

- an aural equivalent of rape, although I concede the problems that attend such a comparison.
19. T.S. Eliot in his *Four Quartets*.
 20. Thomas Clifton, *Music As Heard* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 297.
 21. Kundera's *The Unbearable Lightness of Being*, 92-93, contains a brief but vivid description of what his character calls "noise masked as music".
 22. Cf. Burrows, *Sound, Speech, and Music*, 74-75.
 23. On the idea of "home," see Hank Bromley, "Identity Politics and Critical Pedagogy," *Educational Theory* 39, no. 3 (Summer, 1989): 207-223.
 24. Trevor Wishart, "On Radical Culture" in John Shepherd, *Whose Music?* (London: Latimer, 1977), 234.
 25. Attali, *Noise*, 46. The following two paragraphs draw directly and extensively upon Attali's presentation.
 26. In an article entitled "The Arts of Music" in *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 50 No.3:217-230, Philip Alperson suggests that a pluralistic account of "the fine arts of instrumental music 'promises to help us better discriminate' the values according to which musical styles might be judged, and the audiences and traditions to which they appeal" (227). That idea is clearly congruent with the positions advanced here.

Japanese Traditional Music and School Music Education

Masafumi Ogawa
Ibaraki University

Introduction

Several days ago, the music department of the faculty of education at Oita University staged its annual graduation concert. I was one of the judges of the ten senior students' performances. The program began with Albeniz's "Suite Espagnole" op. 47, and ended with Mozart's "Exultate, jubilate" and "Alleluja" from three motetten KV.165. Other music in the program included such composers as Handel, Ravel, Prokofiev, Bellini, Poulenc, Fauré. Only one student sang Japanese songs by Nobutoki and Nakada, songs in Western notation with piano accompaniment.

Graduation concert programs of other universities across the nation are quite similar. Music major students in most of the universities are trained and educated according to Western art music and its aesthetics. As of 1993, there were 443 full-time music faculty members in fifty schools of education nationwide. Among them, there is only one faculty member who teaches Japanese traditional music performance, one who is a musicologist of Japanese traditional music, and seven ethnomusicologists. The rest are all teachers of Western music.¹

Consequently, students who graduate from these universities are going to teach mostly Western music in the public schools. In turn, students taught by these teachers will enter education departments majoring in music and will be trained with a Western music bias. This cycle has been repeated for over one hundred years.

Outside the school music education community a contrasting phenomenon can be observed. At the community concert held in a small hall near my home in Oita city, the whole program consisted of Japanese folk songs or dances with karaoke music. No Western art music was performed. At the summer festival in early August in 1993, thousands of Oita citizens came to downtown wearing *Yukata* (summer kimono) and danced traditional *Bon-odori* (Japanese dances). The guest singer sang folk songs in the traditional Japanese singing style (nasal chest voice), and not in *bel canto*. In karaoke bars, a majority of businessmen like to sing *enka* (traditional Japanese popular song). There is hardly a song from music textbooks, such as classical *lieder* or *canzone*!

This blatant contrast may seem puzzling to non-Japanese people, especially those who are Western music educators. But such is the reality of the music scene in Japan. There exists a large gap between the music being taught in schools and that being experienced by Japanese society in general. Japan has been one of the nations in which music education is not grounded on its own indigenous music, and the universal slogan that school music education should be based on each country's own music has remained largely unpracticed here.

On a personal note, I studied a variety of non-Western music at college--Indonesian Gamelan, Japanese Gagaku, Hosho Noh play--and the history of Japanese traditional music. But throughout my career I have mainly focused on Western music--voice, piano and choral conduct-

ing. As a Japanese music educator, I strongly feel that I should be doing something different from what I am doing now. On the other hand, I also believe that Western music is a part of myself, equally so with Japanese music. It would be impossible to abandon Western music totally. In fact, I believe that it is no longer correct to consider Western music as music of Western people and Japanese music as that of the Japanese people.

My responsibility in this essay is to clarify the perplexing questions raised by the above discussion--why Western music is still the core of public music education in Japan and how this came to be so. I will then offer my views on the future of Japanese public music education--how Japanese traditional music should be dealt with in school music education and what the responsibility of Japanese music educators might be with regard to this issue.

Japanese Traditional Music

It goes without saying that there exists no single genre of "Japanese traditional music." As in the case of Western music, there are many kinds of Japanese traditional music. However, it must be said that the differences between each genre of Japanese traditional music are greater than those between each genre of Western art music. Let me give some examples.

Each genre in Western music shares a common notation system, whereas almost every genre of Japanese traditional music has a different notation system (usually a tablature notation). Even within a given genre of Japanese traditional music, there exist different performance techniques, expressions, and notation systems according to *Ryu* (school). Therefore, a Noh player of the Kanze school, for example, never plays together with a player of the Hoshō school. It is also a very rare case that a koto player of the Yamada school performs with a player of the Ikuta school.

In sum, each genre of Japanese traditional

music is a highly specialized discipline. Once a student begins to study in a certain school of music as a profession, he or she will probably never study another genre of Japanese music for the rest of his or her career. In my opinion, it is safe to say that different genres of Japanese traditional music are actually different musics. Although there are common characteristics in a broader psychological sense between each genre, the aesthetic criteria on the technical level are quite different from each other. A specialist of a certain genre cannot judge the quality of Japanese traditional music outside his or her specialization.

Another important point is that most of what we call Japanese traditional music is transformed foreign music. *Gagaku* (Japanese court music) came from seventh century China, Vietnam, and Korea. *Shomyo* (Buddhist chants) came from India via China in the eighth century.² *Biwa* (Japanese mandolin) was brought via the "silk road." *Shamisen* (the Japanese long necked guitar) was brought from southern China via the Okinawa islands.³ Japan's location made music from around the Asian continent and the Pacific islands highly accessible.⁴ Through two thousand years of its history Japan has witnessed the arrival and transformation of music from abroad. In short, what we call Japanese traditional music is an amalgam of various kinds of transformed foreign music. Therefore, it is hard to determine whether or not an indigenous Japanese music genuinely exists.⁵

The history of Japanese traditional music has been a process of the importation and assimilation of foreign music. It is therefore natural that the introduction of Western music into Japan be considered another step in the assimilation process. Shibata, a composer and musicologist, asserts that there have been four cultures in the cycle of Japan's history: (1) Jomon Culture (B.C.E.10,000-B.C.E.300), (2) Yayoi Culture (B.C.E.300-C.E.600), (3) Buddhist Culture (600-1550), and (4) Christian Culture (since 1550).⁶

Within each culture, there has been a

process of importation of foreign music, its accumulation and finally transformation. Shibata thinks that with regard to this process the third and fourth cultures are very similar in pattern.⁷ In the third culture, various musics throughout Japan had been introduced during the sixth to eighth century.

Early in the eighth century, the Japanese government established *Utamai no Tsukasa*, a national music institution, where various types of music from China, Korea, Vietnam, and Tibet, as well as "indigenous" Japanese music were taught. Although Japanese music was included in the curriculum, it was only a very minor part. The institution mainly focused on teaching Chinese and Korean music. Several hundred years later, music in Japan entered a fermentation stage, resulting in the production of original Japanese music such as Noh play, Shomyo, and Shamisen music.⁸

The fourth culture began with the arrival of Christianity around 1550. Christian missionaries from Portugal came to the southern part of Japan in 1547, bringing with them Western music and musical instruments. The first singing mass was held in Yamaguchi in 1552. By 1572, the first Christian seminary was established in Oita and music instruction in singing and in playing clavichords was included in the curriculum.⁹

When Japan reopened its doors to the world in the 1860s after 265 years of Tokugawa isolationism, Western music again began to flow in. Since the government admitted both foreign armed forces and Christianity, the music that initially entered the country at that time was military band music and church music. In 1868, the Tokugawa shogunate broke down and a new government was established (Meiji Restoration). Since then, Japan has continued to import Western music.

The interesting analogy with the third culture, pointed out by Shibata, is that the music institutions focused on teaching foreign music while domestic music received little attention. At the Tokyo National University of Music and Fine Arts--today's *Utamai no Tsukasa*--mostly Western art music was taught. Courses in

Japanese traditional music were not established until after World War II. Until recently, music other than Western art music was not even considered to be "music." Today, according to Shibata, the peak of the importation of Western music is over and a time of fermentation for Japanese traditional music has begun.

Whether we hold to Shibata's theory or not, his view provides us with a very interesting explanation of the history of music in Japan. In addition, it gives us a stable foundation for explaining the history and philosophy of music education today.

Public music education in Japan is now about 114 years old. We can divide this history roughly into two periods: (1) from the establishment of public music education and the process of Westernization until the end of World War II (1880-1945) and (2) from the reformation of the educational system under American directorship after World War II until today (1945-1994).

Japanese School Music After the Meiji Restoration

Modernization in Japan began with the establishment of the Meiji government in 1868. The chief objectives of the new government's policy were to strengthen the nation's economy and military (*Fukoku Kyouhei*). Since the former Tokugawa government had closed its doors to the world for such a long time, Japan was far behind European countries in terms of economic development. Japan believed it had to import and imitate almost everything from European countries in order to catch up. Accordingly, the majority of Japanese people adopted the view that anything Western was superior to Japanese culture. Thus "Europeanism" permeated Japanese society at all levels.¹⁰

This tendency towards "Europeanism" inevitably fostered the idea that Japanese traditional music was inferior to Western art music. Before the Meiji Restoration, some forms of Japanese traditional music such as Noh and Shaku-hachi were supported by the government and by religious groups.¹¹ But the abrupt

change in political structure undercut this support. Traditional music lost its privileged status and musicians were forced to abandon their jobs or live in poverty.¹² In addition, under the influence of Western morals most Japanese traditional music was considered "immoral" because its texts dealt mostly with love affairs.¹³ Thus, Japanese traditional music declined to the point of near extinction.

In 1873, the Meiji government promulgated the first educational constitution, *Gakusei* (the Fundamental Code of Education). This was the first official modern educational curriculum and it was based on Western models (mainly those of Holland and the United States). Music was included in the Fundamental Code of Education as one of the required subjects in both elementary and junior high school. Music was called *Shoka* (singing) in elementary school and *Sogaku* (playing music) in junior high school.

However, in the latter part of the Fundamental Code of Education's period of influence, the statement "music is to be suspended for a while" was added. This illustrates the difficulty of carrying out a music program due to lack of teachers, teaching know-how, and music textbooks. Six years later, the government finally established the *Ongaku Torishirabe Gakari* (Music Investigation Committee) in 1879, the first institution of music and music teacher education in Japan. This institution was to function as decision-making headquarters for music teaching in the public schools.

Izawa Shuji, the first principal of the Music Investigation Committee, submitted a proposal describing the aims and mission of this institution to the Ministry of Education in October 1879. In his proposal, Izawa posed three possible choices of direction toward the future of Japanese public music education. These were:

(1) Adopt only Western music in public music education. Western music has now reached its highest point in its thousand year history of study and use. Without question, Western music is far superior to Eastern music. Therefore, should we not

implant Western music expeditiously rather than waste time waiting for Eastern music to grow into an equal with Western music?

(2) Adopt only Japanese music in public schools. Each nation has its own music as well as its own language. Music is naturally cultivated according to the lives and characteristics of the people of each nation. There is no rationale for replacing native music with foreign music. To implant Western music into Japan is as nonsensical as replacing Japanese with English.

(3) These two opinions carry their own logic. But to be practical, we should avoid extremes. Therefore, we should take a middle road. It would be best to mix Western and Eastern music and eventually create a new national music. However, in my opinion, this process will be extremely difficult. But we should pool our wisdom and tackle this project now. Otherwise, who in the future would dare take on such a project?¹⁴

In this proposal, Izawa favored the third option. The Music Investigation Committee finally chose the most practical but most difficult direction. Their final aim was to create a new "national" music. Izawa believed that *Wa-Yo Secchu* (blending Japanese and Western music) was the only way to attain this goal.

Following this statement, Izawa listed three objectives of the Music Investigation Committee as follows: (1) to create a new music by blending Western and Eastern music, (2) to educate personnel who would create a new "national" music in the future, and (3) to execute music teaching in schools throughout Japan.¹⁵

Thus, a great national experiment of mixing Eastern and Western music began. The question arises: Is changing the music culture of Japan at the national level possible or not?

The first step the Music Investigation Committee undertook was to investigate the history and theories of various kinds of music from all over the world. The results of this investigation were included in Izawa's report on

the achievements of the first five years of Music Investigation Committee activities to the ministry of Education.¹⁶

This report began with a brief history of the Music Investigation Committee, followed by a comparison of Oriental and Western music, particularly with respect to musical scales. Izawa concluded that there were many similarities between Western and Oriental music. As evidence he produced data from both his experiences and scientific approaches.

Izawa first asked Luther Whiting Mason, the first foreign director of Music Investigation Committee, to listen to Japanese Gagaku music in order to find any similarities and differences that might exist between Oriental and Western music. Mason's answer was that "there was no difference as to the tonality, but only a slight difference in the mode of the tonal combinations."¹⁷ Izawa then asked Japanese court musicians to listen to Western music in order to discover whether European music had any familiar elements. Their answer was that no difference could be detected.¹⁸ As a third piece of evidence, Izawa reported that the students who were experts in Japanese music made such remarkable progress in studying Western music that Luther Whiting Mason was very "surprised."¹⁹

Then, Izawa next compared (1) Helmholtz's method of making scales by mathematical calculations with tunings of Shamisen and Shakuhachi, (2) Western major and minor scales with Japanese Gagaku scales of Ritsu and Ro modes, and (3) Greek scales with Gagaku scales. He found there was essentially no difference between each pair of scales, although he admitted tonal patterns of Oriental and Western musics might be different. As demonstration of this, Izawa attached the Gagaku music tablature to the Greek music "Hymn to Apollo."²⁰

As a second step to this theoretical project, Izawa wrote a combined history of music for Europe, China, India, and Japan. This was probably intended to correlate Japanese histories of music with Western and other Oriental history of music according to era. In this essay, Izawa

referred to John Hullah's *Grammar of Musical Harmony* and B. Hunt's *A Concise History of Music for the Use of Students* for Western music. He also referred to several books on Indian and Chinese music that were listed in the records of the Music Investigation Committee, but no titles were given.

Thirdly, Izawa investigated the history of several national anthems in order to select music and an appropriate text for a Japanese national anthem. This included England's "God Save the Queen," France's "La Marseillaise," United States' "Hail Columbia," and Austria's "Our Fatherland."²¹ The meaning of each text, brief histories, and a critique of each national anthem was documented here.

Along with its investigation of music from around the world, the Music Investigation Committee took on the task of reforming Japanese traditional music. The chief reason for this endeavor was that Japanese traditional music had "immoral" characteristics both in text and melody.²² The Music Investigation Committee thought this needed to be addressed for the sake of school use.

Due to limited staff and budget, reformation was restricted to two kinds of music: Koto and Nagauta.²³ The reformation process included (1) choosing the pieces, (2) changing the melodies, (3) changing texts, and (4) transcribing to Western notation. Pieces were selected in accordance with their popularity and value in each field by several experts. The policy of melody reformation, it was claimed, would change the original mode to a better or more graceful mode. However, there was no clear definition of "better" and "graceful." Moreover, we have no records of how this melody reformation was actually carried out.²⁴

For the most part, reformation focused on changing the texts. Texts with immoral and emotional expressions were replaced by what were considered to be moral and patriotic texts. After changing the melody and texts, reformed pieces were tentatively performed in public for demonstration purposes. If there were signs of resistance from teachers, then pieces were

changed again. Reformed pieces were then transcribed into Western notation. As a result of this reformation, the collected pieces of Koto music were published as *Sokyoku Shu* in 1888. It was written in Western notation with English explanations. Due to financial restrictions, however, reformed Nagauta pieces were not compiled or published.

As a third step, Music Investigation Committee took on the most difficult part of the process of transformation or *Wa-Yo Secchu*: the creation of new music. Its most urgent project was to publish music textbooks for elementary schools and kindergartens, and its staff was to compose and compile music for these textbooks.

Composition of music for the elementary schools was mainly done by Luther Whiting Mason, Shuji Izawa, and several Japanese language experts. The project bore results in 1881 when *Shogaku Shoka Shu*, the first music textbook in Japan, was published. As a matter of fact, among the thirty-three songs selected for the first edition of this music textbook, only three pieces were original compositions. The other two were composed by Fujitsune Shiba, a court musician and a faculty member of the Music Investigation Committee. The rest of the pieces were selected from Mason's *National Music Course* and other American music textbooks. Texts of these pieces were carefully written by committee members to ensure that moral and patriotic content be present. It would be fair to say that in this project, the process of *Wa-Yo Secchu* was actually a simple assigning of European music to Japanese texts.²⁵

Composition of music for kindergarten was mainly done by Japanese court musicians. At that time, only court musicians, either teachers or students of the Music Investigation Committee, were proficient in both Japanese and Western music. In 1878 they were asked to compose a piece for kindergarten by the Tokyo Women's Teacher College.²⁶ The court musicians composed a piece titled "Kazaguruma" (Windfans). They first chose an appropriate text from the

repertoire of Gagaku music and then composed the melody. It was written in Western notation, but with the tonality of the Ritsu mode in Gagaku music. It had no semitones or tonic endings. In this case, *Wa-Yo Secchu* was seen as the transformation of a Gagaku melody into Western style.

In 1890, after Mason left, the Music Investigation Committee changed its name to Tokyo Music School and began hiring German musicians. Japanese traditional music was no longer considered a required part of the curriculum. Apparently the institution changed its function from that of melting pot of Western and Japanese music to that of a hothouse of genuine Western art music.

No attempt at composing new music can be observed, other than what is described above. Although a substantial number of music textbooks were published after *Shogaku Shokashu* and the kindergarten pieces, the materials were based on the same pattern used for the former books; namely, Western melody with Japanese moral text.

Although *Wa-Yo Secchu* was one of the first attempts to "marry" different cultures on a national scale, and despite the prodigious amounts of energy and expenses dispersed, the project resulted in failure.

First, music materials were inappropriate. In this project, only Gagaku music was chosen from among the various types of Japanese music. Other music was ignored. The explanation given is that Gagaku was the only Japanese music regarded as noble and harmless. In addition, the majority of students in the Music Investigation Committee were former court musicians who inherited the occupation of music. Given this situation, blending Western music with Japanese music inevitably resulted in blending Gagaku music and Western music. Since Gagaku music was only for the nobility, it was far removed from the life of the Japanese public. This blending therefore could not be truly considered "national music."

Second, the processes of *Wa-Yo Secchu* were poorly handled. In terms of the comparison of Western and Japanese music, Izawa drew the simplistic conclusion that Japanese music (only Gagaku) and Western music were similar because they shared the same notes of their respective scales. Obviously, commonality in scales does not mean sameness in music. Izawa ignored all the differences: rhythm, form, timbre, and cultural contexts. Recognition of differences in music is perhaps much more important than that of similarities in this case. Admittedly, circumstances at the time did not allow Izawa to do much better. He had to compromise and achieve results quickly in order to show progress to the Ministry of Education.

Third, this attempt did not last long. The emphasis of public education shifted from Europeanism and liberalism to nationalism and patriotism. The interest in music education was moralistic rather than aesthetic. The authorities probably lost interest in continuing this project. Rather, they favored maintaining the *status quo*. In addition, the Tokyo Music School became a mecca of Western art music.

It was this background that gave current public music education its shaky start. There was no intent to teach Japanese traditional music from the outset. Blended music of the West and Japan was what Izawa and the authorities had in mind for school music. Until the end of World War II, this unfinished and immature style of *Wa-Yo Secchu* characterized school music in Japan.

Japanese School Music After World War II

After World War II, the old "imperialism" was replaced by democracy and Japan began restructuring its politics, economy and education under supervision of the United States. A new educational constitution *Kyoiku Kihon Ho* (Basic Educational Law) was proclaimed in 1947.

One of the remarkable characteristics of the new educational system was the issue of *Gakushu Shido Yoryo* (the Course of Study) issued by the Ministry of Education. At first,

this was intended to be a guide for the contents and standards of each subject grade by grade for schools across the nation. But from 1958, its outline became mandatory. Six editions of this course of study have been issued since 1947.

Music was included in the curriculum under the new system in which the name of the subject changed from *Shoka* (singing) to *Ongaku* (music). Saburo Moroi, a German educated composer and the first supervisor of music education in the Ministry of Education, was mainly responsible for writing the curriculum.

Moroi clearly stated that the "European music system should be taught as basic to the new music curriculum because the foundation of a musical sense can only be established by one kind of music."²⁷ He believed that "teaching several kinds of music simultaneously would hinder the development of children's musical sense."²⁸ But he did not explain why European music should be the chosen basis. No Japanese traditional music was included in the suggested list of teaching materials for the course, and Japanese traditional music was entirely excluded from the curriculum.

The absence of Japanese traditional music from the curriculum continued until the third version of the course of study was issued in 1958. From this time, the course provided a list of teaching materials called *Kyotsu Kyozei* (common materials) which had to be studied by all students both in singing and appreciation areas. In this list, five pieces of Japanese traditional music were included as appreciation material for the first time.²⁹ However, these were the only pieces of Japanese traditional music in the entire nine-year curriculum. The basic structure of the curriculum remained essentially the same as before.³⁰

In 1968, the fourth version of the course of study was issued, this time showing slight progress in its treatment of Japanese traditional music. In this version, the statement that "children's folk songs and folk music of each area of the country are to be taught" was added for the first time. Children's folk songs were added as compulsory singing materials.³¹ In addition to

the former version, nine more Japanese traditional music pieces were added in the listening list of *Kyotsu Kyozaï*.³² It is claimed that this change was influenced by several authorities in Japanese traditional music.³³ However, the fundamental structure of the curriculum remained unchanged.

The number of Japanese pieces was reduced in the fifth version of *Gakushu Shido Yoryo* issued in 1977. Four folk songs, one koto piece, and one ensemble piece were eliminated and one Nagauta piece was replaced by a contemporary orchestral piece.³⁴ This was due to a change in general policy whereby compulsory materials were reduced in order to allow for more flexibility and freedom in the course.³⁵

The most recent version of the course of study was issued in 1989. The content of Japanese traditional music in *Kyotsu Kyozaï* did not change except that one contemporary piece was added to the list as an appreciation piece.³⁶ However, the course put more emphasis on studying Japanese traditional music and other non-Western music than the former version.³⁷ It stated that Japanese folk music and traditional music should be studied as much as the situation allows.³⁸ But the structure, scope and sequence of the curriculum remained basically intact.³⁹

We see then, that public music education in Japan has never given serious consideration to the need for including music in the core of its curriculum. At the start, the government's attempt to blend Western and Japanese music for school use resulted in compromise. But after World War II, the new democratic education placed Western music at the center. Although this policy has slightly changed in the past forty years and the number of Japanese teaching materials has increased, the fundamental line running through the official music curriculum has not changed. However, there have been several attacks and proposals against this curriculum, both from the outside and from within.

Signs of Change

Public music education after World War II has received numerous criticisms and attacks from experts in various fields outside music education. Composers have mainly raised issues to do with the quality of teachers and music materials in the public schools. Ethnomusicologists have criticized the curriculum's extraordinary bias towards Western music. Fumio Koizumi (1927-1983), a pioneer ethnomusicologist and theoretician of Japanese traditional music, and Tomiko Kojima (1929-), student of Koizumi and a Japanese music historian, have been among the most active critics of public school music in Japan.

The publication of Koizumi's book in 1973 titled *Otamajakushi Muyoron (Give up Tadpoles)*⁴⁰ caused a sensation not only in the music education field but also in society at large, since it was the first radical attack on the Japanese official music curriculum. Koizumi argued that (1) current music education was biased towards Western music, (2) public school music was too controlled by the Ministry of Education, and (3) it was too standardized across the country. Therefore, he claimed, it caused the following serious problems: (1) a majority of students develop a dislike for music because the national curriculum forces them to study notations and songs they do not like; therefore, (2) they never carry school music outside the classroom setting; (3) the inflexible curriculum hinders development of the students' sense of music; and (4) the public develops the incorrect conception that Western music is the best of the world's music.

Koizumi asserted that the entire curriculum should be restructured so that students would gain a sense of their identity through musical study and would come to understand various musics in an unbiased way.⁴¹ In his idea of music education, music teaching should start with *Warabeuta* (children's folk song) because he believed "it is directly connected to Japanese traditional music."⁴² Following this statement,

Koizumi provided a rough sketch of his curriculum grade by grade. He concluded that the true purpose of bringing Japanese traditional music into the school curriculum is "not to put pressure on the Japanese sense but to help the natural sense of music bloom from the inside."⁴³

Kojima's criticism against public music education was essentially the same as Koizumi's.⁴⁴ But her opinions were even more radical. She asserted that the entire curriculum should be based on Japanese traditional music alone.⁴⁵ Although she insisted that the current educational system be abandoned, she did not provide a curriculum plan of her own.

Some Approaches from Inside

Influenced by Koizumi and Kojima, a group of teachers called *Ongaku Kyōiku no Kai* (Music Education Association) began applying Japanese traditional music to the classroom setting in 1967. Following Koizumi's suggestion, they taught *Warabeuta* (children's folk songs). But the teachers could not stop teaching Western music since the students were surrounded by it at various levels of society. The solution to this problem was to teach *Warabeuta* and Western music simultaneously by dividing the class into two periods. This was called *Nihondate Hoshiki* (two pillars method).⁴⁶ Although the attempt was innovative and appealing, it did not develop or last long. This is possibly because the curriculum was too precisely determined to allow for flexibility in teaching. Unfortunately, the attempt was also misconceived as a movement toward anti-authoritarianism.⁴⁷

From the 1970s on, many more innovative music teachers have been teaching Japanese traditional music. For example, Takashi Yamada has taught *Noh* flute and *nagauta shamisen* for more than twenty years. Yoshio Chihara has taught Koto music as his main teaching activity. Keiichi Ohara used Korean and African drums as well as Japanese drums.⁴⁸ All three teachers think that Western music and Japanese music should be taught separately because they are essentially different.⁴⁹

In 1991, the Japanese Academic Society for Music Education organized the first national symposium with the theme "Japanese Traditional Music," and leading music educators in Japan finally took another look at changing the current situation. Although research and practice on this issue are only in the early stages, the minds of music teachers are beginning to change.

Perspective for the Future

Before discussing a future perspective, it is necessary to answer the question raised at the beginning of this essay: Why is Western music still the core of public music education in Japan? Historically, there are two reasons why Japanese traditional music has not been the center of the curriculum. From the beginning of public music education until the end of World War II, the government originally attempted to blend Western and Japanese music for school use. But, as we have seen, this resulted in compromise. After World War II, the new democratic education ignored Japanese traditional music and placed Western music at the center.

Two other factors deserve consideration. First, except for a new innovative teachers, the majority of Japanese music teachers have followed *Gakushu Shido Yoryo* (the Course of Study) blindly and have never examined it critically. They have generally been faithful to the government mandate and are reluctant to do anything outside of its policy.

Second, there have been many practical difficulties in implementing Japanese traditional music in the curriculum. For example, there are many kinds of Japanese music from which to choose. That is, there is no such thing as what Westerners might refer to as the "basics." In addition, there is a political factor. In each genre there are at least two or more schools represented. Since these schools compete with each other, it is difficult and unfair to select only one school. Moreover, there is no concept of *gradus ad Parnassus* in Japanese music. That is, unlike Western music, Japanese music usually does not have "drill" music or "etude." The beginners

must practice the same music that the experts play. Because of this, beginners usually take a substantial amount of time just learning the music. These practical conditions have prevented Japanese traditional music from taking root at the center of the curriculum.

Today, the Japanese as well as other peoples of the world are in a very difficult and critical situation politically, economically, and diplomatically. Nearing the end of the twentieth century they are plunging into a time of turmoil, restoration, and revolution. Naturally, music educators are not exempt from facing various difficulties related to these movements. The roles and responsibilities of music educators may become more important than ever before. The decisions of music educators make may in fact determine their own future.

In particular, Japanese music educators are now facing the critical question of deciding how music education should function in the future. In the same way that Izawa faced a crossroads over one hundred years ago, we are again standing at a three-way intersection. Will we

(1) maintain the *status quo*? In this case Western music stays at the center of the national curriculum. It comes out on top of the hierarchy of valued music. The national curriculum retains its power over all schools. Teachers follow this curriculum regardless of their wishes or ideas. Japanese traditional music may be included. But it is only a frill on the edge of the curriculum. Teacher training in music is also centered in Western music.

(2) replace the current curriculum with that of Japanese traditional music? Since Western music cannot merge with Japanese music, only Japanese traditional music is valid and useful in the schools. Faculty at teacher education institutions should teach mainly Japanese music.

(3) develop a new direction that would save both types of music? We cannot limit ourselves to any one type of music. We have to study both types equally and find a music that shares the characteristics of each. This would be the second at-

tempt at synthesizing two music worlds after Izawa. Although this will still be very difficult to achieve today, we will not survive otherwise.

Reviewing the historical facts and consequences naturally leads me to the obvious answer: neither (1) or (2) would work out well. If we choose (1), we will not be able to cope with current pressures. Music education would become isolated from society. As a result, music education would disappear from the school curriculum.

If we choose (2), school music will become chaotic. We cannot change the sense of Western music we have already cultivated for more than a hundred years. Teachers cannot be reeducated nor replaced quickly. This would cause turbulence in Japanese music culture. For example, Seiji Ozawa will not longer be admired in his home country.

However difficult it may be, we have to choose plan (3) for our survival and for the development of our profession. As a first step in this direction, students need to develop a "bi-musicality," the skill of being fluent in two "musics," analogous to the word "bilingual," the skill of being fluent in two languages. A student with "bi-musicality" has two different criteria for judging music, each according to its own particular criteria. For example, he or she does not judge Japanese folk songs as bad vocalization according to Western *bel canto* criteria.

When a student obtains the skill of bi-musicality, he or she will eventually be able to develop a sense of uniting the two musics. This is because one music would not be valued over the other and understanding one music may enrich the understanding of the other. One hundred years ago, this attempt resulted in failure because Izawa and his associates overlooked this process of bi-musicality before blending the two musics. Mastering two musics should have preceded synthesis. After more than one hundred years of trial and error, Japan has hopefully matured to the point of being able to synthesize Western and Japanese music.

In order to accomplish this objective, Japanese music educators must be bi-musical themselves. They must teach not only how to sing "Winterreise" in German, but also how to sing the Japanese folk song "Kisobushi" in Japanese. It does not really matter which kind of music is the teacher's specialty. He or she need only be fluent and skillful in at least two different musics.

In addition to this, teachers should be required to have a sense of the value of both Japanese traditional and Western music. One of the very first things to do here is to change the belief that Western music is the best of all music. Unfortunately, this proposal is a serious threat to the majority of music educators in Japan because they will have to study Japanese traditional music again. But I strongly believe that this is the only direction for a better future in Japanese public music education.

Conclusion

This essay has mainly discussed from a historical perspective the paradoxical question of why Japanese music has not been the center of Japanese music education. Based on this discus-

sion, I have proposed a new direction--"bi-musicality"--as the future of music education in Japan.

The Japanese have a great advantage in becoming bi-musical. They have inherited many traditional kinds of music with more than a thousand years' history. They have also accumulated the experience of teaching Western music in the public music education system.

A number of historical factors have hindered them from becoming fluent in both types of music thus far. Over one hundred years later, it may be time for Izawa's wishes to come true. According to Shibata's theory, the end of the twentieth century is the beginning of a period of fermentation. *Wa-Yo Secchu* or even synthesis of Japanese and Western music can already be seen in the compositions of Takemitsu, Mayuzumi, and many other excellent Japanese composers. Just as the English language is an amalgamation of Latin, German, French, and other languages, the new Japanese music will be an amalgamation of Western music, Japanese traditional music and many other types of Asian music. This new music will become the "national music" of Japan. And public music education must play an important role in this endeavor.

NOTES

1. Data are taken from the list of All Japan Society of Music Faculties in National Educational Universities.
2. Kikkawa, E., *Nihon Ongaku No Rekishi (A History of Japanese Traditional Music)* (Osaka Sogensha, 1977), 157.
3. Uehara, K., *Nihon Ongaku Kyouiku Bunkashi (A History of Japanese Music Culture and Education)* (Tokyo: Ongaku no Tomo Sha, 1988), 55.
4. Shibata, M., *Ongakushi to Ongaku ron (Music History and Philosophy of Music)* (Tokyo: Obunsha, 1980), 11.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid., 17-20.
7. Ibid.
8. Ibid., 56-57.
9. Ibid., 100.
10. Kikkawa, *Nihon Ongaku No Rekishi*, 358-359.
11. Ibid., 355.
12. Uehara, *Nihon Ongaku Kyouiku Bunkashi*, 299-300.
13. Kikkawa, *Nihon Ongaku No Rekishi*, 361.
14. *Tokyo Geijutsu Daigaku Hyakunen-shi (Centennial Chronicles of Tokyo University of Fine Arts and Music)* (Tokyo: Ongaku no Tomo Sha, 1987), 29-30.
15. Ibid.
16. Ibid., 123-189.
17. It was titled "Report on the Result of the Investigations Concerning Music, Undertaken by Order of the Department of Education" and written both in Japanese and English.
18. *Tokyo Geijutsu Daigaku Hyakunen-shi*, 168.
19. Ibid.
20. Ibid., 169.

21. Ibid., 145-152.
22. Ibid., 145-152.
23. Hamano, M. and Hattori, K., eds., *Ongakuyouiku Seiritsu e no Kiseki (Development of the Establishment of Music Education)* (Tokyo: Ongaku no Tomo Sha, 1976), 152.
24. Ibid.
25. Ibid.
26. *Tokyo Geijutsu Daigaku Hyakunen-shi*, 94-96.
27. Kawaguchi, M., "Meiji Iko Gakkou Ongaku No Shiteki Tenkai" ("Historical Development of School Music after Meiji Period"), *Kikan Ongaku Kyouiku Kenkyu (Quarterly Journal of Music Education Research)* 70 (1992): 104.
28. Mashino, M., *Ongaku Kyouiku Yonjunenshi (Forty Years History of Music Education)* (Tokyo: Toyokan, 1986), 36.
29. Ibid., 96. These were: "Rokudan" ("Six Tableaus") of Koto music, "Imayo" ("Current Standing") of old rhyme, "Esashi Oiwake" ("Folk Song of Hokkaido"), "Azuma Hakkei" ("Eight Views of Asume") of Nagauta music, and "Etenraku" of Gagaku music.
30. Shibuya, T., "Warabeuta Kyoiku no Mezashita mono" ("The Aim of Music Education by Children's Folk Songs") in *Ongaku Kyouiku no Rekishi* (Tokyo: Ongaku no Tomo Sha, 1983), 139.
31. Ibid., 140.
32. Uehara, *Nihon Ongaku Kyouiku Bunkashi*, 392-393. These were: "Sakura Sakura" ("Cherry Blossom"), "Kokiriko Bushi" ("Folk Song"), "Godan Kinuta" of Koto music, "Shiki no Nagame" ("Views of Four Seasons") of Sankyoku, "Saitaro-bushi," "Kokaji" of Nagauta, "Kashiboshi Kiri Uta" ("Folk Song"), "Shika no Toune" ("Deers Crying") of Shakuhachi, and "Kiyari no Dan" ("A Tableau of Woodcutter") of Gidayu.
33. Ibid., 375.
34. The title of this piece is "Woodcutter's Song for Orchestra" by Kiyoshige Koyama. This piece used plenty of Japanese instruments as well as Western instruments.
35. Uehara, *Nihon Ongaku Kyouiku Bunkashi*, 394.
36. The title of this piece was "November Steps" by Toru Takemitsu.
37. Nishizawa, A., "Shin Gakushu Shido Yoryo wo Yomu" ("Analysis of the New Course of Study") in *Kyouiku Ongaku Bessatsu* (Tokyo: Ongaku no Tomo sha, 1989), 140-145.
38. Monbuscho (Ministry of Education), *Gakushu Shido Yoryo (The Course of Study)* (1989), 84-85.
39. Nishizawa, A., "Shin Gakushu Shido Yoryo wo Yomu."
40. "Tadpoles" is a metaphorical word for Western style notation.
41. Koizumi, F., *Otamajakushi Muyoron (Give Up Tadpoles)*, (Tokyo: Seidosha, 1980), 52-67.
42. Koizumi, F., *Kodomono Asobi to Uta (Children's Playing and Singing)*, (Tokyo: Soshisha, 1986), 179.
43. Ibid., 192.
44. Kojima, T., *Nihon no Ongaku wo Kangaeru (Thinking About Japanese Music)*, (Tokyo: Ongaku no Tomo sha, 1976).
45. Ibid., 75.
46. Kawaguchi, M., *Ongaku Kyouiku no Riron to Rekishi (Theory and History of Music Education)*, (Tokyo: Ongaku no Tomo sha, 1991), 333-340.
47. Shibuya, T., "Warabeuta Kyoiku no Mezashita mono" ("The Aim of Music Education by Children's Folk Songs") in *Ongaku Kyouiku no Rekishi*, (Tokyo: Ongaku no Tomo Sha, 1983), 142.
48. Omoto, R., "Nihon Ongaku Gakushu Shido no Gutaika e no Shiten" ("Perspectives of Japanese Traditional Music Education") in *Ongaku Kyouiku Gaku (Research in Music Education)* 22, No.1 (1992): 3-11.
49. Ibid., 5.

Toward an Integrated Aesthetic and the Implications for Music Education

Anthony J. Palmer
University of Hawaii at Manoa

Introduction

Traditional Western aesthetics draws distinctions between the subject and object, emphasizing the values of one to the rejection of values for the other. The purpose of this study is to explore a new pathway that examines the *relationship* between subject and object as the most important dimension in this complex. It is this relationship that could possibly lead us toward integration of the two poles.

To this end, the aesthetics of Zeami-Motokiyo Saburo (1363-1443) that he developed for Nô theater will be explored for what those ideas may lend to the investigation. While Kiyotsugu Yuzaki (known professionally as Kannami) elevated a peasant entertainment to the level of a court fine art, it was Zeami, his son, who brought the aesthetics to a new high which guided the practice of Nô for these last several hundred years.

To clarify the discussion between two principal views of philosophy--East and West--upon which this study is based, three major thrusts in Western aesthetic ideation will be outlined. Thus, the ground is established upon which certain postulations about subject and object can be advanced. To conclude the study, findings will be evaluated for the implications that they hold for music education.

Western Aesthetics

Absolute formalism, suitably represented by

Eduard Hanslick, scorns emotion as a source of knowledge and rejects the subject entirely as not being acceptably reliable. Hanslick first decries earlier systems of thought as unphilosophical that would dwell on feelings which music awakens. He then states that

...though no doubt pleasing to a certain class of enthusiasts [using music to describe feelings], they [these ascriptions] afford but little enlightenment to a thoughtful student who, in order to learn something about the real nature of music, will, above all, remain deaf to the fitful promptings of passion and not, as most manuals on music direct, turn to the emotions as a source of knowledge.²

And later he emphatically asserts that, "...the rule has already been laid down that aesthetic investigations must above all consider the beautiful object, and not the perceiving subject."³

The formalist argument, additionally supported in the twentieth century by influential musicians such as Roger Sessions⁴ and Igor Stravinsky, reinforce this emphasis on the object. Stravinsky speaks of the listener as a partner of the composer who should accumulate "musical instruction and education ...sufficiently extensive" to be able to "...grasp the main features of the work as they emerge."⁵ He completely discounts the subject's ability to bring anything to the experience other than musical preparation in order to follow what the composer has achieved in sound, a decidedly formalist viewpoint.