Introduction

When Kanō Jigorō in 1882 created Kōdōkan jūdō his intent by all means was to foster a progressive and complete form of physical and mental education. Oda Jōin formulated it as follows:

“Jūdō is the most effective way to use the power of the mind and body. Its training cultivates the body and spirit through the practice of attack and defence; the essence of this principled moral code (or “path”) is learning through self-awareness. Therefore, jūdō was innovated so that the ultimate objective is to perfect oneself and benefit from life. In summary, jūdō is the most effective way of using the mind and body for the benefit of oneself and others.” (...)[1]

Kanō-shihan was primarily an educator, someone striving to develop high moral principles in his students. Kanō’s first and most extensive book, published in 1911 [2], contrary to what many believe was not about jūdō, but precisely about such moral education. It was entitled Seinen shūyō kun (青 年 修養 訓) [The teaching of young man’s moral self-improvement] (Figure 1). Education is a long process and should start early in life, and self-education should remain one’s life-long mission. It is Kōdōkan jūdō which would become Kanō’s most unique and important tool for achieving...
this education [3,4]. Many articles and transcripts of lectures have survived which show that Kanō believed that *jūdō* was useful for education early in life. However, few such writings have survived that specifically detail how *jūdō* instruction to children should be different from adults, if at all. Much of Kanō’s work in *jūdō* during the *Taishō* (1912-1926) and *Shōwa* (from 1926 to Kanō’s passing in 1938) periods, was devoted to his project of having *jūdō* approved and accepted as the national system of physical and mental education in Japanese schools [5-9].

The purpose of the present paper is to examine Kanō Jigorō’s intellectual development and pedagogical conceptualization of *jūdō* as an education for children, the struggles *jūdō* would endure during his life and after his passing in achieving this goal. In addition, we examine the potential merit and place which *Shōnen jūdō-no-kata* deserves in the light of that struggle and a number of sociological and pedagogical problems which children’s *jūdō* seems to be suffering from.

Our research questions are as follows:
1. How did *jūdō* as a suitable education for children evolve in Japan?
2. Who and what contributed to Kanō’s inspiration for implementing *jūdō* as an education for children?
3. How did Western *jūdō* instruction evolve in the way it did, away from Kanō’s precious pedagogical goals?
4. How truly successful is Western *jūdō* instruction in children?
5. What is the contents of *Shōnen jūdō-no-kata* and does it have pedagogical merit within contemporary *jūdō* instruction for children?

To address these questions and achieve our purpose, we offer a critical evaluation of the educational history of *Kōdō-kan jūdō* and its pedagogical goals for children. We also examine the critical phases in Kanō’s life that significantly contributed to his views for *jūdō* as a form of pedagogy for children. This paper offers an important contribution to the existing knowledge of *jūdō* instruction for children as it was meant, and offers insight into the pedagogical problems it faces and alternative approaches. To the best of our knowledge it represents the only critical scholarly study *jūdō* instruction for children in a Japanese historic perspective, and it is the first and so far only Western paper to provide insight into and discuss *Shōnen jūdō-no-kata*.

**Popularization of *jūdō* in the West**

When *jūdō* in the early 20th century was imported into Europe and America it took a different course and its focus was on the skills it offered to obtain physical victories over another person during fighting contests. This was not much different in *jūdō* as it was taught to youngsters. When Anton Geesink spectacularly defeated some of the strongest Japanese fighters and became the first ever non-Japanese *jūdō* champion in 1961 and subsequently the first non-Japanese Olympic *jūdō* champion in 1964, *jūdō* abroad gained rapid popularity also among youngsters (Figure 2). The author of the present paper, being of European origin, vividly remembers a similar boost among French youth when Jean-Luc Rougé in 1975 became the first French World *jūdō* champion after setting aside strong Japanese and Russian contestants during the Ninth World *Jūdō* Championships in Vienna. This event started a spectacular rise in the popularity of *jūdō* in France, the only Western country so far where *jūdō* would even become the number one sport. Meanwhile a similar development had already achieved a certain status of maturity in The Netherlands. After all, despite Geesink’s retirement from *jūdō* competition in 1965, another Dutch *jūdō* superstar in the person of Willem Ruska had dom-
inated world jūdō in 1971, and especially in 1972 when he achieved unprecedented and since unrepeated doubles in the heavy-weight and open categories of both the Olympics and the European Championships during the same year!

Japanese and Western evolution towards jūdō becoming reduced to a competitive sport

Jūdō pretty much had officially become an Olympic sport at the Tōkyō Olympic Games in 1964, and Geesink’s win had sealed the international character of it. The next year that evolution was accelerated when Charles Palmer was appointed as president of the International Judo Federation (IJF), a position he would hold for the next fifteen years (1965-1979). That same year the IJF published its first set of refereeing rules, having adhered prior to that to Kōdōkan rules. This evolution significantly changed the role and position of the Kōdōkan in jūdō as its authority increasingly became replaced by the IJF.

Hamaguchi [10] points out that this change in rules in addition to how decisions were made as to who was the winner of a fight, the penalties that needed to be imposed on competitors who showed a negative or inappropriate attitude, and the creation of various weight divisions, represented significant cultural innovations that were symbolic of the switch in emphasis from education as view by Kanō through experiencing winning and losing situations (the development of rational spirit) to a sport whose object became reduced to merely competing to win medals and titles (and later also money) [11-14]. Another and more recent symptom of the deterioration of jūdō from a comprehensive form of education to a mere performance sport is the change in color of the jūdō uniform (for an overview of important changes, see [15]. Traditionally the jūdōgi as established by its founder had been white, but from 1997 onwards one of the competitors had to wear an awkward blue uniform to make it easier for spectators to distinguish between them. Hamaguchi indicates that this change is symbolic of jūdō’s adoption of sport-like characteristics. Jūdō was becoming commodified and an element of spectacle was introduced in order to satisfy the demands of spectators and television. At this point, the Kōdōkan had completely lost its hegemony and control of jūdō worldwide. As it evolved, the Kōdōkan in the eyes of the IJF was nothing but a local dōjō or institution.

Evolution towards jūdō competition in children

In the West, Geesink, Ruska and Rougé had become the idols and role models of thousands of youngsters and those days were the dawn of a golden age for new jūdōka. How-
ever, these jūdōka’s desire and understanding of jūdō was usually narrowed down to precisely that what had brought them to jūdō: an individual competitive sport just like track and field with the sole intent to win medals and become a champion. By half of the 1970s most countries had local, regional and national contests for espoirs (15-16 year olds) and cadets (12-14 year olds) (Figure 3). In the 1980s that development was expanded to contests for even younger kids, including minims and benjamins, though not without skepticism from many senior instructors and referees. However, the expansion was pushed by national federations which saw a previously unexplored dimension to increase their membership and with that, also expand their financial income. By the 1990s most of the protest had faded and contests for the youngest were common and attracted participation from most jūdō clubs with children’s divisions. Towards the later 1990s a movement was launched to haul back into competition jūdō-ka who had already retired many years earlier, which essentially meant the start of jūdō competitions for veterans. By the start of the 21st century, the complete conversion of jūdō from a mental, moral and physical education and martial way into an ordinary competitive sports like soccer and this for all ages, had become fact. It took another seven to ten years for the last technical bastion of jūdō previously unaffected by competition, namely kata, to succumb and, essentially, also be reformed into a competitive way. The introduction of financial rewards and a sharp quantitative increase in international contests (creation of Grand Slam contests as in tennis, creation of yearly instead of biannual World Championships, creation of rankings, use of Internet-media for international broadcasting of contests) led to a further commercialization of the jūdō sport at an international and federal level much to the detriment of Kanō’s goals bringing people an intellectual education.

These developments also affected the way jūdōka trained and were instructed. Talent-scouting and special jūdō competitions geared towards cadets and even younger kids became a reality [16]. Cultural settings also played a role and in countries such as the United States one may even frequently see instructors sensitize their children’s jūdō division for the importance of competition and winning medals and championship titles. Whether such a development at a young age and far removed from Kanō’s ideas of jūdō as a pedagogical instrument, leads to the desired successes either in competitive achievements or in one’s self-development remains to be seen. Nevertheless, coaching and instructors courses in many countries have attempted to address some of these concerns and educate future instructors or current instructors who may want to obtain nationally recognized formal instructor and coaching credentials. Instructor and coaching courses generally contain a module about jūdō for children [17-19]. In addition, several national jūdō federations may have a formal or less formal children’s program or guidelines for instructing children at club level including their progression throughout jūdō kyū promotion ranks [20-24]. Furthermore, several textbooks about jūdō instruction for children are commercially available [19, 25-30].

Effects of competition-oriented versus traditional Japanese jūdō instruction on children’s development and wellbeing

Popular views of jūdō instructors and federations frequently allege that practice of jūdō as a sport has many positive effects on the development of children [17,20]. These opinions seem to be driven largely by marketing concerns to increase the membership and thus also their financial income via government subsidies and membership fees. Rarely, are these views underpinned by any peer-reviewed scholarly research or verifiable and reliable sources. At the least, several critical questions may need answering [31]. For this reason a survey of the relevant scholarly literature is appropriate.

Fig. 3. A children’s jūdō contest in China, still conducted according to traditional rules and procedures, and using pre-1960s style tatami
Diamond and Lee in a paper that was published in Science examined the effect of a variety of activities on the development of executive functions in 4- to 12-year old children [32]. With the term "executive functions" Diamond & Lee refer to those activities which are often considered essential to become successful in life, and which include such abilities as: creativity, flexibility, self-control, and discipline, mentally exploring new ideas, giving considered rather than impulsive responses, and staying focused. The activities of which the effects on these factors were examined also included martial arts. The study showed that activities which addressed emotional, social, and physical development were the most effective in improving executive functions.

The authors describe how 5- to 11-years old children randomly assigned to a subject group getting instruction in Korean traditional taekwondo 跆拳道 [Korean: 태권도; modern Japanese: tekkendō て拳道; The way of the fist and foot] were found to show greater gains on cognitive (distractible vs. focused) and affective (quitting vs. persevering) qualities and on mental math (relying on working memory) than children in standard physical education class. Gains were most substantial in the oldest children (grades 4 & 5) and least for the youngest (K & Grade 1), and gains in boys outweighed those observed in girls.

When a group of adolescent juvenile delinquents was assigned to traditional taekwondo (emphasizing qualities such as respect, humility, responsibility, perseverance, honor, physical conditioning, and focusing on self-control and self-defense), this group in comparison to another group which had been assigned to modern competitive martial sports, showed less aggression and anxiety and improved in social ability and self-esteem. Conversely, those in modern competitive martial arts showed more juvenile delinquency and aggressiveness, and decreased self-esteem and social ability.

These results suggest that the effects of martial arts training may be less universally positive than generally suggested, the differential factor apparently being whether such training is competitively sports-oriented vs. traditionally pedagogically oriented.

A couple of other studies will help on finding the answers to their questions. For example, Endressen and Olweus in a 2-year longitudinal study in a sample of 477 boys, aged 11 to 13 years, investigated the relationship between participation in power or fight and strength sports (boxing, wrestling, weightlifting, and oriental martial arts) and violent and antisocial behavior [33]. They found strong suggestions that participating in power sports actually led to an increase of antisocial involvement in the form of elevated levels of violent as well as non-violent antisocial behavior outside sports. These effects were attributed to the sports and their environment, such as repeated contact with macho attitudes, norms and ideals. As there was no selection bias that would have caused such antisocial behavior to be present before the participants took up these power sports.

The martial art which Diamond and Lee looked at and which triggered much of the media interest was limited to taekwondo [32] and Endressen & Olweus looked at non-specified "oriental martial arts" [33]. The question arises whether similar such phenomena also are observed in jūdō and whether, moreover, the way jūdō is taught to children also leads to differential outcomes that may be either positive or negative in terms of social skills and mental attitudes. The majority of these studies looking at the effects of traditional martial arts on social behavior and aggression seem to have focused on so-called striking- and kicking-type of combat sports, such as karatedō and taekwondō rather than on traditional jūdō.

Reynes & Lorant in a two-year longitudinal study in young boys aged 8 years assessed the effects of jūdō and karatedō training on aggressiveness scores [34-35]. Analysis indicated that after two years of practice, karatedō training seemed to have neither positive, nor negative effects on aggressiveness scores, while jūdō training seemed to have a negative effect on anger scores. However, the results also suggest the importance of kata or meditation in training sessions on self-control acquisition in children.

Endressen & Olweus, and Reynes & Lorant, all found that jūdō training in children had negative effects on aggression and social skills [33-35]. These negative effects were particularly associated with modern competitive style martial arts training, a differentiating factor which Diamond & Lee were able to confirm also in taekwondō students [32]. Conversely, traditional oriented training in both jūdō [34,35] and taekwondō [33] exerted positive effects on aggression and social skills.

Competition and lust for fighting do exert an attraction on and motivation in Western children aged 6-14 yrs, as shown by Jánošíková, but the effects in these children, at least on social skills and psychological health, are largely negative; effects of competition on jūdō attrition seem to be different depending on their success [36]. This is no surprise, since a champion derives more motivation and satisfaction from his contests than those who lose, especially those who lose time and time again. Molinero et al. found that perception of failure is one of the major reasons for children in jūdō to quit; the other two most important reasons were having other things to do and disinclining the coach [37].

Furthermore, the individuality of jūdō as a sport too is of importance. Morano et al. observed that in case boys are overweight, they showed greater body dissatisfaction in individual sports including jūdō than in team sports [38]. This is not a surprise either as particularly in jūdō competition, one is divided in weight classes and thus is continuously being confronted with one’s weight and weight issues is particular if failing to make weight of having to cut weight. When competition involves top-contests, the overall problems become even more outspoken. For example, Kristiansen and Roberts showed that at high level competition, such as for example the Youth Olympics, adolescent judōka aged 14-17 years experienced further negative psychological effects in the form of competitive stressors because of the size and importance of the competition, and because of organizational stressors (e.g., housing, lining up for food, and transportation) exacerbated by unfamiliarity with foreign locations, culture and environmental
circumstances such as heat [39]. In addition, elite competitive experiences were often overwhelming for some of the more ‘inexperienced’ athletes, who attempted to use cognitive coping strategies in addition to relying on different types of social support.

Positive effects of jūdō practice were found by Lamarre and Nosanchuk [40]. Using a cross-sectional design in a group of 51 jūdō students they found that aggressiveness declined across training and ages, with gender not having any effect. However, their study did not specifically focus on such development in children. Others, such as Daniels et al., previously had suggested that length of training was critical with beginners attracted to martial arts being more hostile, but that hostility declining with the duration of training [41]. The positive effect of traditional jūdō pedagogy was also illustrated by Fleisher et al. in pre-delinquent Hispanic immigrant early adolescents, who found that children after a one-year jūdō instruction program which emphasized self-discipline and self-control and avoided competitive fighting, had significantly improved in academic achievement and social behavior [42].

These findings from several scientific studies on jūdō and children prompt questions regarding the pedagogical value and psycho-social effects in children, especially with regard to the often diametrically opposed populist views distributed in jūdō federations’ children’s programs or expressed in sports magazines and even in jūdō instructors courses in support of jūdō contests for children. That does not mean that jūdō or martial arts practice, whether competitive or otherwise, have only outspoken negative aspects on children’s development. For example, when it comes to anthropometric, motor abilities or physiological parameters boys aged 11-15 years had better performance than sedentary children [43], and similar positive motor, physical and physiological effects in healthy children [44] and in children with mental disabilities [45-47] were reported by a few other studies, but the same findings would likely apply to any type of sport.

Obviously these studies are not without limitations. For example, doubts have been raised about the validity of self-composed questionnaires and an absence of specifying which type of guidance used within the selected power sports. Another problem is that some studies are not specifically about jūdō but contain or even mix several martial arts [48]. However, the increased aggression reported in young martial arts practitioners parallels what some authors have found in adults [49]; the finding is not really surprising, and reflected in young participants today also becoming increasingly involved in harder martial arts, such as mixed martial arts (MMA) and Thai boxing, a trend clearly visible in Thailand, where children aged between five and nine take part in Thai boxing and become professional fights at around 12 to 14 years old [48].

Since the studies reported above are all Western studies with Western subjects whilst jūdō represents a Japanese form of pedagogy, a logical starting point to investigate the jūdō pedagogy that is adhered to by most Western instructors and taught in instructors courses.

A survey of instructor qualifications course material from several countries (Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, UK) shows that Western instructors and authors who have written about teaching jūdō to children, generally hold the view that there are two approaches: the Japanese and the Western approach [22]. This view seems to suggest the existence of a single, well-defined model to which Japanese dōjō would subscribe in teaching children. However, few of these instructors have either done jūdō internships with children in Japan, read Japanese, or in their eventual written syllabi reflect having any in-depth knowledge whatsoever of Japanese resources and jūdō-pedagogical key texts. Consequently, one has a hard time finding a description of what this supposed “Japanese model of teaching children” precisely would entail (see also [22]).

Even the Western jūdō teaching systems used in children oftentimes are not all the same though one often notices the presence of games, games that in themselves are not jūdō but are purported to support the development of jūdō skills. These games generally involve competition and rely on physical and/or motor skills. Whilst these Western approaches are relatively well known through the many Western books and federation programs, and through distribution in most Western clubs, the Japanese approaches are far less well known. Frequently in the West the understanding about the Japanese approach to children’s jūdō, seems to revolve around the impression of a system that supposedly is harsh, unpedagogical, unfriendly, and almost robotic. These impressions where even strengthened when last year a rare report about jūdō and children in Japan hit the international news media. This happened in relationship to two events. In one of them, Nagahiro et al. [50] reported 30 cases of severe head injuries in children (average age was 16.5 years) occurring between 2003 and 2010 and leading to fifteen fatalities and seven patients entering a permanent vegetative state. The medical cause usually was an acute subdural hematoma associated with avulsion of a cerebral bridging vein. The other event occurred when several October 2011 newspaper articles quoted Uchida Ryō 内田良, an associate professor at Nagoya University Graduate School of Education and Human Development, who reported that at least 114 deaths would have occurred in children during jūdō practice in Japan between 1983 and 2010 at schools alone (Figure 4). While these numbers sent a shockwave through the international news media, one has to consider that the jūdō population in Japan, especially in children, is much higher than in any other country, and that there exist no universally established international registers that would allow comparing incidence between several countries. Consequently, while the absolute number of such injuries in Japan seems high, it is not known at all whether the number of serious jūdō accidents in children in the West really would be lower in a sample of similar size or per number of units in time that children are exposed to jūdō.
Historic attempts to make *jūjutsu* and *kendō* part of school education in Japan

The writings of Kanō specifically about *jūdō* for children, as a special population group are poorly known in the West, and to some extent, also in Japan. Kanō mostly writes about *jūdō* and children in relation to physical education and *jūdō* in schools [3,4]. This is no surprise. Kanō was born in 1860 and was very interested in pedagogy. In 1872, when he was 12 years old, the Japanese government introduced a new educational system that would enable all Japanese people to obtain education. This new, thus pre-Kanō education already focused on the threefold objective of academic education, moral education, and physical education. The physical education component was, however, based on Western gymnastics, which also explains Kanō’s later lifelong and strong commitment to replace this by a Japanese-based physical education. In the late 19th century among a wave of growing nationalism the time was ripe for any idea that would replace Western influx by traditional Japanese values [12,13,51-53]. Kanō was not the only one to support this idea. There were others, and certainly among those with links to the *Dai Nippon Butokukai* 大日本武徳会 [Great Japan Martial Virtues] in Kyōto [54].

The Japanese Ministry of Education on May 5th of 1883 even ordered a formal report (*Kenjutsu *jūjutsu* tō kyōiku jō rigai tekihi chōsa* 剣術柔術 教育 利害手引調査) to look into the feasibility to replace the Western-based physical education by a Japanese *bujutsu*-based alternative. Tasked with carrying out the necessary research and recommendations was a committee composed of members of the *Taisō Denshō* 体操伝習所 [Institute of Gymnastics, later part of Tsukuba University] consisting of Hisatomi Tetsutarō 久富鐵太郎, Shibukawa Hangorō Tamakichi 渋川伴五郎 (1866-1924, and 8th *Sōke* 宗家 [Head of family] of *Shibukawa-ryū*), Tomita Masanao, and joined Miyake Hi'izu (Shigeru) 三宅秀 (1848-1938; Dean of the Department of Medicine at Tōkyō Imperial University), and German internist and anthropologist Erwin Bälz (1849-1913) (who 11 years before had fulfilled a 2-year guest-professorship at Tōkyō Imperial University and became a personal physician to the *Meiji* emperor) [55], and Julius K. Scriba (1848-1905; also a physician with an appointment at the same university).


---

1. According to Niehaus, Bälz has often in *jūdō* literature been linked to Kanō or identified as a major influence, something that according to Niehaus is an exaggeration. Bälz did take kyūdō 弓道 [archery] and *kenjutsu* 剣術 [art of the sword], but his direct link to *jūdō* is very limited.
The Committee apparently on October 13th 1884 arrived at the following conclusions, though these findings were not published until July 1890:

**Merits:**
- Contributes to the development of children’s bodies
- It cultivates physical endurance
- Enjoy good spirit and mental health
- A weak demeanor disappears and is replace by valorous composition

**Negative considerations:**
- Sometimes the development of children’s bodies appears not consistent and positive
- Practice also entails some danger
- Control of movements is difficult hence why both strong and weak children seem to exaggerate
- Children become easily excited and consequently may exhibit a behavior characterized by a wild attitude
- They become easily competitive and show a tendency to win at all costs
- The emphasis of competition is disadvantageous since it encourages an attitude only interested in victory and defeat
- Every single person must be supervised, which makes it difficult to adequately supervise large groups at once
- During classes they need to make use of an excessively large space
- In jūjutsu one uses only practice clothes, but in kendō one requires further practice equipment. It is doubtful that the student will be committed to keep his practice clothes, in particular the additional equipment clear and hygienic

Based on these findings, the Committee completed concluded that it would be inappropriate at that time to accept jūjutsu and kendō (or gekiken 撃剣 [fencing]) as part of the mandatory school curriculum. However, the suggestion was made that with some modification these disciplines might offer useful contributions to physical education [56].

In August 1882 Kanō had started working as a Lecturer 4th Class (kyūjuho 教授補) in politics and economy at the Gakushūin 学習院 or Peers School, a government school under jurisdiction of the Kunaichō 宮内庁 [Imperial Household Agency], with entry now open to children from outside the ranks of the nobility as well. However, Kanō gave up the position in 1883, to move to Komaba Nōgakkō 駒場農學校 [Komaba Agricultural College, now Tōkyō Agricultural University] to teach economy (Rizaigaku Kyōju 理財学教授 [Professor of economics]).

In April 1885 though, he returned to Gakushūin to become the new principal in succession of Lt. Gen. Tani Tateki 谷干城 who had been asked to become the new Minister of Agriculture⁴.

In January 1889 Kanō left there to become a civil servant at the Ministry of Education. It is unclear if Kanō actually resigned or was fired from the Gakushūin, but fact is that he collided with Lt. General Miura Gorō 三浦梧楼 (1846-1926), his successor who was brought in. Miura saw education in a rather strict and militaristic way, and wanted education to privilege especially descendants from military families, whereas Kanō viewed education as intellect- and merit-based irrespective of background.

**External foreign and Japanese influences on the development of Kanō’s educational views**

In August 1891, after just seven months at the Ministry of Education, Kanō accepted the position of Dean at the Fifth Higher Normal School (today’s Kumamoto University 熊本大学). It was there that Kanō met P. Lafcadio Hearn (1850-1904), who also went by the Japanese name of Koizumi Yakumo 小泉八雲. Hearn was a Westerner born in Lefkada (Λευκάδα, Greece [hence his derived unusual first name ‘Lafcadio’) to a Greek woman and an Irish Sergeant-Major, who was stationed there during the British occupation. Hearn was taken to Dublin, Ireland, when he was two years old, but when he was 19 emigrated to Cincinnati, OH, in the U.S. He was a talented writer and worked as a journalist specializing in writing about criminal cases. However, he certainly was also a nonconventional libertarian. After spending the first years of his life being raised in a Greek Orthodox environment, he then grew up in the protestant surroundings of his father, but attended a Roman Catholic school as an adolescent. In Cincinnati during a time when racial segregation was still absolute Hearn, who was Caucasian, ignored social conventions by marrying an African-American woman, an act that was even still illegal in the 1870s⁵. Consequently, Hearn became socially isolated and was promptly fired from his job for refusing to give in to the conservative white establishment.

His marriage only survived a couple of years and in 1877 he divorced his wife for unknown reasons. Hearn then moved to New Orleans, LA, a predominantly black environment. It is there that Hearn further developed himself as a published writer. After spending from 1887-1889 in Martinique as foreign correspondent for a New Orleans newspaper, he relocated to Japan in 1890. It is there that he married a Japanese woman

---

1 As to precisely which schools were involved, there is some contradiction between the data provided in Bennett and Niehaus.
2 Kōdōkan publications typically exaggerate Kanō’s credentials and usually say that Kanō became a ‘pro-fessor’, which would have been a considerably higher academic rank.
3 Note: It is this appointment from 1885 that has given rise to the Kōdōkan myth of Kanō being awarded a doc-torate and supposedly becoming ‘Dr. Kanō’; in reality Gakushūin, today’s Gakushūin University 学習院大学 in those days never had the authority to award any doctorates, nor did the doctoral degree system even exist in Japan in those days; in other words and in reality, Kanō became a professor without holding a prior doctorate.
4 Slavery in Ohio had been abolished by the State’s 1902 Constitution, but segregation and Black exclusion laws remained in existence much longer.
5 In those days never had the authority to award any doctorates, nor did the doctoral degree system even exist in Japan in those days; in other words and in reality, Kanō became a professor without holding a prior doctorate.
by name of Koizumi Setsu 小泉セツ, and adopted her surname as his Japanese name and became Koizumi Yakumo 小泉八雲. It is there that Hearn in late 1891 ended up in a teaching position in Kumamoto, Kyūshū, at the Fifth Higher Middle School, the school where Kanō had just become the new principal. Hearn must have been a fascinating figure due to his international experience and unconventional life, and it is assumed that he and his experiences and views must have been of great influence on Kanō's developing educational vision.

It was said by the Japanese of the time that all the foreigners in Japan Hearn had the greatest knowledge of Japanese culture as shown in his works Kokoro [Heart], Kaidan [Ghostly stories] and others. He is said to be the first non-Japanese to write about jūdō in his book Out of the East. In this book he describes Kanō Jigorō running a jūdō class and the impression it made on him. Hearn was much attracted by the idea of jū 柔 which may have coincided with his pacifist views and how it could overcome brute force. Many Western jūdōka subsequently followed him in this without understanding or even knowing about its Chinese Taoist origins or applications.

Hearn was also attracted by the ideas of Herbert Spencer who along with Darwin (the same one who coined the phrase “the survival of the fittest”) was an English evolutionary philosopher, much in vogue at the time, who later became rather unfashionable. Spencer held that evolution was a one-way street to perfection and that if all strived for perfection we would end up in a perfect world. A main criticism to this view is that unfortunately people sometimes can and do turn out badly and engage in evil things. Kanō may very well have gained interest in Spencer through the influence of Hearn. In any case, one cannot but note the appearance of the words ‘perfection’ and ‘evolution’ later at the occasion of the establishment of the Kōdōkan Bunka-kai [Cultural Association] of 1922, terms that seem to invoke Spencer’s and Darwin’s inspiration.

After Kanō had left the Gakushūin following his conflict with its new principal Lt. General Miura Gorō 三浦梧楼, in August 1889 on order or through involvement of the Kunai-chō 宮内庁 [Imperial Household Agency] he was ordered to make a sixteen-month study journey to Europe. Consequently, Kanō left from Yokohama on September 13th, 1889 and arrived in Marseilles almost a month later on October 15th. In Paris Kanō met the French educator and later (1927) Nobel Peace Prize winner Ferdinand E. Buisson (1841-1932). Buisson was known as a pacifist, radical socialist, and antlerical. After a career with many hiccups due to his outspoken political views he became Inspector of Primary Education in the Third Republic. Once more, his political engagement caused him to be accused in the National Assembly for slandering the Bible and was finally forced to resign from his position. However, in August 1878 under a new government Buisson returned, this time even in a higher position, as the Inspector General of Primary Education in France, and the following year he was promoted to Director of Primary Education, which he would remain for 17 years. One notes that this position was somewhat equivalent to the position Kanō would hold when he visited Buisson. In 1896 after having completed a Doctorate in Literature, Buisson became a professor of education at the Sorbonne (present day Université Paris-Sorbonne [Paris IV]). Buisson likely was of considerable influence on Kanō’s educational views and developing pacifism.

During his time in Paris, Kanō apparently also attended the lectures of Octave Gréard (1828-1904) at the Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques [Academy of Moral Sciences and Politics], where the latter was a professor and vice-rector. Gréard was largely responsible for the creation of lyceums (upper secondary schools) for girls in France and for completely revamping the French secondary school Bacca-lauréat. His major importance on French education led to him becoming a member of the Académie française. Gréard is another figure that has largely been written out of Kōdōkan-published writings about Kanō, and likely also was of considerable effect on Kanō’s own ideas of educational reform and girls’ education in times that this was not considered evident. After spending several months in Paris, Kanō moved on to Berlin and other major cities in Austria, Belgium, Denmark, England, Netherlands, Russia, and Switzerland to complete his 16-month visit. Kanō spent most of his time having meetings with educators, educational reformers, education officials, ambassadors and notables.

On Kanō’s return to Japan in January 1891 he was sent to Kumamoto on the southern island of Kyūshū. There, he was appointed headmaster of the Kumamoto High school (1891-1893). This was first regarded as a retrograde step by Kanō in the light of his previous position at the Gakushūin. However, his energy and vigor soon took the better of him and it was not long before he was pushing to promote a new Imperial university in Kyūshū.

Kanō himself left his position at the Kumamoto Fifth Higher Middle School about seven years later and in January 1898 he became a civil servant holding the position of National Director of Primary Education at the Ministry of Education.

**Developments towards jūdō instead of jūjutsu/kendō becoming part of the educational system in Japan**

Following the October 1884 negative advice from the Committee appointed by the Japanese Ministry of Education to implement kendō and jūjutsu as a replacement of Western-style physical education in the Japanese school education system, the same topic was revisited several times during the following years by a variety of committees. On February 7th of 1905 finally a parliamentary motion was submitted to make martial arts part of the school curriculum, but it would take until 1908 before a final motion or approval was agreed upon. During these years Kanō heavily lobbied via personal meetings with principals of all schools in Tōkyō to make them
favorable towards the idea of getting budo to become part of school curricula. Only on July 31st, 1911 through article 13 of the Chūgakkōrei shikō kisoku kaisei 中学校令施行規則改正 [Amendment to the Middle School Ministerial Administrative Ordinance] the change became official: “The main objective of physical education is to create a balanced physique, develop strength and agility in movement, to cultivate a cheerful, fortified spirit and perseverance, self-discipline and the ability to co-operate with others. Exercise in schools should be comprised of military and normal calisthenics, and gekiken 撃剣 (kenjutsu) and jūjutsu may also be included.” (...) [57].

However, jūjutsu and kendō still did not make their entry into school syllabi and compendia until 1913, and when they did it was still as elective classes. It is likely that one of the reasons Kanō removed so many dangerous and hard techniques from jūdō was to avoid some of the concerns that curricular committees had towards kendō and jūjutsu and which had severely hampered and delayed them being approved as courses within the educational system. However, Kanō clearly wanted more than just having jūdō approved as just another elective class; he wanted jūdō to replace the entire physical education system. On February 25th of 1926 Kanō held a lecture entitled Kanō jūdō to shōnen no shidō 嘉納柔道と少年の指導 [Kanō jūdō and the instruction of children] in which he made a case for Kōdōkan jūdō to become part of the school system and even replace the national system of physical education (Figure 5). Several of Kanō’s assistants, such as Yamashita Yoshitsugu 山下義韶, Nagaoka Hideichi 永岡秀一, and Mitune Kyōzō 三船久蔵 held similar lectures, demonstrations and other initiatives to sensitize people for the educational value of Kōdōkan jūdō. So did other close collaborators of Kanō, such as, for example, Honda Masujirō 本田増次郎 (1866-1925). Around 1906 Honda was a professor at the Tōkyō Kōtō Shihan Gakkō 東京高等師範学校 [Tōkyō Higher Normal School] where Kanō Jigorō was principal. Honda, like Kanō, is often considered an educator, but he was also an outspoken early advocate of women’s education and rights. Since 1919 he was a contributor to the Japan Times and in 1922 he became a writer for the Imperial Household Agency. In 1911 he was awarded a Doctorate Honoris Causa in Humane Letters (Litt. D.-H.C.) by Trinity College in Harford, CT [58].

Also at Tōkyō Kōtō Shihan Gakkō [Tōkyō Higher Normal School] was Sakuraba Takeshi 櫻庭武 (1892-1941). He was another one of those advocates of jūdō as part of a wide educational reform [59].

On May 27th, 1926, thanks to Kanō’s interventions, the terms gekiken 撃剣 and jūjutsu were officially changed by the Ministry of Education into kendō and jūdō to emphasize their spiritual connotation [57]. Shortly after, in 1927-1928, Kanō Jigorō completed his work on the last kata of Kōdōkan jūdō created by him, and called Sei-ryoku zen’yō kokumin taiiku 攻防式国民体育 (sometimes also called Kōbōshiki kokumin taiiku 攻防式国民体育) (see further) [60-64]. This extensive exercise was intended to provide a logical series of gymnastics based on martial arts that could easily be performed by either gender, and which did not require any special equipment or clothing. Finally, in January 1931 jūdō and kendō became mandatory classes at school for everyone hence fulfilling Kanō’s lifelong dream. However, this success was not achieved merely because of Kanō’s personal enthusiasm but also because of the increasing militarization and fascism to which such scripted and disciplined physical exercises appealed [56]. According to
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* Present day Tsukuba University
reasearch done in the 1930s by the Tōkyō Kōshi Higher School, out of 352 schools, 331 had a jūdō club hence showing the increasing popularity of jūdō in Japan in those days.

Towards the end of Kanō’s life several books appeared in print which focused on Kōdōkan jūdō as part of education in school, such as those written by Miyawaki Taiken (宮脇泰軒) [65-67] and Shiotani Munee (塩谷宗雄) [68-69], and several others [13-70-72]. This shows that the Japanese did devote considerable though to the pedagogy of jūdō in children, and did so from an early age.
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