

Kosei and *Zokei* Education:
Bauhaus and the Formation of Kuwasawa Design School

Hidehiro Ikegami
Tokyo Zokei University

Abstract

THE Bauhaus movement had a significant impact in Japan. Based on the advice of Takehiko Mizutani, who had studied in Dessau, Renshichiro Kawakita established the *Shin Kenchiku Kogei Kenkyu Koshu-jo* [School for Modern Architecture and Craft]. Education at this school included expressionist style content such as visualizing the sound when a washbowl is beaten. The course content by Kawakita adopted undoubtedly the educational methods, created by Johannes Itten at the Bauhaus of Weimar era.

Kawakita published *Kosei Kyoiku Taikei* [Compendium of Kosei education] in 1934, which contributed to spread widely the concept of *kosei kyoiku* in Japan. Yoko Kuwasawa, pupil of Kawakita and future founder of *Kuwasawa Design Kenkyu-jo* [Kuwasawa Design School], joined this project as a main editor.

This study aims to clarify the philosophy behind Kuwasawa Design School and of its founder Kuwasawa, focusing on their role in promoting Bauhaus acceptance in Japan.

Although Kawakita's *kosei kyoiku* was fundamentally based on Mizutani's *kosei kiso kyoiku* (corresponded to the first year course of Bauhaus), Kawakita considered Mizutani's method as an "abstract *kosei*". Nonetheless, Kawakita strongly intended to integrate the two different education styles of Bauhaus (Itten's expressionist style and Moholy-Nagy's rationalist style) and to systematize all concepts under his own almighty sensationalism.

In the same way, although it was Kawakita who directly taught her the concept of Bauhaus(-like) education, Yoko Kuwasawa did not inherit Kawakita's *kosei kyoiku* in the same form. On the other hand, a critic and educator Masaru Katsumi chose the term *zokei* instead of "design" or *kosei*, when he established Zokei Kyoiku Center.

In 1954, Yoko Kuwasawa established Kuwasawa Design School and one of the core members Katsumi called it as "Japanese version of Bauhaus". He expressed his joy when Gropius evaluated the school positively.

The educational philosophy of Bauhaus, during the stage of its acceptance in Japan, underwent various trials and errors. The activities of Kuwasawa can be defined and evaluated as follows.

- 1) Her attitude of strongly desiring to connect daily life and design laid the groundwork for the active acceptance of the policy of Katsumi, Moholy-Nagy and so on, even if these two had differing opinions.
- 2) The Itten-like expressionist style method by Kawakita impressed her.
- 3) When she established Kuwasawa Design School, she adopted both trends.
- 4) At the beginning, she established the school mainly for fashion design, but from the second year, the school began to push further in terms of its synthetic and rationalistic character.

Keywords: Kuwasawa Design School; Bauhaus; Kosei/Zokei Kyoiku

Yoko Kuwasawa and the *Kosei-kyoiku* by Renshichiro Kawakita

A fat teacher, who seemed to be Mr. Kawakita himself, suddenly started to hit the buckets, washbowls, and wooden tables around him. He made banging or popping sounds, then he asked to us to visualize the rhythm freely on the drawing paper with pencils... I could only behold the scene in front of my eyes. I couldn't move my pencil at all.¹⁾

The quote above, from Yoko Kuwasawa's memoir, depicts a scene of a class at the *Shin Kenbiku Kogei Kenkyu Koushu-jo* [School for Modern Architecture and Craft]. The small school for night students was located in Ginza (Tokyo), founded by Renshichiro Kawakita in 1931. Kuwasawa, born in 1910 in Tokyo, the future founder of *Kuwasawa Design Kenkyu-jo* [Kuwasawa Design School], was a young clothing designer and fledgling journalist at the time. Incidentally, Kuwasawa Design School is the first institute in Japan whose name bears the word "design" in *katakana*.

As can be seen in the recollection of Kuwasawa, the educational methods in Kawakita's course adopted a tendency toward expressionist and spiritualist styles attributed to Johannes Itten at the Bauhaus Weimar.

The educational methods of Kawakita were greeted with sensational surprise in the art educational circles in Japan at the time. With Katsuo Takei, Kawakita published *Kosei Kyoiku Taikei* [Compendium of Kosei education] in 1934, which contributed to the wide spread of his concept throughout Japan.²⁾ Kawakita was an architect and designer, whereas his co-author Takei was an educator. Kuwasawa joined this project as a main editor; the large textbook contained more than 500 pages.

This study aims to clarify the philosophy behind Kuwasawa Design School and of its founder Kuwasawa, focusing on their role in promoting Bauhaus acceptance in Japan. Toward this end, the philosophies of Kawakita and Takei need to be examined as both guided Kuwasawa's formative years in the field.

At the time, a long-standing practice in Japanese school education was to provide "art education" in the form of *zuga* [drawing] lessons, which emphasized naturalistic free drawing, as advocated by Kanae Yamamoto. For Takei, the separation of *shukou* [craft] lessons from *zuga* lessons was a problem. Moreover, for more than a half century in Japan, *zuan* [design] was considered as a rigid practice of "making patterns" that did not accommodate creativity.³⁾

Takei attended the world art education conference in Paris in 1937. He later told Kazuo Kaneko that he was impressed when he saw "a teacher of a German junior high school explain his teaching method of playing the piano while instructing students to convert the sound into

1) ———— Yoko Kuwasawa, *Fudangi no Designer* [Designer of Undress], Tokyo: Kuwasawa Gakuen, 2004, p. 60.

2) ———— The Japanese word "Kosei" can have the meanings of structure, composition, organization, construction or formation. Kawakita uses it with wider meaning.

3) ———— Katsuo Takei, *Baubaus system ni yoru Design Kyoiku Nyumon* [A guide for Bauhaus system design education], Tokyo: Zokei sha, 1964, pp. 1-2.

an image”.⁴⁾

Takei, born in 1898, was the principal of a primary school in Tokyo when he joined Kawakita’s School for Modern Architecture and Craft. Takei soon admired the younger teacher’s interesting lessons and became co-author of *Kosei Kyoiku Taikei*. At the time, as described above, Kawakita practiced Itten-like specific tuition.

Kawakita himself named his teaching method *Kosei Kyoiku* and defined it as follows: “*Kosei Kyoiku* is, so to speak, the way of knowing and touching materials or substances that have shapes and colors and then of treating them in various ways”.⁵⁾

Kawakita and the two different trends of Bauhaus

WHAT was the philosophy of Kawakita? Where did his knowledge and views come from? Although the components of his practice were based on the method of Itten, Kawakita himself did not experience studying at the Bauhaus. Nonetheless, Kawakita was fluent in German, and as such, he could access information from German materials, such as architectural magazines, brought back by Japanese scholars who visited the Bauhaus, including architect Chikatada Kurata.

When the Bauhaus was founded in Weimar in 1919, the expressionist–spiritualist bases (and handicraft trends) were integrated into the rationalism and functionalism programs under the leadership of two strong personalities: the first principal Walter Gropius and Itten, who supervised the preliminary courses for first-year students.

In 1923, as it is well-known, Itten left the Bauhaus. The main reason of the conflict was the differences of their two opposing philosophies of Itten and Gropius. His departure was also partially because, as Itten himself recalled later, of his commitment to Eastern philosophy; his adoption of meditation, massage, and yoga exercises in class provoked criticism against his “mystical” approaches.⁶⁾ After Laszlo Moholy-Nagy succeeded Itten, rationalism and functionalism became the mainstream principles in the Bauhaus, which met the trends of industrial design and mass production.

During this reformation, few Japanese studied in the Bauhaus. After returning to Japan, they gradually introduced Bauhaus in the country. Among them, one of the very first visitors was Sadanosuke Nakata, whereas Takehiko Mizutani is considered to have contributed the most in the early days of the Bauhaus in Japan. The former was a visitor of the Bauhaus in Weimar (i.e., Bauhaus with Itten), whereas the latter trained in the Bauhaus after the institute moved to Dessau (i.e., Moholy-Nagy era).

In an article by Nakata in *Mizue*, he quoted Gropius, who emphasized the nature of “syn-

4) ——— Kazuo Kaneko, ‘Kaisetsu, Kosei Kyoiku Taikei no shuhen’ [Commentary: Surroundings of Kosei Kyoiku Taikei], in R. Kawakita and K. Takei, *Kosei Kyoiku Taikei*, 1934; reprint edited by H. Mori, Tokyo: Yumani Shobo, 2012, commentary p. 5.

5) ——— Renshichiro Kawakita and Katsuo Takei, *Kosei Kyoiku Taikei* [Compendium of Kosei education], Tokyo: Gakko Bijutsu Kyokai Shuppan-bu, 1934, p. 5.

6) ——— Johannes Itten, *Design and Form: the basic course at the Bauhaus*, translated by F. Bradley, revised edition, London: Thames and Hudson, 1975, p. 9.

thetic art” at the Bauhaus.⁷⁾ However, a specific description of the concrete educational program is not available. As for Mizutani, he introduced detailed course contents, such as lessons on drawing the moving human body from the class taught by Oscar Schlemmer.⁸⁾ After returning to Japan, Mizutani was reinstated at the Tokyo Bijutsu Gakko (later Tokyo National University of Art) in 1930. From 1933, he began to deliver lectures in the Kawakita’s School for Modern Architecture and Craft. Mizutani then became a type of advisor for Kawakita, providing guidance to the formation and development of Kawakita’s *Kosei* educational philosophy.

Kawakita, despite his collaborative relationship with Mizutani, did not thoroughly agree with the latter. Although his *Kosei Kyoiku* was fundamentally based on Mizutani’s idea, Kawakita considered Mizutani’s preceding educational method *Kosei Kiso Kyoiku* as an “abstract *Kosei*” without any practical purpose. *Kosei Kiso Kyoiku* corresponded to the course content of the *Werklehre* [work class] that first-year Bauhaus students studied in their first six months of training. To Kawakita, this curriculum differed from his practical and functional “productive *Kosei*.”⁹⁾

As such, Kawakita did not directly and wholly accept the philosophy and the practical methods of the Bauhaus. His uniqueness can be seen in another case as follows.

In *Kosei Kyoiku Taikei*, he coined the term *Shupannunku* and devoted the most space in his treatise to explain its meaning and function. This term is written in *katakana* and derived from the German word *Spannung*, which means “tension” and “stimulation.” Kawakita wrote: “There are two ‘Shupannunku.’ One is ‘passive Shupannunku,’ which occurs when the five human senses receive and perceive something from the outer world. The other is ‘technical Shupannunku,’ which generates positive tension in every creation and criticism. *Kosei Kyoiku* refers to the various processes as follows: to catch all ‘Shupannunku’ generated by nature or by daily life, organize them, and then transform them into the above-mentioned ‘technical Shupannunku.’”¹⁰⁾

He was almost certainly inspired to use the German term *Spannung* by Wassily Kandinsky’s treatise, but the definition by Kawakita is far from the original meaning. In effect, his overly broad interpretation and usage of his *Shupannunku* was strongly criticized by the Seinen Kenchiku-ka Club (group of young architects) in 1933 and 1934. In addition, *Kosei Kyoiku* itself was attacked by the same group as being too “mystical and spiritualistic” for education.¹¹⁾

Nonetheless, Kawakita strongly intended to integrate the two different education styles of Bauhaus (Itten’s expressionist style and Moholy-Nagy’s rationalist style) and to systematize all concepts under his own almighty sensationalism.

7) ———— Sadanosuke Nakata, ‘Kokuritsu Bauhaus’ [National Bauhaus], *Mizue*, vol. 244, issues 6&7, 1925, pp. 4-5.

8) ———— Takehiko Mizutani, ‘Shinko Germany and Bauhaus’ [New Germany and the Bauhaus], *Asabi Graph*, vol. 14, issue 1930.4-9, 1930, p. 14.

9) ———— Renshichiro Kawakita, ‘Kosei Kyoiku ni tsuite’ [About the Kosei Kyoiku], *Kenchiku Kougei I SEE ALL*, vol. 2, issue 11, 1932, p. 9.

10) ———— Renshichiro Kawakita and Katsuo Takei, op. cit., p. 16.

11) ———— Hiromitsu Umemiya, ‘Renshichiro Kawakita no Kosei Kyoiku ni taisuru Seinen Kenchikuka Club no hihan ni tsuite’ [Renshichiro Kawakita: the criticism against the idea of his design education], *Research Reports: Architectural Institute of Japan*, vol. 32, 1992, pp. 1057-58.

Kuwasawa's initial aims

AFTER editing *Kosei Kyoiku Taikei* with Kawakita, Kuwasawa continued her career as a journalist with various magazines, mainly in the fashion industry. In 1942, she opened a tiny studio, *Kuwasawa Fukushoku Kobo* [Kuwasawa Clothing Atelier], in Ginza. After the war, Japan soon entered the state of recovery and economic growth, and subsequently, the demand for dress-makers (not “fashion designers”) increased.

In 1948, she established *Tamagawa Yosai Gakko* [Tamagawa dressmaking school], as well as a small group inside the school, *K. D. Gijutsu Kenkyu-kai* [Kuwasawa Design workshop of technique]. However, the workshop, which did not yield any income, was forced out from the school by the owners. Thus, she established her own school, Kuwasawa Design School, in 1954 in Shibuya (Tokyo).

As regards her aim for the establishment, she wrote in her memoir as follows:

The biggest purpose of education [in this school] is to break the general preconceived notion for “design” through training. [...] The *Zokei Kyoiku* [Zokei education] in Japan, done only from the technical point of view, had harmful effects on all related fields.¹²⁾

As described above, it was Kawakita who directly taught her the concept of Bauhaus(-like) education. However, she did not inherit Kawakita's *Kosei Kyoiku* in the same form. In her memoir, she shared an evaluation of Kawakita's method. At first, she admired the great contribution of *Kosei Kyoiku* to the formation phase of design education in Japan. However, she also criticized it directly as follows:

I have doubts about Kawakita's *Kosei Kyoiku*. I felt that, in following *Kosei Kyoiku*, one runs the risk of misunderstanding the requirements of dress design or product design, given the focus on picking up elements such as points, lines, and colors, without providing intermediate processes. [...] I think that the first step in *Kosei Kyoiku* should be to comprehend the basic elements for all modeling sensations, such as colors, points, lines, and textures [tactile sensation], in the primitive sense as human nature. I believe that the phase of practice should come after [the first phase]. [The second phase should be that of practice] to construct those elements in a beautiful manner, with the most rational method.¹³⁾

As Teruhi Yamano pointed out, Kawakita advertised *Kosei Kyoiku* as “the practical method, useful for all figurative art” and also emphasized its aspect of the “fast way to get a hang of design.”¹⁴⁾ However, Yoko Kuwasawa thought that *Kosei Kyoiku* lacked the necessary “interme-

12) ———— Yoko Kuwasawa, op. cit., p. 211.

13) ———— Ibid., pp. 65-66.

14) ———— Teruhi Yamano, “Zokei-syugi bijutsu kyoiku no Keifu I: Kawakita Renshichiro no Kosei Kyoiku ni kansuru ichi kosatsu” [The pedigree in Art Education of “Zoukei-syugi” I: a study of “Kousei-kyoiku” works of R. Kawakita], *Bijutsu Kyoiku-gaku*, Bijutsu-ka kyoiku-gakkai, vol. 14, 1993, p. 357.

diate process” between the phase of grasping elements through the senses and that of design creation.

Although few materials are available on the details of the lectures held at Kuwasawa Design School, the memoirs or interviews by ex-teachers and students (at the time of establishment) is valuable to the present discourse. For instance, Go Michiyoshi, ex-student and later teacher at Kuwasawa Design School, described one of the classes in the school: “After instructing us to put some dots on a piece of paper, the teacher said that we have to think about the spaces between them. It was so philosophical...”¹⁵⁾

Meanwhile, ex-student Motoo Nakanishi reported that he learned how to connect ideas to machines in a class under Kozo Koike at Kuwasawa Design School.¹⁶⁾ This description relates to one of the steps in the “intermediate process” that Yoko Kuwasawa thought should fill the gap in Kawakita’s *Kosei Kyoiku*: between the phase of grasping elements through the senses and that of design creation.

Amid such circumstances, Gropius came to Japan and visited Kuwasawa Design School in 1954. On this occasion, Masaru Katsumi, critic and educator, organized a commemorative exhibition and a welcome party at the University of Tokyo. Katsumi, born in 1909, founded the *Zokei Kyoiku Center* [Zokei Education Center] in 1955 with Masato Takahashi and took an instructive role in *Zokei* education in Japan.

Katsumi was also one of the core founders of Kuwasawa Design School. He called the school a “Japanese version of Bauhaus” and expressed his joy when Gropius evaluated the school positively, translating the message given by Gropius to Yoko Kuwasawa as follows: “Here I have found genuine Bauhaus spirit, the desirable trend I am looking for: the transitional, creative bridge between the East and the West. Great success to you!”¹⁷⁾

It is interesting to note that Katsumi used the term *zokei* instead of “design” or *kosei*. This was because, at the time in Japan, the word “design” had a narrow meaning, signifying only the molding plan and its purpose and utility. In promoting the practice of Bauhaus education, Katsumi thought that, the Bauhaus-like methods, including *kosei kyoiku*, similar to elementalism, could lead to a division of labor in design. Thus, he chose the term *zokei*. *Zokei* as used by Katsumi literally meant “to mold,” but Katsumi imbued it with the wider definition of “design.” To him, *zokei* should signify “designing whole figurative things with shapes and colors” and “much more fundamental and unspecialized ability (than literary meaning of *zokei*)”¹⁸⁾

15) ——— Go Michiyoshi, ‘Kuwasawa Design Kenkyu-jo no omoide’ [Memory of Kuwasawa Design School], in R. Sawa (ed), *Kuwasawa Yoko to Design Kyoiku no Kiseki*, Tokyo: Kuwasawa Gakuen, 2005, p. 150.

16) ——— Asao Sakurai, *Hyo-den: Kuwasawa Yoko* [Biography of Yoko Kuwasawa], Tokyo: Kuwasawa Gakuen, 2003, p. 202.

17) ——— Message by Walter Gropius to Yoko Kuwasawa, translated by Masaru Katsumi, in Taro Takamatsu, *Kuwasawa: So-so no Tsui-oku* [Memory of the early days in Kuwasawa], Tokyo: Kuwasawa Gakuen, 2004, the back cover.

18) ——— Masaru Katsumi, ‘Sekai no Zokei Kyoiku’ [Zokei education in the world], *Chosaku-shu: Bigaku, Kyoiku-ron*, Tokyo: Kodansha, 1986, pp. 217-219

Transition of Kuwasawa Design School: Masaru Katsumi and Yoko Kuwasawa

KATSUMI consistently pursued “Design for Living” as his ideal. He used the term “Living Design” to symbolize his idea. As Akio Kasuga and Takashi Kobayashi pointed out, Katsumi aspired to “guide one’s attention to the social function of art, through art education, putting design and daily life at the core.”¹⁹⁾

Meanwhile, as the title of her book *Fudangi no Designer [Designer of Undress]* symbolically shows, Kuwasawa aimed to make *Monpe* (Japanese women’s work pants) beautiful while maintaining their function.²⁰⁾ She believed that all design must originate from human’s daily life. On this point, both Katsumi and Kuwasawa shared common interests. They formed a tag-team to establish Kuwasawa Design School: Kuwasawa as the engine and Katsumi as the operator who supported her philosophical leanings.

In the first pamphlet of Kuwasawa Design School in 1954 for freshmen and new candidates included the following lines:

This is the first genuine school for learning design with the best staff in Japan. [...] We want to create “our own *Kimono* [clothes]” that are appropriate to our society, natural features, and our daily life.²¹⁾

The statement above does not conceal her nature as purely a fashion designer. Further, her personal wishes were far from Gropius’s “synthetic art” philosophy, although the school was called by Katsumi as the “Japanese version of the Bauhaus.” In effect, although the school consisted of two departments (“dress-making” and “living design”), the latter only had evening classes, whereas the former had much more students, owing to the established fame of Kuwasawa as one of the most important dress designers at the time.

The School’s pamphlet in its second year included the following lines:

What is design?
What is the basis of design?
How can we pursue basic training? [...]
Kuwasawa Design School gives clear answers for these questions.
Kuwasawa Design School helps you comprehend the design principles through programs with theories and methods, selected by the New Bauhaus preliminary course system. [...]²²⁾

Evidently, the two successive statements of the school differ greatly. The second statement indicates that one year of operation was enough to lessen Kuwasawa’s personality as a fashion de-

19) ——— Akio Kasuga and Takashi Kobayashi, *Kuwasawa Gakuen to Zokei Kyoiku Undo* [Kuwasawa Gakuen and the Zokei Kyoiku Movement], Tokyo: Kuwasawa Gakuen, 2010, p. 52.

20) ——— Shunjiro Iizuka, ‘Kuwasawa Design Kenkyu-jo no omoide’ [Memory of Kuwasawa Design School], in R. Sawa (ed), op. cit., p. 32.

21) ——— Mikiko Tsunemi, *Kuwasawa Yoko to Modern Design Undo* [Yoko Kuwasawa and the modern design movement], Tokyo: Kuwasawa Gakuen, 2007, pp. 142-143.

22) ——— *Ibid.*, p. 145 (underlines added).

signer and for the School to shift to an education system based on the New Bauhaus. Further, the other founder members, such as photographer Yasuhiro Ishimoto who studied in the Institute of Design (Chicago Institute of Design, succeeding organization of New Bauhaus) in the United States, may have played important roles in the shift.

As mentioned above, Moholy-Nagy took Itten's place as the instructor of the preliminary courses, and engendered the shift in Bauhaus's educational policy from expressionist style to rationalist style. Then, after the dissolution of the German Bauhaus, Moholy-Nagy defected to the United States and established the New Bauhaus in Chicago in 1937. In Chicago, there was also Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, last director of the Bauhaus, who immigrated to the United States and restarted his career of instruction.

Ishimoto studied in the Institute of Design from 1947 to 1952. Thus, he may have introduced the New Bauhaus philosophy and teaching methods to the newly opened Kuwasawa Design School. For example, the "hand sculpture" class in the New Bauhaus (not in the German Bauhaus) was introduced by Ishimoto and is still now one of the main classes in Kuwasawa Design School. In this sense, Kuwasawa Design School's mainstream educational policy was influenced by the Moholy-Nagy (and probably van der Rohe) rationalist group's principles.

The influence of the Arts and Crafts Movement in the thought formation of Moholy-Nagy is often pointed out. For Kuwasawa, who was pursuing design inspired by daily life, it was not difficult to sympathize with Moholy-Nagy's philosophy, introduced first by Mizutani and later by Ishimoto. Mizutani once wrote in 1930: "*Werklehre* [work class] in the preliminary course aims at giving common understanding to all students before they major in their specialization. The class should be the place to be initiated into finding and training creativity. At the same time, it must be the place 'to know well the nature and usage of the materials and tools'; it is nothing but education for research on structures and combinations."²³⁾

The above statement evokes the attitude of setting the value on the connection between the elements and the design. However, as Terao pointed out, since 1931, descriptions on Bauhaus principles generally disappeared from Mizutani's writings, superseded by introductions of concrete expressionist style methods in the preliminary course.²⁴⁾ Nonetheless, the peculiar atmosphere in the prewar days could be a factor, as this period prioritized practical and technical skill acquisition.

After the war, the debate continued within Kuwasawa Design School. As mentioned above, from its second year, the school changed policies, under the influence of the introduction of Chicago school philosophies by Ishimoto. In this respect, Katsumi, a main founder of the Kuwasawa Design School, wrote: "Recently, Mies van der Rohe says that 'shape is born from function.' I do not agree with such an opinion, or rather, the opposite is true. We first make a sufficient shape, and then, we try to adapt the function to the shape."²⁵⁾

Moreover, opinions within Kuwasawa Design School were divided into two streams: one

23) ——— Kazuyuki Terao, 'Mizutani Takehiko ga shoukai shita Bauhaus' [Bauhaus introduced by Takehiko Mizutani], *Nihon Bijutsu Kenkyu*, vol. 2, 2002, p. 38.

24) ——— *Ibid.*, p. 39.

25) ——— Masaru Katsumi, 'Konichi no design no seitai' [Ecology of contemporary design], *Chosaku-shu: Design Undo*, Tokyo: Kodansha, 1986, p. 55.

stated that “designers should relate to society through their profession,” and the other concluded that “individuals should face society as citizens first before designers.” Kuwasawa, who personally agreed with the first stream, allowed a situation in which both co-existed without taking sides.²⁶⁾

Conclusion

THUS, the educational philosophy of Bauhaus, during the stage of its acceptance in Japan, underwent various trials and errors. The activities of Kuwasawa can be defined and evaluated as follows.

- 1) Her attitude of strongly desiring to connect daily life and design laid the groundwork for the active acceptance of the policy of Katsumi and of various theorists, even if they had differing opinions.
- 2) The Itten-like expressionist style method by Kawakita impressed her.
- 3) When she established Kuwasawa Design School, she adopted both trends: rationalist and expressionist (She also adopted Kawakita’s teaching method, even if she had some doubt in it).
- 4) At the beginning, she established the school mainly for fashion design, but from the second year, the school began to push further in terms of its synthetic and rationalistic character, derived mainly from the Chicago school.

In 1966, Tokyo Zokei University was established and Kuwasawa served as the first president. The university put Katsumi’s philosophy at the forefront, which is easily known from only looking at its name with the term *zokei*. The Bauhaus educational system was also adopted here; for example, Tokyo Zokei University offers the preliminary intensive course *Zokei Kiso* [basic Zokei] for the first six months for all students to complete before majoring in their specialization. Meanwhile, the curricula do not have a fashion design course. As the trend of practical science teaching grows in Japan, the weight of practical technique training programs has increased in the university as well. This scenario is similar to the doubt Kuwasawa held as regards Kawakita’s method. Thus, the aims of Yoko Kuwasawa have not all been realized.

26) ————Osami Sakano, ‘Kuwasawa Design Kenkyu-jo no omoide’ [Memory of Kuwasawa Design School], in R. Sawa (ed), *op. cit.*, p. 85.