborated on the essence of child drama. Drawing upon Tsubouchi's 1922 article, "Jidogeki no Sanshurui" (Three Kinds of Child Drama), he described the ideal child drama as utilizing 1) age-appropriate content; 2) child-participating drama rather than child drama for appreciation; 3) child-centered orientation rather than audience-catering orientation; and 4) simple sets, costumes and makeup so that drama can maximize expression by children. Aoki maintained, "As far as these principal grounds are preserved, I am certain that child drama should be valued as a necessary means to promote children's holistic cultivation" (53). Here, too, Tsubouchi's strategic conception of educational child drama was clearly endorsed. Although Aoki offered no information about his familiarity with child drama, it is clear that Tsubouchi's words about its effects had influenced him.

The survey results and Aoki's article were reflected in subsequent government regulation of school drama. Toukyou Shi Gakumuka (The Educational Affairs Section of Tokyo City Office) issued an official notice in May of 1923 to public elementary schools within the Tokyo district, requiring them to formally request its permission before producing any more school drama performances. The notice was titled, "A Notification on the Rehearsal and Performance of Children's Song/ Children's Drama in Elementary Schools." Admitting the popularity of dramatic activities in school environment, it read in part:

...It is a fact that these (dramatic) activities should not necessarily be prohibited depending upon their motivations and goals; however, since elementary education has its own standards and boundaries at the same time, conducting such activities by blindly following the fashion of the time might not only revolt against the educational goal of elementary

schools but also bring about some regrettable result. Therefore, this is to request that in case there is a necessity of conducting such events, the principal of the city elementary school in the district should consult with supervising staff of the local government in advance and make a careful decision with much discretion (qtd. in “Gakkogeki no Mondai” *Kyoiku Jiron*)

*Kyoiku Jiron* (*Educational Review*), one of the major educational journals featured a discussion on this official notice in its June issue. Chisato Narita, a supervising staff official from the Tokyo City Office, contributed an article on the notice titled, “Korobanu Sakino Tsue” (Prevention is Better than Cure) pointing out some of the negative aspects that had been observed in recent performances.<sup>13</sup> Narita said that the City Office acknowledged “the effect of art education and has no intention whatsoever to ban school drama as long as it is executed seriously” (10). He insisted that the Office criticized only those schools which conducted school drama by “blindly following its popularity without much consideration on its significance” and “those encouraging open performances in public.” He contended that, even within the school setting, the City Office would not approve performances that were “decorated like a professional stage with gorgeous curtains and rented gaudy costumes because these would in effect lead into serious regrettable results against the mission and goals of elementary education” (10).

The government’s policy had remained unchanged in principle since the last major school ban in a 1909 ordinance which had prohibited “making pupils put on makeup and disguise with costumes” because it would promote an “air of frivolousness” (Komatsubara); but there was a slight, yet crucial change in the tone and attitude toward school drama both in the Tokyo City Office’s notice and in Narita’s remarks. Both acknowledged the value of school drama, whereas the 1909 ordinance had made the blanket-statement that drama-like activities would “lead to the demoralizing of school life by promoting an air of frivolousness” (Komatsubara). It is clear that, perhaps partly due to the responses of teachers and scholars as well as the opinion of Aoki described earlier, school drama had won some recognition of its educational significance even by the government. This shift in government rhetoric may also be due to the direct and/or indirect influence of Tsubouchi.

However, despite the pretext that his ordinance was not meant to

be a school drama ban, Narita was tacitly warning that any school drama conducted against the City Office's educational policy could provoke countermeasures. The July issue of *Geijutsu Kyoiku* (*Art Education*) reported on this official notice, criticizing it as effectively functioning as a school drama ban since the government issued the notification without providing appropriate guidance for this "new rising art education" and thereby negatively influencing school teachers ("Zappou" 103).

## Tsubouchi's Disappointment and Shift of Attitude

At this time, Tsubouchi similarly complained about the flippant attitude of Japanese school teachers in their incorporation of child drama ("Jido Geki ni Kansuru Jakkan no Gimon" 478-9). Tsubouchi, who had envisioned using child drama as a disciplinary device to regain what had been lost by Japan's Westernization, expressed much disappointment in the Japanese people's acceptance of a new trend based only on their sheer instinct and he lamented the fact that the Japanese people understood only a part and never digested the whole of his vision (479-480).

Re-emphasizing the importance of his original ideas of "child-centeredness" and "closed orientation," Tsubouchi insisted that if these ideal principles were not preserved, "the most important significance of child drama will be lost and it will fall into an activity of mere entertainment for adults" (479). Thus, although their perspectives were not exactly the same, both Tsubouchi and the government shared similar concerns regarding school drama's tendency to become a mere pleasure-seeking entertainment. This agreement may be a key to understanding Tsubouchi's reaction to the 1924 School Drama Ban.

Faced with the arbitrariness of each school's interpretation of his concept, Tsubouchi concluded that discrepancies were attributable to the lack of model performances and competent leaders who knew the right way to handle child drama ("Jidogeki no Mohanjitsuen no Hitsuyou" 832-4). Tsubouchi's attitude inclined more towards a mission of providing model performance demonstrations and model scripts. Tsubouchi's remark on June 4, 1923, clearly indicated his disappointment in popular interpretations of his work, as well as his belief in the need for demonstration: "After all, in this



hectic society, I suppose no one has time to carefully read my explanation on how to handle child drama. I am convinced that there is no other choice but to demonstrate an actual model directly and concretely” (“Kateiyo no Jidogeki wo Gekijode”).

Beginning in June 1923, Tsubouchi’s Tokyo production, supported by the Asahi Newspaper Company, assumed a more demonstrational nature with the mission of presenting an ideal child drama model for inexperienced local teachers and children.

In the meantime, an unforeseen complication arose for Tsubouchi, a by-product of the Great Kanto Earthquake in September 1923, which challenged the quality of child drama by further complicating school teachers’ arbitrary interpretations of the term “educational significance.” According to some of his lectures, Tsubouchi was repelled and made anxious by a trend of promoting child drama in the name of charity. This trend clearly shaped the activity into a more superficial entertainment for the earthquake victims, thus threatening to encourage children’s self-conceit.

In his November 1923 article, “Fukkoki Geijutsu ni Kansuru Yosoku” (Prospects on the Art during the Period of Recovery), Tsubouchi expressed his concern that “hope for the reconstruction of legitimate art, child drama” was deteriorating because people were “exploiting child drama under the excuse of charity for entertainment purposes.” He continued:

As hungry people are not selective of their food, the victims of the earthquakes do not question the quality of charity art. And the carefree applause from this kind of audience tends to spoil players…if children fall into this trap and get spoiled, they are finished. (868-9)

Thus, Tsubouchi expressed his concern that the quality of child drama was being undermined by irresponsible encouragement, over-praise, and lack of legitimate objective criticism. In other writings too, Tsubouchi reiterated the danger of a “carnival entertainment atmosphere” in which children receive carelessly excessive flattery.

Confronted by this development, Tsubouchi’s demonstrational performances began to assume an ascetic and serious nature, incorporating more rigidly fixed choreography and movement, thus stressing its disciplinary aspects at the expense of children’s self-initiated creation. Furthermore, as he lectured and witnessed local child drama during his tours, Tsubouchi began

to question the competency of the entire contemporary children's creative engagement, claiming that since the children had grown up "in the culturally backward Japanese environment," they lacked access to competent creative models appropriate for children ("Jissaijo kara Mita Jidogeki" 820).

Ultimately, Tsubouchi shifted from his original faith in child-initiated creative output to favoring models for children created by others, admitting, "It is necessary that children first appreciate something relatively creative, pure, educational, and at the same time, artistic before they get engaged in their own creative endeavor" (820). For the purpose of producing creatively competent models for inexperienced people, Tsubouchi discarded the most basic principle of his child drama, the priority of child-initiated creative engagement, for the sake of familiarizing children with exemplary drama. He confessed: "...though it might sound like a contradiction to the spirit of pure child-centered drama, we cannot help imposing a model example [during the rehearsals of demonstrations] on participating children who do not have any background knowledge" (819-20). Prior to these remarks, in December 1923, Tsubouchi had published his play collection titled *Gakkoyo Sho Kyakuhon (A Short Play Collection for School Presentation)* which demonstrated child drama for children's appreciation. It consisted of six stories for demonstrational purposes, most of which were either derived from mythology or biographies of great historical or legendary figures, done in operetta style with dance and songs accompanying dialogues.<sup>14</sup> Tsubouchi referred to his shift to this kind of play in his 1924 article, "Jidogeki no Mohanjitsuen no Hitsuyou" (A Need for Child Drama Demonstration):

I am quite aware that some people might reproach me because many of the plays [in the collection] are beyond even the acting skills of students in middle schools or in girls' higher schools. ... I cannot help but believe in the necessity of demonstrational performances for the time being, though it contradicts my initial intention (835)

In addition to acknowledging the contradiction between demonstration performance vs. child-initiated drama, Tsubouchi acknowledged that, from his observations, he had concluded that it was "a few years too early to start child drama activity in the katei environment" in Japan and that, instead, "Education in the field of dramatic arts had to begin in the school environment" (*Gakkoyo* Preface). Tsubouchi ended up shifting direction

so much that, at a practical level, his original ideal for child drama, “Child Drama for Domestic Presentation” had to be abandoned.

Tsubouchi’s drastic shift in attitude may have been an attempt to counter the diverse interpretations of his theories, especially against those that permitted his concept to be identified with the entertainments that had provoked government surveillance. When we look at his child drama endeavor in the light of his goal to create legitimate theatre with children, as well as to regain the lost Japanese cooperative spirit, it seems natural that he would resort to protecting the more artistic and ascetic aspects of drama. However, it is also clear that almost none of the concepts he had originally published remained in his demonstrations and that, to many people, these demonstrations must have seemed no different than other professional children’s theatre productions, including those of the Takarazuka Girls’ Operetta Company.

## Consequences of the Kuzuryu Incident

As the school drama trend accelerated under the influences of both the Takarazuka Girls’ Operetta Company and the sudden increased demand for drama after the Kanto Great Earthquakes, there were many who produced large-scale extravagant public performances with admission charges under the pretext of a “charity activity.”

Among the many schools that were noted for their open performances, the Kuzuryu Shuga Jogakko, (Kuzuryu Girls’ School for Needlework Painting), a vocational-technical school in Tokyo, would become the case for the next major government intervention. The school had about 400 students of whom approximately 150 were provincial students boarding at the school. According to a newspaper interview, the principal, Senmatsu Kuzuryu, encouraged music and drama activity because he believed that doing so would “enrich the girls’ lives” (“Jogakusei no Kageki”).

According to Kuzuryu’s wife, Chiyo Kuzuryu, these activities were at the same time “Principal Kuzuryu’s own personal hobby” (Ochiai, “Kuzuryu Shuga Jogakko” 35). Kuzuryu cast and directed all the dramatic pieces although “He himself was a complete layman without any special knowledge of drama or music” (32). In June 1922, he incorporated musical drama as

part of the school's regular curriculum and even built an auditorium with a seating capacity of 900. The school performed open musical dramas in their auditorium twice a year and these performances always received much media exposure. *The Yomiuri Newspaper* described their elaborate performances:

Their musical drama is in no way like those amateurish stages of normal girls' schools. Theirs are like professionals in terms of their costumes, sets, and lighting effects created by the girls themselves and much better in quality than those of the Asakusa district ("Jogakusei no Kageki")

As one former student recollected, "Though it started like a *gakugeikai* performance first, it gradually assumed a style like a Takarazuka Company" (Ochiai, "Kuzuryu Shuga Jogakko" 39). In addition, not only did the stage rendering assume the look of a professional entertainment, some students even began to be treated as star players by the media. *The Yomiuri Newspaper* on March 1, 1923, for example, featured one student as a star dancer with her solo picture and the heading, "Ishigawa Takeko, A Promising Genius Dancer – Now She Even Takes Charge of Choreography" ("Buyo no Tensai toshite").

This lavish, pomp-filled student-production began being performed outside the school, as Chiyo Kuzuryu recollected: "Because of the aftermath of the (Great Kanto) earthquake, there was no entertainment and my husband [Senmatsu Kuzuryu] was encouraged to go out [to perform for people]" (Ochiai, "Kuzuryu Shuga Jogakko" 34). At the same time, school officials announced through various newspapers that in-school performances would charge an admission with profits going to charity.

Announcements of their performances became ubiquitous in *the Yomiuri Newspaper* around this time.<sup>15</sup> In addition to their own performances, the student troupe was also hired by such companies as Kanegafuchi Boseki, (Kanegafuchi Spinning Company) and Ueno Seiyoken Restaurant, according to the recollection of Chiyo Kuzuryu (Ochiai, "Kuzuryu Shuga Jogakko" 34).

Although Kuzuryu was not a typical normal school whose curriculum was strictly controlled by the Ministry of Education, and these performances were "for the sake of charity" (38), it is still amazing how busy these young students were with performing, particularly considering the additional time

needed for rehearsal. When they began performing at the Teikoku Hotel, the boundary between professional theatre groups and amateurs began to be blurred. The government expressed its view on these performances in the April issue of *Geijutsu Kyoiku* (*Art Education Journal*) stating, “Theirs was like a professional theatre business which totally contradicts school’s educational purpose” (qtd. in Kido, “Gakko Geki Kinshi Kunrei no Zengo” 218-9). Thus, Tsubouchi’s apprehension had come to reality.

## Consequences of the Accelerated School Drama

Confronted by this increasing tendency of public open school drama despite his efforts to correct its direction, Tsubouchi’s enthusiasm for child drama diminished. Shortly after the publication of his *Gakkoyo Sho Kyakuhon* (*A Short Play Collection for School Presentation*), Tsubouchi began to express his discouragement about child drama in his personal diary. This period coincided with the mass media’s frequent reference to Kuzuryu’s showy charity performances.

Another factor in Tsubouchi’s loss of interest in child drama was that he had placed himself into a corner by contradicting his own original concept in order to make adjustments in response to deviant school drama activities like those of Kuzuryu. Although he attempted to return to his original child drama concept by creating short, age-appropriate plays with a small number of roles for children in *Kateiyo Jidogeki Dai San Shu* (*Child Drama for Domestic Presentation III*), his original enthusiasm was lost. By the time *Kateiyo Jidogeki Dai San Shu* was published in July, he had already withdrawn from child drama activity including his demonstrational performances in the Kyushu area (September 27 - October 15). They were, instead, directed by one of his students, Toshitaka Furukawa under the publicity, “Child Drama Performance with Dr. Tsubouchi’s direct advice” (Date and Omura 20).

Heightened surveillance by the government was another major ramification of the Kuzuryu development. It was reported that the Educational Section of Tokyo City Office had been “accused by the Ministry of Education of not having imposed strict control over these Kuzuryu productions and it [the Tokyo City Office] was ordered by the Ministry of Education to conduct an investigation on this case” (“Kogyoteki na

Gakkogeki”). The pressure from the Ministry of Education reinforced the Tokyo Office's attitude on school drama, making it hypersensitive to drama's public nature. In the April issue of *Geijutsu Kyoiku*, the Chief of the Educational Section of Tokyo criticized the Kuzuryu School for its lack of proper student management and poorly equipped educational facilities compared to its drama activity and well-built performing auditoriums. Chief Kondo announced, “From now on, we intend to ban this kind of [academically unbalanced] activity aggressively whether it be a girls' school or elementary school” (qtd. in Kido).

Thus, Kuzuryu's performances at the Teikoku Hotel had provided a significant stimulus to the government's aggressive intervention in public open performances. Consequently, more relentless and indiscriminate interventions followed no matter how much educational significance the schools claimed.

For example, the Takinogawa Elementary School, led by Principal Kikujiro Yamazaki, held an open performance at the Banzai Movie Theatre on February 20.<sup>16</sup> Yamazaki was preparing this performance for the purpose of demonstrating to other teachers and parents the result of his experimental drama classes with the school's fifth graders. According to an interview in *the Tokyo Asahi Newspaper*, Yamazaki had based the dramatic sketches on the school textbook and everything from sets to props had been made manually by teachers and students (“Shogakko ga Kamoku nishite Shibai wo Oshieru”). Another article reported that admission was free and “every child was dressed in a daily kimono” (“Subarashii Gakkogeki no Makuaki”). Thus, other than its publicly open nature, the performance seemed simple, serious and well prepared, even utilizing the school textbook.

Nevertheless, Yamazaki was summoned both to the Tokyo City office and the Ministry of Education and given a verbal warning. The interrogation he and his colleagues received at the Educational Section included the question: “Why did you present the performance in public to parents and specialists without confining it to children?” (Kido 221). Here the Educational Section is seen to be sensitive specifically to its publicly open nature.

It is clear that the government had identified the effect of open performance with the act of entertainment, of catering to the stranger

audience whose attitude was regarded counter to the attitude of “sincerity and seriousness”. Confronted with a tacit threat from the Ministry of Education, Yamazaki shifted his pedagogical direction and discarded drama activity.<sup>17</sup>

Having witnessed both Kuzuryu’s and Yamazaki’s cases, Teikoku Kyoiku Kai (Imperial Education Committee) and Geijutsu Kyoiku Kai (Art Education Committee) held the Geijutsu Kyoiku Taikai (Art Education Conference) at Ueno Jiji Kaikan Hall for three days in May 1924 after several months delay due to the earthquake. Entaro Noguchi reported that the 275 participants were from all over Japan and mainly consisted of elementary school teachers involved in art education (Noguchi, “Hokoku”). According to *Geijutsu to Kyoiku (Art and Education)*, “the main agenda was the issue of school drama” (qtd. in Kido 212).

For three days, heated discussions continued among the participants. According to the discussion report in *Geijutsu to Kyoiku*, the school drama committee after much discussion came up with a set of resolutions.<sup>18</sup> It is impressive that the resolutions reiterated much of what Tsubouchi previously had proposed in his *Jidokyoiku to Engeki (Child Education and Drama)*. Directives such as the simple rendering of the stage with suggested costumes as opposed to realistic renderings, and warnings against drama’s tendency to “provoke children’s self-conceit and decorating the stage with showy elements” had been the main pillars of Tsubouchi’s Child Drama Concept. It is worth noting that the committee had resorted to Tsubouchi’s original child drama concept in its desperate appeal to the government.

Unfortunately, the work of the conference came too late. Despite their efforts, when a conservative Minister of Education, Ryohei Okada, was assigned in June 1924, he reinforced government intervention in an even more direct way. In August, he gave discretionary instructions on educational administration at a governors’ conference. Regarding the issue of school drama he stated:

… Dramatic instinct in each child should be acknowledged and the manifestation of the instinct at such occasions as family gatherings and pastimes should not necessarily be reproached. Nevertheless, it is without doubt that children should never be allowed to cater to public’s entertainment pleasure engaged in drama-like business with

makeup and disguise especially in the school settings, because it is a revolt against the nation's spirit of "Shitsujitsu Goken," (austerity and hardihood). It is strongly requested that each school authority be extremely thoughtful about this issue ("Monsou no Kunji Enzetsu" 32-33)

Following this statement, an official notification was issued by the Vice-Minister of Education to principals of the public schools. It was a reinforcement of Minister Okada's warning against "drama-like activities with makeup and disguise," requesting the principals to assert further control. Okada's instruction and this official notification make up what is generally acknowledged as "the School Drama Ban" of the Taisho Era. As Hiroyuki Tomita contended, "Although they [both the instruction and the notification] never used the word 'to ban,' they certainly had an effect of banning the school drama" (*Nihon Jido Engeki Shi* 136).

Many teachers and journalists expressed their objections to Minister Okada's action and brought forth counter arguments in several journals and newspapers. The October issue of *Geijutsu Kyoiku* (*Art Education Journal*) featured this topic under the title, "Gakkogeki wa Shitsujitsu Goken no Kifu ni Hansuruka" (Does School Drama Really Vandalize the Ethos of Austerity and Hardihood?) (43-59).

At the beginning of the journal issue, Minister Okada explained the intention behind his notification under the title, "Zettaini Kinshi Shitawake dewa nai" (I Never Meant to Ban [the School Drama]), wherein he maintained that he "never banned the whole school drama but only targeted the school drama that was carried too far" (43-44). Surveying both Okada's June instruction and the September notification from the Vice-Minister of Education, it is notable that in response to teachers' attempts to propose reconciliatory ground with the government using Tsubouchi's principles and concerns, Okada used Tsubouchi's language and rhetoric as the reason for his instruction.

Acknowledging children's dramatic instinct and approving of its manifestation within the private environment, Okada still criticized school drama's frivolity with its elements such as makeup and costumes. Tsubouchi's child drama concept was utilized and interpreted from both teachers' and government's sides as evidence to support their opposing goals.



Many prominent advocates of school drama criticized the Minister's ambiguous wording of his instruction.<sup>19</sup> But among protests and denunciations by school teachers and other intellectuals, Tsubouchi actually supported the Minister Okada's instruction. It was an opportunity for him to clarify his disapproval of the status quo of the contemporary treatment of child drama, as well as to reclaim his original concept that had disintegrated under his desperate adjustments. On August 11, 1924, Tsubouchi contended that Minister Okada's instruction was correct: "...I do not approve of today's school drama in this country. In child drama, children need not be powdered or be exposed in public... Since these elements embrace much harmful effect, I take the Minister's decision as quite natural and rightful" ("Watashi wa Monsono Kunji wa Touzenno Kototo Omou")

Inevitably, Tsubouchi's endorsement of Minister Okada's attitude reinforced school principals' careful and nervous policy toward their school's dramatic activities. Thus, Tsubouchi had to reap what he had sown. While he was the initiator of school drama, he ended up becoming an advocate of the government's School Drama Ban Policy.

Clearly, there were many complicated conditions and obstacles, both accidental and inevitable, that hampered the smooth promotion of school drama. Taisho School Drama Trend was ended by governmental intervention; however, during the trend, many important concepts were openly and enthusiastically discussed and disputed among the government, teachers and critics like Tsubouchi.

One school teacher, Shimoda introduced an impression on the Taisho Era's school drama as narrated by his fellow researcher of the past school drama theories, Mr. Kato: "Researching [the theories and discussion on] school drama at its prime in the Taisho Era, it seems that every issue on child drama we discuss and study today has already been thoroughly thrashed out during that period" (qtd. in Shimoda, "Gakkogeki no Hensen" 413).

It is indeed true that some of the issues hold true even today and remain unsettled. Consequently, I believe that it is imperative that we take a closer look at both Tsubouchi's experience and the content of the discussions and disputes of his time related to the school drama trend, and listen closely to their voices so we can build constructive views upon these issues for our child drama activity both at present and in the future.

- 
- <sup>1</sup> For example, in 1907 issue of *Jokan*, a women's magazine in the Meiji Era, tableau vivant was actually referred as "the business of prostitutes" that are most likely staged in the pleasure quarter (Terao 79).
- <sup>2</sup> For the detailed formation process of Tsubouchi's child drama concept, refer to Fujikura "Cultural Assimilation".
- <sup>3</sup> For further discussion, refer to Fujikura "Between Theory and Practice"
- <sup>4</sup> The Seijo Elementary School was, in many ways, a protected environment; not only was it less affected by the government because it was a private school, but also the principal, Sawayanagi, was a former Minister of Education and a strong advocate of Taisho New Education. Sawayanagi encouraged Obara to pursue his ideal for drama education.
- <sup>5</sup> For an example of these controversial school plays, refer to Fujikura, "Reevaluation" Chapter II.
- <sup>6</sup> See Fujikura, "Between Theory" 79.
- <sup>7</sup> These English names, The Committee for Art Education and The Art Education Association, are my translation for the sake of distinguishing the two groups.
- <sup>8</sup> Kurahashi was a teacher at the Tokyo Joshi Koutou Shiha Gakko (Tokyo Girls' Higher Normal School) and at the same time known as the leading authority of kindergarten education. He was the founder of preschool education and an editor of *Yojino Kyoiku (Preschool Education)*.
- <sup>9</sup> For details, refer to Fujikura, "Reevaluation" 164-5.
- <sup>10</sup> For the details of their discussion, refer to Fujikura, "Reevaluation" 165-9.
- <sup>11</sup> For this discussion, see Fujikura, "Reevaluation" 168-170.
- <sup>12</sup> Shimoda was one of the founding members of Geijutsu Kyoikukai (Art Education Committee). He also translated Finlay-Johnson's *Dramatic Method of Teaching*.
- <sup>13</sup> For the content of the complaints the Office had received from parents of the school children, refer to Narita 10.
- <sup>14</sup> For the titles of the six stories in *Gakkoyo Sho Kyakuhon*, refer to Fujikura, "Reevaluation" 189.
- <sup>15</sup> For the details of these newspaper articles, refer to Fujikura, "Reevaluation" 193-4.
- <sup>16</sup> Since many of the public schools did not have a large auditorium appropriate in size, it was not unusual to hold gakugeikai in this kind of movie theatre.
- <sup>17</sup> For the detailed report of Yamazaki's visit to the Ministry of Education, see Kido 219-222.
- <sup>18</sup> For the details of the resolution see Fujikura "Reevaluation" 197-9.
- <sup>19</sup> For the details of their contention, see "Gakkogeki wa Shitujitsu Goken no Kifu ni Hansuruka" 43-59.

### Bibliography

Aoki, Seishiro. "Jidogeki to Jido" [Child Drama and Children]. *Shakai to Kyoka [Society and Edification]* 3. 4. (1923): 48-53.

- “Buyo no Tensai toshite Shokubou Sareru Ishigaya Takeko san – Imadewa Jibunde Furitsuke Mademosuru” [Ishigawa Takeko, A Promising Genius Dancer – Now She Even Takes Charge of Choreography]. *Yomiuri Newspaper* 1 Mar. 1923: 4.
- Chiba, Haruo. “Subeteni Jinsei no Haikei wo Egaite” [Always Depicting Real Life in the Background]. *Kyoiku No Seiki* [*The Century of Education*] 2.6. (1924): 12-17.
- Date, Minoru, and Hiroyoshi Omura. “Kateiyo Jidogeki Oyobi Peijent Joen Tenmatsu” [Record of Child Drama for Domestic Presentation and the Pageant Performances]. *Shoyo Senshu* [*Shoyo Anthology*] Vol.9. Supplement. Tokyo: Shunyodo, 1926. Supplement 1-32.
- “Doyo Geki Taikai” [On Fairy Tale Drama Concert]. *Geijutsu Kyoiku* [*Art Education Journal*]. May (1923). 22.
- Fujikura, Takeo. “Between Theory and Practice: Contradictions and Substantial Effects of Shoyo Tsubouchi’s Child Drama.” *Youth Theatre Journal* 24 No. 1 (2010):77-95.
- . “Cultural Assimilation of American Child Drama Concept by Shoyo Tsubouchi: The Formation Process of the First Treatise on Child Drama in Japan.” *Waseda Global Forum* No. 6 (2010): 75-106.
- . “Reevaluation of the Effects of Shoyo Tsubouchi’s Theory of Child Drama: Child Drama for Domestic Presentation.” Ph. D. diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison. 2006.
- “Gakkogeki no Mondai” [An Issue of School Drama]. *Kyoiku Jiron* [*Educational Review*] Vol. 1375 (1923): 1.
- “Gakkogeki no Mondai” [An Issue of School Drama]. *Geijutsu Kyoiku* [*Art Education Journal*] June (1923): 26-27.
- “Gakkogeki wa Shitsujitsu Goken no Kifu ni Hansuruka” [Does School Drama Really Vandalize the Ethos of Austerity and Hardihood?]. *Geijutsu Kyoiku* [*Art Education Journal*] Oct. (1924): 43-59.
- Hattori, Yukio, Tetsunosuke Tomita, and Tamotsu Hirose, eds. *Kabuki Jiten* [*Kabuki Encyclopedia*]. Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1983.
- Ichikawa, Genzo. “Ni Jouken ga Soroeba” [The Two Conditions]. *Tokyo Nichi Nichi Magazine* no. 40, 26 Dec. 1922. 2.
- “Jogakusei no Kageki- Asakusa Atarino yori Minna Ojoku” [Operetta by Students at Girls’ School- They Are More Skilled Than Those of Asakusa]. *Yomiuri Newspaper* 25 Oct. 1921: 5.
- Kido, Wakao. “Gakko Geki Kinshi Kunrei no Zengo” [The Before and After the School Drama Ban]. *Taisho Jidai no Kyoiku Jyanarizumu* [*Educational Journalism in the Taisho Era*]. Tokyo: Tamagawa Daigaku Shuppanbu, 1985. 211-226.
- “Kogyoteki na Gakkogeki wo Genjuni Torishimaru Hoshin de Zenkoku Jogakko ni Kunrei” [An Official Instruction Given to Girls’ School Throughout the Country Imposing Strict Controls Over School Drama in Public]. *Yomiuri Newspaper* 7 Mar. 1924: 5.
- Komatsubara, Eitaro. “Gakko Fuki Torishimari Kunrei” [An Official Instruction for

- School Moral Order] . qtd. in *Tokyo Asahi Newspaper* 16 Jan. 1909: 3.
- Koyama, Shizuko. *Kodomotachi no Kindai: Gakko Kyoiku to Katei Kyoiku [Modern Age for Children: School Education and Home Education]*. Rekishi Bunka Raiburari 143. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kobunkan, 2002.
- Kurahashi, Sozo. "Butai ni Tataseru Kotowa Kodomono Tameni Warui – Hantairon wo Teijishita Tachiba Kara..." [Participation in Public Open Performance Is Harmful to Children – From An Opposing Position]. *Tokyo Nichi Nichi Magazine* no. 40, 26 Nov. 1922. 2.
- Monbusho Shakai Kyoiku Kenkyukai [the Social Education Study Group of the Ministry of Education] , ed. "Gakko Geki ni Kansuru Iken" [Opinions on School Drama]. *Shakai to Kyoka [Society and Edification]* 3.4. (1923): 43-47.
- "Monsou no Kunji Enzetsu" [Instruction by the Minister of Education]. *Kyoiku Jiron [Educational Review]* Vol. 1410. (1924): 32-33.
- Nagao, Minoru. "Gakkogeki no Mokuteki" [The Goal of School Drama]. *Geijutsu Kyoiku [Art Education Journal]* May (1923): 24-31.
- Nakano, Akira. *Taisho Jiyu Kyoiku no Kenkyu [A Study of Taisho Free Education]*. Tokyo: Reimei Shobo, 1968.
- Narita, Chisato. "Korobanu Sakino Tsue" [Prevention Is Better than Cure]. *Kyoiku Jiron [Educational Review]* vol. 1375. (1923): 10.
- Nihon Gakkogeki Kyokai, ed. *Gakkogeki Jiten [School Drama Encyclopedia]*. Tokyo: Shogakukan, 1953.
- Noguchi, Entaro. "Hokoku" [Report]. *Geijutsu Kyoiku [Art Education Journal]* July (1924): 5.
- . "Shin Kyoiku to Gakko Geki" [New Education and School Drama]. *Kyoiku no Seiki [The Century of Education]* 2.6. (1924): 18-33.
- Ochiai, Sosaburo. ed. "Kuzuryu Shuga Jogakko no Engeki Katsudo" [Dramatic Activities at Kuzuryu Girls' School for Needlework Painting]. *Shonen Engeki [Youth Theatre]* Vol. 1. (1967): 30-41.
- , ed. "Obara Kuniyoshi Sensei ni Nihon no Gakkogeki no Oitachi wo Kiku" [An Interview with Mr. Kuniyoshi Obara on the Growth of School Drama in Japan]. *Shonen Engeki [Youth Theatre]* Vol. 2. (1968). 24-36.
- Shigaki, Hiroshi, et al. "Getsurei Yawa Kai- Gakkogeki wo Chushin to Shite" [Monthly Discussion – Centering on School Drama]. *Kyoiku no Seiki [The Century of Education]* 2.6. (1924): 124-133.
- Shimoda, Seishi. "Gakkogeki no Hensen to Gakkogeki no Shorai" [History of School Drama and Its Future Perspective]. *Nihon Gakkogekishu [Collection of Japanese School Drama]*. Tokyo: Kyobunsha, 1938. 413-423.
- . "Jido no Seikatsu to Gakkogeki" [Children's life and School Drama]. *Kyoiku no Seiki [The Century of Education]* 2.6. (1924): 34-44.
- Shimonaka, Yasaburo, et al. "Kodomono Shibai Gokoro" [Dramatic Spirit of Children]. *Kyoiku No Seiki [The Century of Education]* 2.6. (1924): 134-140.

- “Shogakko ga Kamoku nishite Shibai wo Oshieru” [Elementary School Teaches Drama as a Subject]. *Tokyo Asahi Newspaper* 18 Feb. 1924: 3.
- “Subarashii Gakkogeki no Makuaki” [Wonderful School Drama Opens]. *Tokyo Asahi Newspaper* 21 Feb. 1924: 2.
- Terao, Toru. “Joshi no Fuzoku ni Tsuite” [On Women’s Fashion]. *Jokan* 17. 1 (1907): 78-79.
- Tomita, Hiroyuki. *Nihon Jido Engeki Shi* [History of Children’s Theatre in Japan]. Tokyo: Tokyo Shoseki, 1976.
- Tsubouchi, Shoyo [Yuzo]. “Airashiki Shojo Kageki” [An Adorable Girls’ Operetta Company]. *Takarazuka Shojo Kageki Kyakuhonshu* [Play Collection of Takarazuka Girls’ Operetta Company] Vol. 1916. qtd. in “Takarazuka Oitachi no Ki” [The Record of the Growth of Takarazuka]. *Kobayashi Ichizo Zenshu* [Complete Works of Kobayashi Ichizo]. Tokyo: Daiyamondo Sha, 1961. 455-456.
- . “Fukkoki Geijutsu ni Kansuru Yosoku” [Prospects on the Art during the Period of Recovery]. *Waseda Bungaku* 215 (1924): 2-10. Rpt. in *Shoyo Senshu* [Shoyo Anthology] Vol. 9. Tokyo: Shunyodo, 1926. 861-872.
- . *Gakkoyo Shou Kyakuhon* [A Short Play Collection for School Presentation]. Tokyo: Waseda Daigaku Shuppanbu, 1923.
- . “Jidogeki ni Kansuru Jakkan no Gimon” [My Concerns about Contemporary Child Drama]. *Shukan Asahi* 3. 22. (1923): 3-4. Rpt. in *Shoyo Senshu* [Shoyo Anthology] Vol. 9. Tokyo: Shunyodo, 1926. 477-483.
- . “Jidogeki no Mohanjitsuen no Hitsuyou” [Need for Child Drama Demonstration]. 1924. *Shoyo Senshu* [Shoyo Anthology] Vol. 9. Tokyo: Shunyodo, 1926. 831-835.
- . “Jidogeki no Sanshurui” [Three kinds of Child Drama]. *Waseda Bungaku* 202 (1922): 2-13. Rpt. in *Shoyo Senshu* [Shoyo Anthology] Vol. 9. Tokyo: Shunyodo, 1926. 461-475.
- . *Jidokyoiku to Engeki* [Child Education and Drama] Tokyo: Waseda Daigaku Shuppanbu, 1923. Rpt. by Koguma Sha, 1975.
- . “Jissaijo kara Mita Jidogeki” [Child Drama on Actual Stage] (1923). *Shoyo Senshu* [Shoyo Anthology] Vol. 9. Tokyo: Shunyodo, 1926. 809-822.
- . *Kateiyo Jidogeki Dai Ni Shu* [Child Drama for Domestic Presentation II]. Tokyo: Waseda Daigaku Shuppanbu, 1923.
- . *Kateiyo Jidogeki Dai San Shu* [Child Drama for Domestic Presentation III] Tokyo: Waseda Daigaku Shuppanbu, 1924.
- . “Kateiyo no Jidogeki wo Gekijo de Joen Sasuru Riyu” [The Reasons for Presenting the Child Drama for Domestic Presentation on Public Stages] *Tokyo Asahi Shinbun* Getsuyou Furoku [Tokyo Asahi Newspaper Monday Supplement Page]. Tokyo, 4 June 1923. 1.
- . “Nanigotomo Omotoshite Yonenki Kara” [Everything Should Start at Infancy]. *Geki to Sonota* [Drama and Et Cetera] Soukango [Inaugural issue] (1924): 2-6.

---. "Watashi wa Monsono Kunji wa Touzenno Kototo Omou" [I Take the Minister's Instruction as a Quite Rightful One]. *Yomiuri Newspaper* 11 Aug. 1924: 7.

Yamamoto, Nobuyoshi, and Toshihiko Konno. *Kindai Kyoiku no Tennosei Ideorogi: Meiji Gakko Gyoji no Kosatsu* [Ideology of the Emperor-System in the Modern Education System: A Study of School Activities in the Meiji Era]. Tokyo: Shinsensha, 1973.

---. *Taisho Showa Kyoiku no Tennosei Ideorogi Vol. 2: Gakko Gyoji no Gunjiteki, Gijijichiteki Seikaku* [Ideology of the Emperor-System in Education System in the Taisho and Showa Era Vol. 2: Militaristic and Pseudo-autonomous Characteristics of the School Activities]. Tokyo: Shinsensha, 1977.

"Zappou" [Miscellaneous]. *Geijutsu Kyoiku* [Art Education Journal] May 1923: 103.