

Yasuhiro Sakaue

The Nationalisation of the Body in Martial Arts: The Case of Post-war Japan

Abstract

For this paper, I define ‘the nationalisation of the body’ as a notion and emotion of the people – nationalism, national identity – that is internalised in an individual’s body and is defined as a reflection or realisation of collective solidarity. Body culture recognised as part of one’s country’s culture can – like, for instance, a common language – be an effective tool of nationalisation. Remarkable examples of this phenomenon are Turnen in Germany that was developed as a reaction to the perceived “humiliation” under French foreign rule, the Czech’s Sokol and the Gaelic sports of Ireland.

Although modern Japan feared and fears foreign domination, Japan had not experienced defeat or occupation until 1945. Therefore, a phenomenon similar to Turnen or Sokol did not develop in Japan; however, some have argued that Japanese martial arts or budō can be compared to these examples of nationalisation of the body (Iwahara, 1936).

Twice in history, budō has acted as a tool for nationalisation. The first period is from 1931 until 1945, while the second period lasts from 1989 until the present. Both of these introduced and made budō a requirement in school education.

In this paper, I will mainly follow and discuss the historical background of how martial arts became a tool for nationalisation, the conditions under which this became possible, the inconsistencies, the issues that subsequently arose, and the positive potentials.

Keywords

Japanese martial arts; nationalism; nationalisation; militarism; physical education; budō; kendō; jūdō

Contact

Yasuhiro Sakaue, Prof.
Hitotsubashi University
y.sakaue@r.hit-u.ac.jp

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)
and published in the [JOMAR | Journal of Martial Arts Research](https://jomar.com)
(ISSN 2567-8221) on 2019-07-12
For more: j-o-mar.com

1 Martial arts as a tool for nationalisation: 1931-1945

1.1 How did martial arts become a tool for nationalisation in 1931?

During the construction of the modern, Western-style nation of Japan, martial arts were marginalised. However, after the Russo-Japanese War from 1904 to 1905, their importance was recognised. Then, in 1911 and 1912, kendō and judō were introduced into the curriculum of middle and normal school. In January 1931, martial arts were made compulsory for boys in secondary schools, as well as in middle and normal schools, becoming a tool of nationalisation. Two events strengthened this shift: The first was a martial arts competition held by the Ministry of the Imperial Household in May 1929 in conjunction with the celebration for Emperor Showa's ascendance to the throne. The second came just after the competition as a resolution of the Council on Educational Affairs, an advisory body to the Ministry of Education (Sakaue, 1998).

In making budō compulsory, the Ministry of Education stated that budō is 'unique to Japan' and insisted that the objectives of budō lessons were to train 'a national spirit of fortitude and vigour' and to discipline mind and body.

But what is it about budō that makes it an effective tool for nationalisation? An opinion leader favouring budō in schools at the time, Satō Ukichi (1895-1975), emphasised ideas as: "Japanese martial arts are most valuable as a means to understand the pure spirit of Japan, and most appropriate for promoting the awareness of a Japanese people", or "in combination with bushidō, Japanese martial arts promote development, which results in the demonstration of the desired martial arts" virtues of the spirit of loyalty and patriotism', etc. (Satō, 1928, p.83).

This was the 'precious characteristic' of martial arts that could not be found in sports. Moreover, the perceived disparities between martial arts and sports in terms of 'ethnicity and national character' created several other differences: Sato (1928) discussed examples taken from competition rules to criticize the immaturity of kendō competitions as "the beauty of the martial arts spirit not bound by winning or losing" (pp.85-86). In addition, Sato asserted that very burdensome and assiduous etiquette and unscientific and irrational practice methods, as well as the subsequent "suppression of expressing one's emotions", were unique to kendō as part of Japanese culture (pp.86-87).

Sato's claim indicates a pattern in which the martial arts themselves changed based on the dynamics surrounding nationalisation. These are, first, emphasis on historical origin and tradition, and, second, emphasis on the uniqueness distinguishing it from sports and other cultures. The issues with Sato's claims are that they prohibit maintaining rules of competition, rationalising the practice of budō and even expressing one's own emotions. Another, perhaps in a slightly different direction, is the issue of unification of the value of martial arts and elimination of the possibility of diverse development.

1.2 Combining intense nationalism and militaristic demand

In 1934, the Japanese army replaced their sabres by Japanese swords. And around this time, the military began to take notice of budō, especially the value of kendō in combat situations and fostering fighting spirit, which gradually began to influence education. Gender bias functioned strongly in Japanese martial arts before 1945 and kyūdō (Japanese archery) and naginata (Japanese halberd) became integrated into the physical education curriculum in girls' middle school and girls' normal school in 1936.

After the start of the Second Sino-Japanese War in 1937, martial arts were regarded as a means to train self-sacrificing soldiers. In April 1941, martial arts were also made compulsory for boys, and naginata was taught in girls in elementary schools' physical education classes. With Japan's

participation in World War II in December of 1941, martial arts as a whole were reorganised into effective battlefield combat strategies, thus, becoming tools in the service of extreme nationalisation. In 1943 and 1944, naginata was made compulsory in girls' middle schools and girls' normal schools.

All martial arts organisations were integrated into the Dai-Nippon Butokukai (Great Japan Martial Virtue Society), which, in March 1942, was placed under the influence of five Ministries: Home Affairs, Education, Welfare, the Army and the Navy.

The purpose of the martial arts classes was to “train to attack as a main focus” and to cultivate “practical skills of serviced devotion”. Secondary schools emphasized martial arts along with “the belief of certain victory”, “mind of selfless dedication” and “combative spirit”; in a combination of intense nationalism and militaristic demand (Kōzu 2001, p.245).

Jūdō techniques focused on combat-style attacks, for example to the temples of one's forehead, the pit of one's stomach or between the eyes, as well as hitting and joint-twisting techniques. Kendō was changed to a one-point system, and the length of the bamboo sword and its handle were shortened to make it similar to real Japanese swords. In martial arts classes hand-to-hand combat group competitions were held.

I would particularly like to stress that the changes in the technical repertoire of kendō emerged from using Japanese swords in combat situations at the battlefield in China. The most well-known and documented example of Japanese swords used at the Chinese battlefield happened in 1937. During the invasion of Nanking, two Japanese commissioned officers held a contest to see who could kill 100 people the fastest with a Japanese sword; turning murder into a sportive ‘race’ of sorts, with keeping ‘records’, 106 versus 105 killed. The Tokyo Nichi Nichi Newspaper also published a photo of the two officers proudly holding their swords on December 13, 1937. While Japanese textbooks don't mention this incident, it was included in Chinese middle school history textbooks showcasing the brutality of the Japanese army's during the Nanking Incident. In the minds of the Chinese, this ‘contest’ entered cultural memory and is remembered as if it happened yesterday (Sakaue 2001).

Meanwhile, in 1937 in Korea, which was then a colony of Japan, Japanese national physical exercises were established. It was compulsory in every school to practice the basic kendō movements with wooden swords (Nishio 2003). In this case nationalisation through budō was supposed to turn Koreans into Japanese.

2 Transforming martial arts into sport: 1945-1988

2.1 The ban of martial arts

After the defeat in World War II, for the first time in its history, Japan was under foreign rule, that is, United States rule, from August 1945 until April 1952. Martial arts were not only removed from the school curriculum and extracurricular activities, but also from society: 1,927 martial arts teachers were forced into retirement, and 1,219 executives of the Dai-Nippon Butokukai were removed from office because they were regarded as having been ‘tools of militarism’ during the War. Even the use of the term budō was banned.

2.2 Martial arts reclaimed as sport

The prohibition periods of kendō, jūdō, and kyūdō differed; however, the commonly imposed condition of reintegration into society was, eventually, to transform these martial arts into ‘sports’. In 1946, the Japanese Ministry of Education gave kendō the most severe evaluation,

specifically, “the fact that kendō was used as a means to train [young men] to use swords in war” (Monbushō, 1946, p.450). According to the Far Eastern Commission in 1947, “classical sports, such as kendō, which encourage the martial spirit, should be totally abandoned. Physical training should no longer [be] associate[d] with Seishin Kyoiku (ideological education)” (Kyokutō linkai, 1947, p.266).

In the case of kendō, the ban was not lifted until the end of the Occupation. Because of the prohibition, kendō officials created a new sport, ‘shinai kyōgi’ or bamboo sword sport, which was similar to fencing. Even so, this new sport was recognised and implemented only eighteen days before the Occupation ended in April 1952. The Ministry of Education began to discuss the ‘rehabilitation’ of kendō in the fall of 1952, and by July 1953, thus after the occupational forces had left, kendō could again be practiced in schools. The final consideration was given to officials of kendō and other sports who composed the School Kendo Research Committee. For kendō to become a sport, in 1953, the Committee reported the four following, specific requirements:

(1) Play for the purpose of kendō itself, not as a means to an end, was specifically imposed. And the focus was directed towards enjoying the process of the activity itself instead of a focus on a result; (2) The purpose of kendō practice had to be the pursuit of better technique and purposeful activity, without any restriction by external objectives. (3) Mutual affirmative cooperative relations was formulated as goal, not mutual negative human relations. (4) Finally, the sport was to be governed by the presence of reasonable and well-defined rules of competition (Zennihon Kendō Renmei, 1953).

Turning martial arts into a sport meant that elements such as militarism, ultra-nationalism and nationalisation would be extracted from the concept that martial arts practitioners had of their martial arts and that martial arts would need to transform into a pure physical activity. Accordingly, from 1958 on, the term ‘combative sports’ or ‘kakugi’ replaced the general term for kendō, jūdō and sumō (wrestling) in junior high and high school physical education.

2.3 The New Leaders

Watanabe Toshio (1911-1989), a member of the School Kendō Research Committee who led the resurrection of kendō in post-war Japan declared: “We have concluded that kendō will be a sport from now on and have shown, how it should progress as sport. This is the policy made from thinking about and deeply reflecting on the state of the times” (Watanabe, 1962, p.258). The new leaders, Watanabe and other members of the Committee, were alumni of universities and colleges, and for them, kendō involved not just moralistic didacticism, but competitive athleticism. They had competed a tournament-style system, when they were students in the 1920s and 1930s; therefore, kendō’s transition to a sport was thus based on their previous experience.

2.4 The significance of martial arts becoming sport

First, transforming budō into sport neutralised the value of martial arts, as this budō theory completely denies practical application of budō. It seems to me that the theory was mainly based on three things: The first was psychology and/or play theory (Zennihon Kendō Renmei, 1953), and, the second was the flow of liberalism that existed even before World War II in the Japanese physical education and sporting world (Sakaue, 1998) and, finally the reflection that budō had used as a tool of militarism and ultra-nationalism during the war. This new definition of budō was important in securing a permanent place in school physical education for martial arts. However, this budō theory placed itself in a neutral position, and thereby also created a theoretical weak spot as it was separated from the universal human values of peace, democracy and health.

Second, budō becoming a sport facilitated the reform of budō and made it possible to promote martial arts actively. The methods of sports, such as rules and teaching methods, became points of reference and were absorbed into the practice as well as theoretical framework of kendō. Third, co-education culture was brought into budō. Kendō and jūdō were after WWII not only accessible for men, but also for women. The notion that ‘budō is for the masses’ removed the barrier of gender bias.

2.5 The popularity of martial arts as sport

After being reborn as sport, martial arts gained popularity. The number of new kendō rank holders annually was more than 30.000 from 1965 on, 40.000 from 1971 on and 50.000 in the 1980s (Nihon Budō Gakkai Kendō Senmon Bunkakai, 2009). At the 1964 Summer Olympic Games in Tokyo, jūdō became an Olympic discipline for men, which resulted in increasing popularity in Japan. That is mirrored e.g. in the number of newcomers in the Kōdōkan, which peaked in 1965 with 46.127 new memberships (Oimatsu, 1976).

3 Re-inventing Japanese traditional culture – a tool for nationalisation once again: 1989 to today and beyond

3.1 Outline

In the mid-1980s, martial arts reached a peak of popularity among Japanese youth. At the same time, however, Japanese martial arts associations began to question the concept of martial arts as a sport, claiming instead that budō was a part of traditional Japanese culture. In addition, along with politicians, martial arts associations increased pressure on the Ministry of Education to bring back the name ‘budō’ to junior high school and high school physical education. In 1989, they were finally successful, and teachings about the originality and uniqueness of traditional Japanese culture were made compulsory. Once again, martial arts became a means of nationalisation. At the same time, flying the national flag and singing the national anthem at schools also became mandatory.

Furthermore, in 2008, budō became compulsory in junior high school. In 2019 due to the pressure of lobby groups, especially the Japanese Budō Association, nine martial arts can be implemented in schools. These include jūdō, kendō, sumō, kyūdō, naginata, karate, aikidō, shorinji kenpō and jukendō (or bayonet).

3.2 Signs of change in 1985

However, forces that influenced nationalisation through budō existed already before 1985. In 1977, the Japanese Budō Association was founded, and in 1978, the 132 members of the Diet promoted the establishment of their own Budō Federation. In 1979, with the Nippon Budōkan now added, these three groups – the Japanese Budō Association, the Diet’s Budō Federation and Nippon Budōkan – began to hold annual general assemblies with a referendum for the re-establishment of budō in schools. The vote was then presented to the Ministry of Education.

However, pressure groups were still not successful in changing the name ‘combative sports’ or ‘kakugi’ into ‘budō’. There are two reasons: first, the opposing side built a ‘impenetrable wall’. Second, no arguments could logically be won against the claim that ‘budō is a sport’ (Nishimura, 1983). But signs of change appeared in 1985. Until 1984, the annual general assembly of these three groups defined, that: “Budō teaches how to equally train strong bodies and minds, which

is different from the western way of separately teaching intellectual, moral and physical education” (Nippon Budōkan, 1984, p.70). The groups further claimed: “Our country must preserve the special nature of these traditional martial arts.” (Ibid.) On the other hand, they also claimed: “While budō is turning from an ethnic culture to a shared culture, we must establish a view of budō that encompasses its universality as sport without being influenced by obsessive national consciousness” (Ibid.). This changed in 1985 when the phrase “we must establish a view of budō that encompasses its universality as a sport” disappeared (Nippon Budōkan, 1985, p.51). At this point, the three pressure groups had weakened the opposition’s ‘impenetrable wall’, and the claim that ‘budō is a sport’ could perhaps be proven false.

3.3 Factors of change

As influential factors of change, first, ‘the conservative heyday’ had come. The conservative Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) held the majority in parliament until the late 1980s. The word ‘sport’ for defining budō, which had disappeared in 1985, because of the aforementioned resolution by the annual general assembly, was brought back for just four years, from 1992 through 1995. That period overlapped with the time when another party took power from the LDP administration. This clearly indicates that the developments in the role and definition of budō within physical education were strongly influenced by conservative political forces.

Second, national pride was enhanced mainly due to economic success. In 1980, Japan surpassed the United States in the number of vehicles produced, becoming the number one car manufacturer in the world. This development resulted in a strong ‘economic power nationalism’, which in turn could be linked to the previously mentioned ‘conservative heyday’ that activated certain changes.

Third, a ‘budō boom’ occurred, mainly among the Japanese youth. For example, in 1984, the number of high-school kendō club members peaked at 95,071 (Otsuka, 1995). Some may have experienced increased pride in their own culture, linked to the strong ‘economic power nationalism’. Another reason for the boom would be the period’s violent protests involving students. Parents then looked to budō as a method of instilling discipline. In these circumstances, forces promoting nationalisation through budō saw martial arts as an effective therapy for certain negative social developments and symptoms and as a means of education for the Japanese youth, who – in this perspective – were poisoned by individualism, materialism and consumerism.

3.4 Where the problems lies (1): Pressure groups’ martial arts theory

Pressure groups thus concentrated their efforts on constructing a logic in which ‘budō is not a sport’. In 1987, the Japanese Budō Association aggregated the Japanese Budō Charter, symbolising budō as ‘not-sport’. The association stipulated the special qualities of budō as “seeking the perfect unity of mind and technique, budō has been refined into a way of physical training and spiritual development” (Nippon Budō Kyōgikai, 1987a, unpagged). In the English version of the Budō Charter, the expression has been softened in comparison to the original Japanese (Nippon Budō Kyōgikai, 1987b). The Japanese version uses old fashioned, strict wording, leaving the strong impression that ‘budō is a method of ascetic practice’.

A member of the Japanese Budō Charter Research Committee, Katsumi Nishimura, declared, that these are the ‘special qualities’ of budō that should be passed on to future generations throughout history, despite social changes (Nishimura, 1989a). Furthermore, “budō essentially differs from sport, which has the essential characteristics of amusement and competitiveness and is an end in itself. Budō cultivates human beings and trains people to be useful to the world; that is the significance of budō’s social existence” (Nishimura, 1989b, pp.12-13).

As in 1931, the emerging pattern of change is rooted in the dynamics surrounding nationalisation. The Budō Charter shows that, first, historical origin and ‘tradition’ are emphasised, and, second, uniqueness is emphasised through differentiation from other forms of physical activities, specifically from sports and other cultures. The redefinition of budō denies enjoyment and competitiveness, once again removing the possibility of diverse cultural developments. ‘Tradition’ is made absolute, and critical scrutiny and improvement of ‘traditions’ became taboo, closing any path towards progress.

3.5 Where the problems lies (2): Martial arts physical education at schools

Since 1989, the Ministry of Education, according to its official teacher guidelines, has perceived budō, not as sport, but as ‘traditional culture’. In other words, budō is a ‘traditional way of thinking’ that places importance on character building, and, therefore, budō can be perceived as having an educational character rather than being a sport (Sakaue, 1993).

However, until 1989, the Ministry of Education’s thoughts on character building were, that the overall basic objective was, first physical education, which was not unique to budō and second, that budō being taught at schools was denied because it was too difficult to integrate martial arts with general coaching theory and practice in physical education was too difficult. The Ministry thus turned around 180 degrees (Sakaue, 1993).

The Ministry of Education became obligated to ‘pay attention to how exercise traditional activities’ as a strategy for ‘traditional’ character building in schools. One specific example is strict ‘rei’ (propriety), in the meaning of suppressing the emotions that come with winning or losing. That’s why the ‘guts pose’ or raising one’s fist in triumph is considered to be against the martial spirit of Japanese martial arts and prohibited in some budō.

In school budō, we can therefore also observe a pattern in which the dynamics surrounding nationalisation have changed budō. Suppressing the expression of one’s emotions was reinstated, along with an emphasis on historical origin and cultural tradition, as well as Japanese uniqueness through differentiation from the other.

3.6 Did students accept the revival of budō?

Japanese youth sports have largely been organized as part of the educational system rather than through private sport and community clubs as in most Europe (Nakazawa, 2014). However, since the country implemented the nationalisation of budō, there has been a continuous decrease in kendō and jūdō participants in junior high schools and high schools. The number of kendō club members in high school is less than half of that during the peak in 1984 (Zenkoku Kōkō Taiiku Renmei, 2018). The decline of jūdō club members is even more remarkable, and the total number jūdō practitioners has also decreased. The number of registered members in the All Japan Jūdō Federation was about 250.000 in 1993, 190.000 in 1998 and 155.367 in 2017 (Keisatsu Daigaku Kōyūkai, 2000; Zennihon Judō Renmei, 2018).

In another example, from 2002 to 2005, Japan spent a budget of 127 million euros (16.7 billion yen) for the maintenance of dōjōs (martial arts halls) in 980 schools (Monbukagakusho, 2002; 2003; 2004; 2005). Ironically, in parallel to these efforts, kendō and jūdō participation is continuously decreasing (Uchida, 2016). I think it can be concluded, that nationalised budō has neither been accepted by junior high school nor by high school students. From the perspective of lifelong physical education, school budō has not achieved success, but is – instead – declining.

3.7 The possibility of change for the better

At the same time, however, budō in schools certainly has positive potentials in the context of the overall physical education goal in schools, which is ‘lifelong physical education’. ‘Lifelong physical education’ means integration of school physical education with fundamental goals: ‘To enjoy pleasure and delight through being able to exercise’ was defined as coaching goal for budō. This is specified in the 2008 and 2009 guidelines. It is the first time in history that the learner’s enjoyment and pleasure has been stated as an overt teaching goal. The guidelines also request that in budō ‘the exercise [is] rationally put into practice’ to guarantee pleasure and delight through being able to perform techniques” (Monbukagakushō 2008, 2009) .

‘Budō as traditional culture’ and the aim of nationalisation through budō, limits the realisation of ‘enjoyable budō’. However, there is a possibility and opportunity to radically reform technical guidance in ‘enjoyable budō’ classes, in which the learner’s enjoyment and pleasure are defined as coaching goals.

Finally, I would like to refer to the research conducted by Uchida Ryō, an educational sociologist. He discovered that between 1983 and 2013, 118 junior high school and high school students died during jūdō club practice (Uchida, 2013). However, his research resulted in a considerable change in jūdō practice and awareness of the dangers of certain training practices. As a result no student had died during jūdō practice since 2014. His research thus shows that research indeed can change the world.

Bibliography

This paper is based on the following essays by the author:

- Sakaue, Y. (2009). Budōkai no senji taiseika: Budō sōgō dantai Dai Nippon Butokukai no seiritsu [The reorganization of martial arts’ world for war: The establishment of the Dai Nippon Butokukai]. In Y. Sakaue, & H. Takaoka (eds.), *Maboroshi no Tokyo Orinpikku to sono jidai: supōtsu, toshi,shintai [The Tokyo Olympics of 1940 and its period: sport, body and urban areas in the wartime]* (pp.243-278). Tokyo: Seikyūsha.
- Sakaue, Y. (2014). Tanoshii budō to wagakuni koyū no dentō to bunka o kangaeru [Problems of enjoyable physical education and the teachings of the originality of traditional Japanese culture]. *Tanoshii Taiiku Supōtsu*, 33(7), 29-32.
- Sakaue, Y. (2015). Nippon no budō: nashonarizumu no kiseki [Japanese martial arts: Tracing nationalism]. In M. Tosa (ed.), *Higasi Azia no supōtsu nashonarizumu [Sport nationalism in the East Asia]* (pp.75-110). Kyoto: Mineruba Shobō.
- Sakaue, Y. (2018). The Historical Creation of Kendo’s Self-Image from 1895 to 1942 : A Critical Analysis of an invented tradition. *Martial Arts Studies*, 6. doi.org/10.18573/mas.66

Further sources:

- Kyokutō linkai [Far Eastern Commission] (1947). Nihon kyōiku seido kaikaku ni kansuru seisaku [Directive Regarding the Revision of the Japanese Educational System, Clause 10]. In E. Suzuki, *Nihon senryō to kyōiku kaikaku [The Revision of the Japanese education under the GHQ occupation]* (pp.265-267). Tokyo: Keisō Shobō, 1983.
- Iwahara, T. (1936). Honpō taiiku undō no gyōseiteki kansatsu [Observation of Japanese physical education and sport from an administrative point of view]. In K. Tanaka & I Terasawa (eds.), *Shihan Daigaku kōza taiiku [Teachers College course in physical education]*, vols.14 (pp. 1-12). Tokyo: Kenbunkan.
- Keisatsu Daigaku Kōyūkai (2000). *Shōnen judō shidōhō [Judo instruction for young people]*,15. <https://www.syaanken.or.jp/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/sh1234P014-021.pdf>
- Kōzu, M. (2001). Budō. In Y. Kubo et al. (eds.), *Gendai kyōikushi jiten [Dictionary of the history of Japanese education]* (p.245), Tokyo: Tokyo Shoseki.
- Monbushō [The Ministry of Education] (1946). Hatsu Tai [Notification] no.95, Shakai taiiku jisshi ni kansuru ken [Practice of community sports]. In Zennihon Kendō Renmei [All Japan Kendo Federation]. *Kendō no rekishi [The history of kendo]* (pp. 449-451), Zennihon Kendō Renmei, 2003
- Monbukagakushō [The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology] (2002). Budō no jūjitsu ni tsuite [The promotion of budo]. *Budō* [monthly magazine of Nippon Budōkan], 425, 140.
- Monbukagakushō (2003). Budō no jūjitsu ni tsuite. *Budō*, 437, 143.
- Monbukagakushō (2004). Budō no jūjitsu ni tsuite. *Budō*, 449, 147.
- Monbukagakushō (2005). Budō no jūjitsu ni tsuite, *Budō*, 461, 145.

- Monbukagakushō (2008). *Chūgakkō gakushū shidō yōryō hoken taiiku Hen [The Ministry's official guidelines of physical education for junior high schools]*, 97-115.
http://www.mext.go.jp/component/a_menu/education/micro_detail/_icsFiles/afield-file/2011/01/21/1234912_009.pdf
- Monbukagakushō (2009). *Kōtō gakkō gakushū shidō yōryō hoken taiiku hen [The Ministry's official guidelines of physical education for high schools]*, 71-80.
http://www.mext.go.jp/component/a_menu/education/micro_detail/_icsFiles/afield-file/2011/01/19/1282000_7.pdf
- Nakazawa, A. (2014). Seeing Sports as educational activities: A postwar history of extracurricular sport activities in Japan. *Hitotsubashi Journal of Social Studies*, 45, 1-14.
<http://hermes-ir.lib.hit-u.ac.jp/rs/bitstream/10086/26123/1/HJsoc0450100100.pdf>
- Nihon Budō Gakkai Kendō Senmon Bunkakai (2009). *Kendō o shiru jiten [Dictionary for knowing kendo]* (p. 289). Tokyo: Tokyodō Shuppan.
- Nippon Budō Kyōgikai (1987a). *Budō Kenshō [The Budō Charter]*.
<https://www.nipponbudokan.or.jp/shinkoujigyou/kenshou>
- Nippon Budō Kyōgikai (1987b). *The Budō Charter*. <https://www.nipponbudokan.or.jp/english/budochater>
- Nippon Budōkan (1984). Budō shinkō taikai [The annual general assembly of the Japanese Budō Association, the Diet's Budō Federation and Nippon Budōkan]. *Budō*, 210, 70.
- Nippon Budōkan (1985). Budō shinkō taikai. *Budō*, 222, 51.
- Nishimura, K. (1983). Gakkō kyōiku ni okeru 'Budō' no suii [The transition of 'budo' in school education]. In Nippon Budō Kyōgikai & Nippon Budōkan (eds.), *Gendai Budō Repōto [Contemporary Budo Report]*, 84-85.
- Nishimura, K. (1989a). Budō Kenshō no igi [The significance of the Budō Charter]. *Budo*, 268, 12.
- Nishimura, K. (1989b). Gakkō budō no suii to fukkatsu no igi [The transition of school martial arts and the significance of the revival of budo]. *Budo*, 271, 12-15.
- Nishio, T. (2003). *Nihon shokuminchika Chōsen ni okeru gakkō taiiku seisaku [The policy of school physical education in Korea under Japanese occupation]*, 408-415.
- Oimatsu, S. (1976). *Judō hyakunen [Judo century]*, Tokyo: Jiji Tsūshinsha, 384.
- Otsuka, T. (1995). *Nihon Kendō no rekishi [Japanese kendo history]*. Tokyo: Madosha, 230.
- Sakaue, Y. (1993). Gendai budō no bunkateki kadai [The cultural problems of contemporary budō]. *Taiikuka Kyōiku [Physical education]*, 41(13), 18-21.
- Sakaue, Y. (1998). *Kenryoku sōchi toshite no supōtsu [State and sport in inter-war Japan]*. Tokyo: Kōdansha, 104-134.
- Sakaue, Y. (2001). *Supōtsu to seiji [Sport and politics]*. Tokyo: Yamakawa Shuppansha, 82-87.
- Satō, U. (1928). *Kendō*. Tokyo: Meguro Shoten, 83-87.
- Uchida, R. (2013). *Judō jiko [Judo accidents]*. Tokyo: Kawaide Shobō Shinsha.
- Uchida, R. (2016). *Undōbu katsudō no ninki no suii [The transition of popularity of extracurricular sports activities]*. <https://news.yahoo.co.jp/byline/ryouchida/20160104-00053087/>
- Watanabe, T. (1962). Onshi Takano Sasaburō no omoide [Memory of my respected teacher Takano Sasaburō]. In R. Harada (ed.), *Takano Sasaburō* (pp.257-258). Omiya: Saitama Kenritsu Bunka Kaikan.
- Zenkoku kokō Taiiku Renmei (2018). *Home Page*. <https://www.zen-koutairen.com/pdf/reg-30nen.pdf>
- Zennihon Judō Renmei [All Japan Judo Federation] (2018). *Home Page*.
<http://www.judo.or.jp/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/tourokujinkou-suii2019.pdf>
- Zennihon Kendō Renmei [All Japan Kendo Federation] (1953). *Gakkō kendō: Shidō no tebiki kaisetsu [School kendo: an explanation of the instruction guidebook]*. Shin Kendōsha, 6-17.