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AUTHOR'S PREFACE

Kato Hiroyuki (1836-1916) once told the following anecdote. It is an anecdote which brings into focus an important aspect of the Tokugawa period and well worth re-telling.

Whenever the Shogun went on a tour of inspection or was, in the current phrase, on an "august visit," special preparation was made. In the areas through which his itinerary might take him on his august visit all traffic was interdicted and people forbidden. Consequently, when the Shogun's procession was passing through, the streets were deserted; not a person was to be seen. Once the Shogun is said to have questioned one of his waitingmen, saying: "The streets of Edo I have heard are teeming, yet I do not see the least sign of activity! What in the world can be the reason for this?" The retainer answered, "Usually the streets are very lively, but for the occasion of the august visit persons having been forbidden, the streets are quiet." Hearing this the Shogun is said to have replied: "In that case, next time we intend to go out when there is no august visit."

This quotation regarding the august visit is good in that it indicates one aspect of the feudalistic Tokugawa period.

In a work by Fukuchi Ouchi (1841-1906) the troubled and confused state of the period when Perry and his four "black ships" suddenly appeared off Uraga, is noted as follows:

With the coming of the Black Ships, the excitement of the Bakufu seethed like a cauldron. Speedily the Daimyos were ordered to the defense of the coasts bordering on Edo. More than two hundred years of peace, sad to relate, had resulted in a state of almost complete military unpreparedness. Some Daimyos sought to buy armor and weapons from the merchants, others hastily engaged foot soldiers. There were also
Daimyos who were proud of the state of their preparations when they saw the array of their samurai who had been called out for defense duty. The troops were clad in light armor, among them some were holding aloft their rising-sun-embossed war fans. Rusting guns, carefully tucked away in scarlet sacks, and twenty-five pound gun barrels drawn up by ox-cart appeared...

These are caricatures which illustrate two important aspects of the final period of the Tokugawa Shogunate. More importantly, however, these two accounts high-light the fundamental characteristics of the Tokugawa age from 1603 to 1867. The special characteristics of this age were the results of the feudal system and the maintenance of a closed-country policy. The two passages we have quoted show us the ignorance of the Shogun, a result of a feudal authority widely separated from any contact with actual society and the impracticability of his regime as a consequence of the closing of the country. This is obvious from the fact that Perry's four black ships could so easily threaten Japan.

The two policies, feudalism and closing the country, are not mutually inclusive; they are not necessary to each other. The feudal system of the Ashikaga period (1338-1573) was not linked to a closed country policy, and, contrariwise, in the present Communist states what is called the Iron Curtain is more or less a real example of a closed-country policy not linked to feudalism. While there is thus no essential connection between feudalism and a closed country policy, cases do exist in which the two are tightly joined. There is no better example of this than the Tokugawa system.

The hundred years of Japanese history from the coming of Perry can be interpreted as the history of how Japan changed from a closed country to an open country, from a feudal system to a constitutional one, in short, how Japan became a modern country. This period is also the history of how old Japan, burdened with characteristic traditions, attempted to come to grips with modern Europe. The substance, the core, of this
history of the formation of modern Japan can be found in this attempt to cope with modern Europe.

Accordingly, two related problems constitute the motive forces of this period of history. First there is the external problem of the variant nature of the two cultures, or the problem of the confrontation of the Japanese and Western cultures. Secondly, we have the problem of the confrontation of the old and the new ages within Japan, or the problem of the conflict between conservativism and progress. At that time, "Western," in many cases, meant new age, progressive; "Japanese" meant old age, feudalistic or conservative.

At the time of the vaunted modernization of Japan, all the constructive energy, the creative force, was not of Western origin. The new Japan was not simply a copy of modern Europe. While the pursuit of new ideas was present in this period, there was also present the attempt to create a distinctive culture. Even politically, while the European countries, the so-called "advanced" countries, were very important models for Japan, they were never the sole repositories of the Ideal. The traditional Japanese conception of the World could not be entirely eradicated, with the modern Western world concept immediately taking its place.

In this book I should like to trace mainly the transformation in thought from 1853 to the end of the Meiji period in 1912. During this period the two motive forces which I have mentioned always drove Japan on. I will begin by discussing the developments, movements, complications, and intellectual confusion which attended the age of the opening of Japan.
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PART I

CHAPTER I.

PRECURSORS AND PATRIOTS

1. The Formation of an Intelligentsia

When we speak of an intellectual movement or trend, it is customary for us to single out a group of people who are its representatives, who cherish feelings derived from it, or who, at the very least, can formulate and give expression to its leading ideas. We call such people intellectuals. That group of educated, cultured people, similar in nature to the Intelligentsia which originated in Russia in the 1830's, came into existence in Japan in 1873. An intellectual substratum from which this group emerged, however, existed much earlier.

Even under the Tokugawa feudal system there existed a group which formed, preserved, and propagated knowledge. We can see this from the many schools which were established by the Bakufu. The various territorial clans also established schools and by 1830 there was no clan without a school. The number of schools thus established during the Edo period (1603-1867) reached 223. We must add to this number the various learning institutes which were privately organized. These included different schools of Confucianism as well as the nativist historical schools which had been growing apace during the last third of the Edo period. The intellectual substratum we spoke of was composed of the aggregate of teachers, pupils and disciples. The school founded by Satō Issai (1772-1859), for example, was said to have had over 3,000 students.

We must, however, distinguish between a self-conscious intelligentsia which did not exist in Japan till 1873, and this
vague aggregation of more or less educated people which existed much earlier. To sharpen this distinction it would probably be better to follow traditional Chinese precedent and speak of this latter group as "readers."

We shall attempt to trace the intellectual developments which transformed these readers into a self-conscious intelligentsia. We can note here in summary fashion that among the readers changes began to take place during the 1830's; by the 1850's a new group had emerged. This group was the core from which the modern Japanese intelligentsia developed. These new people were not merely educated but exhibited a special tendency in their thought. They were people who had become patriotic, who were precursors of the opening of Japan, the modernization of Japan. We must therefore examine the conditions which led to the formation of this new group. We must see why this group was new and what it was in their thought that was new.

The first of the conditions which gave rise to the new group was the emergence of a critical spirit. Of course, in any period there is unrest and disaffection. The major part of this takes place within a given social organization and social order and is usually a consequence of not fulfilling one's hopes and aspirations. In the Tokugawa feudal society the observation of ancestral law was obstinately maintained; criticism against it was not permitted. In extreme cases, the subject could through his suicide admonish his lord, but this still was not an attack on social norms and institutions. Criticism relating to the institutions and organization of society was not possible. Expostulation exists within the norms of any given society, its essence often underlies personal relations; the object of criticism, however, is a given social norm or institution itself. The latter, of course, was strictly forbidden in Tokugawa Japan. As time went on, however, it was precisely this kind of criticism which began to appear—a criticism rather than a simple expostulation—directed at the norms and institutions of the feudal society.
It is of interest to note that this criticism grew out of the traditional concept of *meibun*—the obligations attending one's status in the hierarchic feudal society.

The concept of *meibun* is an extremely feudalistic one. *Meibun*, as it is used in ancient Chinese works, is a concept which sets the duty of the Emperor as the governance of the empire by rites and ceremonial. The essence of ceremonial is to be found in the allotted duties of lords and subjects, high and low; allotted duty is determined by social status. Social status is comprehended as denoting a basic relationship which inheres in the existence of lords as lords and subjects as subjects. Duty is defined as the discipline set by one's station in life. In this sense, social status comes to define the norm by which perforce this duty exists. Accordingly, the correct understanding of allotted duty must accompany the stipulation of social status. Even if social status has been lost, as in the case of the pre-feudal aristocracy, disrespect is not permissible, on the contrary, actuality itself must be rectified to accord with social status. The Confucian concept of the rectification of names meant the bringing into accord of names—the formalized marks of status—with actuality. When joined with a precise definition of the essence of social status, this would form a new reality. In other words, allotted duties were the feudalistic social status relations; social status was the substantive norm which determined the former.

With the development of the Mito historical School which was influenced by the neo-Confucians of the Sung period (960-1279), the relations between the Emperor and the Shogun could not but become a proper subject for investigation: The spirit of obeying ancestral law could not stop with a return to Ieyasu (1542-1616), the founder of the Tokugawa Shogunate. More and more it became necessary to return to the ancient Japanese past. Here, the past, the ancient past, a still more ancient past, and finally the mythical past—a type of historical Utopia—became a standard for the critical spirit. At the same time,
reformist tendencies began to appear.

The second condition which led to the rise of the new group was the awakening of a spirit of practicality.

The original Confucian learning—the Confucian learning which in the Tokugawa period formed the basis of the official learning—was a syncretic combination of Buddhism and Confucianism, and as such could be thought of as a type of religion. To be sure, this was not religion in the unworldly or world-transcending sense. In the Koishikawa ward of Tokyo there was a burial ground which was derisively called the "Confucian dumping-ground." Since the Confucians rejected burial according to Buddhist rites, they could not be buried in Buddhist temple burial ground. This term, Confucian dumping-ground, became the vulgar expression for the area where the Confucians were buried without benefit of funeral rites. The refusal of the Confucians to receive Buddhist rites was evidence of their attempt to separate themselves from the Buddhists. Yokoi Shōnan (1809-1869), in conversations recorded by Inoue Kowashi in his Shōzan taiwa, makes clear the Confucian attitude:

What are called the investigation of things in the Great Learning of Confucius were properly the occupation of the ancient scholarship. These principles of nature and their investigation are at the heart of the Empire, are the occupation of its thought. Even though the Buddhists perform their austerities with pure hearts and are themselves pure and virtuous, by reason of not giving themselves over to this thought, they can only dimly perceive the raison of the Empire.

It appeared to Shonan that the gist of scholarship being thought, the object of thought should be the investigation of natural principles which constitute the raison of the Empire. The difference between Confucians and Buddhists was that the Buddhists did not go beyond their pure-hearted austerities to a study of these principles.

Rationalism was an important characteristic of Confucian learning. And parallel to it, it goes without saying, was a highly
developed morality. Shōnan, in discussing the question of evil in the teachings of Buddha and Christ, said: "If Christ maintains ethics and Buddha discards ethics, then the evil of Buddha's doctrine is greater." Since Buddhism discards ethics, it is something which must be rejected even more so than Christianity, he implied. Shōnan came to understand Christianity, its ethical nature and its moral content. To Shōnan, "the function of the sage is to govern the realm and tranquilize the people." Thus, the Confucian learning was based on rationalism coupled with strong moral leanings.

In time, some Japanese Confucian scholars developed a strong penchant for "practical" learning. In 1852 there was a question over the setting up of schools in the Fukui territorial clan. Shōnan submitted his own views, criticizing the schools of that time: "If we make a distinction between political affairs and scholarship, the schools will become reading places. The result will be useless, vulgar learning." He criticized even Confucian scholars, saying:

What is called scholarship is only personal learning and self-cultivation. They are called scholars who read books and expound their meaning, but whose sincere, reverential hearts stop short at world affairs. As a consequence of their self-cultivation they limit themselves to the classics, to history, and to the attainment of letters and poetry.

Not even that paragon of traditional Confucian virtue, the "sage," the "superior man," escaped Shōnan's criticism.

He attacked "useless, vulgar learning" because he thought it meant forfeiting the study of statecraft, which to him was useful learning related to the governance of the realm. Rejecting the study of empty theory, the learning characterized by literary embellishment, his own theory of "true learning" emerged.

These views were not confined to Shōnan alone. There began to appear among the educated classes a practical spirit. It should be remarked, however, that Shōnan's and other like-
minded thinkers’ concept of true learning was not simply our idea of pragmatism. It was defined by the Confucian phrase about the administration of the Realm—welfare of the people. This later Confucian learning had as its practical goal rational governance and popular welfare. The learning concerned simply with self-cultivation and the frivolous composition of literature, was called “vulgar learning.” The concern of the true learning was the state and society. And if the critical spirit we discussed was an outcome of the feudal meibun concept, which dealt with the allotted duties connected with one’s status in the society, the growth of a practical learning spirit was the result of this Confucian concept of true learning.

The joining together of these tendencies toward criticism and practicality, gave rise to a spirit of reform. It is of interest that reform here meant confronting the future with reforms which looked to the ancient past for precedents.

The intellectual strata of the Tokugawa period were not only composed of Confucians and samurai. There were the National Scholars, the Kuge or court nobles, who dated back to pre-feudal times, the Gōshi or country samurai, and especially the priests, Buddhist and Shinto, and, later to be sure, among the townsmen too, people with aspirations for learning began to appear. However, the largest group was the samurai; even the learning of the townspeople was determined by samurai standards. It was among the intellectual strata just mentioned, that in addition to the critical spirit and the practical spirit, this new spirit of reform appeared. New types of intellectuals were emerging. These were patriotic, public-spirited samurai; the majority were rebellious, burning with hatred, possessed of a tragic sacrificial spirit.

Mention must also be made of another trend which appeared among these new intellectuals. This was the growing influence of Western learning which, since the Dutch were the only West- erns with whom the Japanese had relations, was called “Dutch learning.” This too was related to the concept of true learning.
The focus of the new intellectuals was on the problem of the State rather than on such general theoretical problems as the nature of life. The problem of national defense became a paramount concern.


Despite the extremely tight supervision exercised by the Shogunate, Western learning continued to exist in Japan throughout the Edo period. Its devotees were interested primarily in the new scientific techniques that were being developed in the West. In the crucial 1830's however, Japanese interest in Western learning began to change and increasingly Japanese were now attracted to its economic and political teachings. Also at this time curiosity was manifested in conditions in the West in general.

The political crisis that marked the closing years of the Shogunate was a product of the increase in the pressure of the West on Japan and the general worsening of Japan's economic situation. To tighten its hold on the country the Bakufu was forced to resort to desperate measures. In 1839 the Bakufu began making a series of arrests which were aimed at destroying the growing trend towards Western studies which had now become a source of criticism directed at the government. Among those arrested, the most prominent and well-known were Takano Chōei (1802-1850) and Watanabe Kazan (1793-1841). Chōei had studied Western-style medicine under von Siebold in Nagasaki and gradually developed a broad concern for economic and political problems. Kazan, a former student of Satō Issai's, and a prominent artist, had also become a student of Dutch learning.

The series of arrests starting in 1839 have been collectively called the "Trouble of Barbarian Sympathizers." The analysis of the trouble will provide the readers with a key to the change in their interest and activities. We may note here that Takano Chōei was sentenced to life imprisonment. Later he escaped and spent some years wandering about as a fugitive.
Faced by the certainty of recapture, he committed suicide. Kazan was sentenced to permanent house arrest in his native province and also committed suicide after having been slandered by provocateurs.

There is a compilation, *Bansha Sōyaku Shōki* (A Short Record of a Meeting in Misfortune) by Takano Chōei. This was secretly written while in prison, and contained an outline of the origins of Western learning in Japan. Chōei’s account began with the period when the Portuguese came to Japan in 1542-3. He dealt with the ban on Western learning which accompanied the ban on Christianity. He traced Western learning from this period of severity to the gradual loosening of the ban in the 18th century. Chōei wrote of the difficulties suffered by many students of Western learning, and finally he came to the real case the Bakufu had against Kazan and himself. This work, then, was a cursory glance at the history of Western learning from the mid-16th century to 1839-40 and provided a description of conditions in Japan during the 1830’s.

Discussing the contribution of Western learning to Japan in the 16th century, Chōei wrote:

The coming of the barbarians was of profit to Japan in:
1) *Castle construction*—the present castles all arose after Nobunaga. Their stone walls, storied towers, square-shaped donjons, etc., all are based on Western construction style.
2) *Astronomy and geography*—until the coming of the Westerners this was extremely rough, it now began to be an exact study.
3) *The art of healing sickness*—wars and disorder were prevalent in Japan, but medical practice was extremely clumsy. Under the influence of the Westerners, a number of famous Japanese and foreign doctors were engaged, and their success in the healing of sickness and the efficacy of their surgical procedure was marked. This was the origin of the schools of those who follow Western medicine.
4) *The manufacture of firearms*—all manner of ordnance, gunpowder and related production is derived from the barbarian tradition.
Obviously, the type of Western learning described in the foregoing was eagerly adopted because of its "extreme usefulness." By the 1830's, however, we can sense the addition of a new motive for the interest in Western learning. Now Western learning was broadened to include problems of political economy and problems of foreign relations.

For complicity in the Siebold affair (1828), Takahashi Sakuzuemon and some ten people interested in Western learning were imprisoned. The movement for Western learning suffered a setback for a time. During the mid-1830's, however, it was once more flourishing. Chōei described the milieu of the 1830's by saying that the practicality of Western learning guaranteed its revival after the set-back it had received. New followers began to flock to this learning. People like himself who were interested in medicine and others who wanted to study mathematics, astronomy, and zoology were attracted. Still others who were interested in the causes of the "rise and decay of various states" were drawn to Western studies. Eventually this attracted the attention of certain malicious persons, Chōei said, and because of their jealousy Western studies fell upon evil days. Chōei had written a work which could be regarded as critical of Japan; he was denounced and imprisoned. Others committed suicide, and again Western studies suffered a decline.

In Edo at that time, there were two groups of Dutch or Western learning scholars: the Shitamachi group and the Yamanote group. The names corresponded to the districts in Edo where the members lived, or the districts they frequented. The Shitamachi group included people like Itō Genboku (1800-1871), Tsuboi Shindō (1795-1848), Takeuchi Gendō (1795-1870), Totsuka Seikai (1799-1876), and Sugita Rikkyō (1786-1846). Itō, Takeuchi, Tsuboi and Sugita were known for medicine, Totsuka for surgery. They chiefly occupied themselves with Dutch medical books, and in their Western studies did not venture beyond language study and medicine. The Yamanote group included men like Watanabe Kazan, Takano Chōei, and Satō
Nobuhiro (1769-1850).

These men did not limit themselves to medicine. They studied the geography and history of foreign countries and extended the range of their interests to political and economic matters as well. The Yamanote group represented a new trend in Dutch learning. It was for this reason that I spoke of the addition of a new motivating factor in Western studies. Western learning with this group gradually became characterized by a concern with problems of politics, economics, and above all foreign relations. This led to the Trouble of Barbarian Sympathizers.

The essence of this new motivation can be found in the socio-economic conditions of the period. The period from 1830 to 1840 was a miserable one in which famine was raging most of the time. In the year 1833 the famine became acute; conditions were particularly bad in Ōu and along the coasts of the Sea of Japan. Everywhere thieves swaggered, riots broke out, and in Edo itself the price of rice more than doubled. Bad crop conditions continued for the next five or six years; 1836 surpassed the four previous years in bad crops. The famine extended to the west and north of Japan. Ōshio Heihachiro's rising in Ōsaka (1837) was a direct consequence. This was also the period when Ninomiya Sontoku (1787-1856) fought hard to reform the finances of the lord of Odawara. It was at this time that Satō Nobuhiro was engaged by Kazan, the karo, or chief retainer, of the San-shu Tawara clan, and opened a short course on agricultural administration. Kazan presented his Kyōkō Kokoroe-gaki (Written Information on Crop Damage) to his clan lord. He wrote therein:

The principle of revering the lord and slighting the people is the usual state of affairs. In time of famine and bad crops, this principle must be reversed: the people should be important and the lord slighted.

The times were such that many lords begged instruction of the Yamanote group. The latter, including Kazan and Chōei, were spurred on to develop counter-measures.
Chōei described conditions, saying:
In a period of prolonged peace and tranquil government, the military arts are discarded and the scholarly tradition is corrupted. The military make ostentation and literary embellishment most important, and learning becomes chiefly trobuling over wording and phrasing. They lapse into elegant letters, while at the same time there is a grievous absence of practical social welfare. Since 1833 crop failure has continuously taken place, death from hunger in the capital is plentiful, and the conditions in the countryside and in the remote villages can well be imagined. Distressed and sighing as a consequence of this, they wrote various books on famine relief. When they studied the practical science of economics, the lords frequently questioned established policy. Those who questioned affairs of state were very numerous. For this reason people of the capital for a time seemed to have become economic experts.

It is clear from the foregoing that the new orientation in Western studies was the result of socio-economic conditions. These had led to the formation of special study groups in Edo. And thus these conditions led to the Trouble of Barbarian Sympathizers.

A second factor which produced the new orientation in Western studies and was ultimately connected with the Trouble was the concern over foreign relations. This ended in criticism of the Bakufu’s closed-country policy.

The Bakufu at that time was able to acquire news of conditions abroad through the Dutch. Every year when the Dutch trading vessel docked at Nagasaki, important events that had occurred abroad were collected and written down. These were then reported to the Nagasaki chief administrative official, who in turn transmitted them to the Bakufu. In the report for 1838, it was recorded that the English ship *Morrison* was visiting Japan to return seven castaways. The ship entered Edo directly, without making port in Nagasaki. Ostensibly it was returning
castaways, but its object was to open trade relations. The Bakufu began deliberations as to what attitude to assume. Differences developed over whether it would be better quietly to caution the Morrison to return home, as had been done in the case of the Russian envoy Rezanov who made a similar attempt in 1804, or whether to apply the Bakufu order promulgated in 1825 to the effect that “ships from abroad are to be attacked and driven away.” Ultimately the party advocating the latter course won. It was resolved “to strike and drive away without any second thought.” This was October 1838.

At the time there were rumors concerning the Bonin islands. Some of the students of Dutch learning proposed to colonize them and make them productive. Kazan and Chōei were accused of instigating this plan in order to further their desire to traffic with the foreigners and they were arrested in May 1839.

To be sure, the charges against them were not justified. Kazan and Chōei, it has become clear, did not all have the intentions of which they were accused. Their real offense was that they had written the Shinki-ron and the Yume Monogatari respectively. Today these writings seem neither violent nor extreme. They contain a discussion of many subjects, and they show a good deal of misinformation. For example, the question is brought up as to what kind of a person Morrison was, the authors did not realize that Morrison was the name of a ship! They discussed foreign affairs, especially in connection with England. They felt that the Bakufu policy was not only courting disaster, but was also not in accord with the principles of humanity and justice. They were misinformed about world conditions, having only the one-sided reports of the Dutch to go by. They concluded their reports with a rejection of intercourse with foreign countries. The Yume Monogatari noted that:

While England is not an enemy of Japan, neither does she have any relations with Japan. By not responding to Eng-
land's special efforts to return castaways and by driving the English ships away, the Japanese people will be known as uncompassionate and their country as inhumane. And if perchance this lack of humanity and lack of justice should anger England, there are many islands in the waters bordering on Japan, which are subject to England, and the hindrance they will be to shipping is easily conceivable . . .

Charged with having "slandered the Imperial Council" and having "criticized the affairs of state," Chōei was sentenced to lifelong imprisonment, and Kazan was confined to permanent domiciliary arrest. This was an extremely harsh sentence. And yet, when we read the writings of Chōei and his associates carefully, we can see that while they did not contain criticism of the exclusion policy as such, they were clearly in opposition to the spiritual seclusion and the cultural seclusion to which Bakufu policy condemned Japan. Their urging of a spiritual opening of the country implied a criticism of foreign policy, and the resultant fears of the conservatives led to the harsh verdict against the two. In this sense, then, the implicit criticism of foreign affairs, the problem of foreign relations was the second factor that led to the Trouble of Barbarian Sympathizers of 1838.

The Trouble of Barbarian Sympathizers ended in the suicide of Chōei and Kazan among others. Interestingly enough, the person who denounced them and precipitated the Trouble was a younger brother of the head of the Hayashi School of Bakufu sponsored Confucianism. His name was Torii Yōzo, and he was later known as Kai no Kami. Torii had become involved with Egawa Tarōzaemon (1801-1855) who was a close friend to Kazan and Chōei and was favorably disposed towards the Dutch scholars. Torii planned, therefore, to make a clean sweep of the lot.

We can conclude that the hatred of one section of the Confucians—typified by Torii—for the Dutch scholars, developed into the clash between Confucian learning and Dutch learning.
This was the third factor which led to the Trouble. The hatred between a section of the Confucians and the Dutch scholars was expressed in terms of the question as to what was the proper military science to adopt in the defense of Edo against the West.

The problem was becoming a pressing one in connection with the Morrison incident. As we saw, in October 1838 the conference was held at which it was decided to strike and drive away the English without any second thought on the matter. The Bakufu felt it necessary to strengthen the defenses of Uraga. In January 1839 Torii Yōzo was ordered to plan the new defenses and to conduct a survey of the waters adjacent to Uraga. Egawa Tarōzaemon, who was both a gunnery expert and the chief magistrate of Nirayama, was permitted to participate in this. From the outset, however, Torii and Egawa clashed over the question of what procedure they should follow. Egawa, offering illness as an excuse, withdrew from the joint venture. Through Kazan he obtained the assistance of some of Chōei’s disciples and produced an independent set of survey maps and a carefully worked out defense system. There were thus two surveys and two defense plans. Conflict was a foregone conclusion. It goes without saying that the Western-style, precise Egawa plan was far superior to Torii’s antiquated, slipshod proposal. Torii lost prestige and came to hate Egawa, as well as those who, like Kazan and Chōei, had lent him their support. When Torii got wind of the rumors about the Bonin islands, he lashed out at Kazan and Chōei.

The hatred of Dutch learning was almost a tradition in Torii’s family. In a secret letter which Chōei sent from prison to Tachihara Kyosho (1785-1840), he noted:

The venerable and highly reputed Confucian master (Torii Yōzo’s father, Ouchi Kiko) saw my Yume Monogatari and said that the author of this work ought to be cut down, and that he loathed Kazan, who also loves Western learning.

With a father like this famous “Confucian master,” and
with an elder brother who was the chief of the official government-sponsored school of Confucianism, Torii’s shrewdness as well as the animus he felt towards Western learning can be inferred. Contemporaries, in writing Torii’s given name Yōzo, used characters which, while similarly pronounced, meant in effect “repository of wickedness.” Chōei had early inclined towards Western studies and had consequently been critical of Confucianism. Kazan, on the other hand, was at first a disciple of the Hayashi school of Confucianism. He was reputed to have been one of the best scholars in the Hayashi school. Through his growing interest in Western learning, he became critical of Confucianism. It was therefore natural that Kazan and Chōei earned the detestation of one section of the Confucian scholars and were meted out such harsh punishment.

Of course, not all the Confucians of the period took such a foolish attitude. For example, outstanding Confucian scholars like Matsuzaki Kodo (1771-1840) presented outspoken memoranda to Mizuno Echizen no Kami, pleading the innocence of Kazan. Within the Bakufu, too, the later kanjo bugyo, or chief fiscal officer, Kawaji Saemon-Jo-Takanori, expressed an opinion which was not in agreement with the policy of striking and driving away foreign ships. However, these pleas were unavailing. In May 1840, there was even an order banning the use of Dutch lettering on signboards in Edo.

In the foregoing I have presented three factors which underlay the Trouble of Barbarian Sympathizers. The socio-economic factor was the first of these. Chōei bears witness to its importance when he states in connection with Kazan’s arrest:

The reason for his arrest, whatever else may be thought, is the persistence of bad crop years. Public feeling is frightened and uneasy; the rich become richer, the poor poorer. The poor people in many places are rioting. Since society is disturbed, Kazan, his heart burning with patriotic indignation, extracted from Dutch books information dealing with the national polity, the state of political affairs, and the social conditions of all countries.
The second factor in the Trouble of Barbarian Sympathizers was the implicit criticism of foreign affairs contained in the urging of a spiritual opening of the country. The third factor, the clash between Dutch learning and Confucian learning, was ostensibly related to the question of Western-style military science. It was this question and the attempt of Torii to solve it by force in favor of the official Confucianism, which led to the arrests of the Trouble of Barbarian Sympathizers.

Egawa Tarōzaemon and Takashima Shūhan (1798-1866) can be said to be the founders of Western-style military science in Japan. In May 1841, at a place called Tokumarugahara in Musashi, seven and one-third miles west of Edo Castle, Takashima and 125 disciples performed Western-style military drill. While winning the admiration of many, in October 1842 Takashima, too, was slandered by Torii, and under suspicion as a rebel he was imprisoned for more than ten years. In 1853, after Perry's arrival, he was hurriedly set free. Kazan and Chōei had long since died. In 1853 Perry's coming to Japan provided the impetus for a drastic change.

I have spoken in some detail about the Trouble of Barbarian Sympathizers, because it points up the various problems of the last years of the Bakufu and the early Meiji period. These problems can be summed up under two headings: the dispute over the merits of opening the country and, derivatively, the debate over loyalty to the Emperor vs. adherence to the Bakufu. These two problems were the basis of the intellectual conflict of the last years of the Tokugawa regime.
CHAPTER II.

OPEN VS. CLOSED COUNTRY

1. The Essence of the Controversy

Japanese thought in the last years of the Bakufu was focused on the question of whether or not to open the country. Popular feeling had at first demanded reverence for the Emperor and support for the Bakufu. Towards the end this was changed to the familiar slogan: "Revere the Emperor; expel the Barbarians." Finally there emerged a new slogan: "Revere the Emperor; open the country." This slogan signalized a complete change in Japanese opinion. The pace of development was extraordinarily quickened; the Emperor was restored to power, a modern state was established, and Japan was set on the path of progress.

In connection with these developments, we must take up two points. First, it is obvious that during a period of profound change, thought would be primarily of a practical and political character. The thought of the Japanese during these last years of the Bakufu was almost entirely concerned with practical and concrete political issues. The Trouble of Barbarian Sympathizers of the late 1830's, of course, comprehended practical political issues. Bakufu foreign policy, economic policy were the roots of the "Trouble." After Perry's visit to Japan in June 1853, the issue that predominantly aroused interest was whether or not to open the country. Now the question was disputed by the public at large. The Bakufu was not able to arrive at an independent decision on the demands of the West for opening the ports to trade. In July the Daimyōs residing in Edo were summoned to Edo Castle. They were instructed by the Bakufu to give their opinions, "without fear and without withholding in the slightest any expression of your true feelings." The majority
of the opinions given favored expelling the barbarians. This was the first time that the Daimyōs and their retainers were able to participate in a discussion of this nature, a discussion which openly dealt with the question of foreign relations. The Bakufu itself took an unprecedented step on June 13; Perry's arrival was reported to the Emperor Kōmei (1831-1866). On the 15th the Emperor sent the following message to the Ise Shrine:

Barbarian ships have of late been frequenting the waters neighboring on Japan. Our mind is greatly disturbed. We earnestly look for divine assistance to speed the expelling of the barbarians lest they destroy the national polity.

This was the first time that the phrase "expelling the barbarians" was used, and it was soon picked up as a political slogan. The Bakufu realized that the opening of the country was unavoidable. This realization was diametrically opposed to the slogan about expelling the barbarians and led to the development of political conflict in Japan. Under the circumstances, the original slogan calling for reverence for the Emperor and support for the Bakufu dissolved into its component elements. Moreover, these elements rapidly became mutually exclusive.

The foregoing shows that the violent anti-foreign phase of the last years before Meiji had been given expression by the Emperor himself. "Expel the Barbarians" was a sloganized version of the Emperor Kōmei's words which we quoted above. The other part of the slogan, "Revere the Emperor," was of different origin.

The earliest formulation of this concept was made by the Mito school of historians. These historians recognized that the Emperor was the ultimate source of authority, that the Shōgun was subordinate and that his assumption of power was a consequence of his investiture by the Emperor. The Mito school then theorized that if the Shōgun's authority was derived from the Emperor, what better way to support the head of the Bakufu, the Shōgun, than by reverencing the source of his authority, the Emperor! Hence the slogan: "Revere the Emperor; support the Bakufu."
With the coming of the Westerners this neat formulation fell apart. The Bakufu was not living up to its commission and instead of expelling the barbarians was concluding peace with them. Even the Bakufu's attempt to unite the Court and the military in its frantic effort to shore up its declining power, was now suspect. The rumor circulated that if the Emperor Kōmei was not in agreement with Bakufu aims he would be forced to abdicate. The slogan now became: "Revere the Emperor! Overthrow the Bakufu!" This was the state of affairs in 1862.

The next point to be noted derived from the exigencies of national defense. The people connected with the Trouble of Barbarian Sympathizers had come to Western learning primarily through an interest in medicine or in the natural sciences, and only gradually had their interests become political. From their relatively broad cultural background they developed into precursors of Japan's modernization, and through concern with her welfare they became patriots. Another important characteristic of these men was the fact that they regarded the Western countries they had come to know through their wide reading as representatives of a superior culture. In short, men like Takano Chōei, Koseki San-ei, and Watanabe Kazan, who had all been caught up in the "Trouble", were primarily intellectuals. They were men who, looking at Japan's economic problems in the 1830's, gradually shifted their interest from the natural sciences to the social sciences. They had become precursors and finally—faced by stubborn resistance to change—had become patriots concerned with Japan's welfare. The people we shall next deal with were of a different order. They regarded the West as representing not so much a superior culture as a superior military force. Their chief concern was to defend Japan against this overwhelming might which was threatening her. The most representative figures in this group were Yokoi Shōnan (1809-1869), Sakuma Shōzan (Zōzan) (1811-1864), and Yoshida Shōin (1830-1859). These people were not precursors of a spiritual opening of Japan to Western culture as the former group was,
but precursors of the actual opening of Japan. As Sakuma Shōzan said, they knew that "nothing was more urgent than the defense of Japan." They were extremely sensitive to the difference in armed might between Japan and the West, and on this basis urged the necessity of opening the country.

These men, then, were first samurai, military men, who burned with indignation over the weakness of Japan and through this concern became precursors of the Restoration. The earlier group consisted of intellectuals who became precursors and ultimately patriots. The later group was driven almost from the outset by their patriotic concern for Japan to become precursors of the Restoration. They had an enthusiasm for political change and the force to attempt to put their ideas into practice. In the next section we shall try to analyse their thought at some length. It should be noted that they started out by advocating the expelling of the barbarians and ended by being trail blazers of Meiji thought. It is this transition with which we must now deal.

2. Sakuma Shōzan (Zōzan)

In 1842 when the military expert Takashima Shūhan was imprisoned Sakuma Shōzan wrote his famous memorial on coastal defense. This was called "Kaibō Hassaku" (Eight Policies on Coastal Defense). In this memorial Shōzan argued for strict coastal defense and was in favor of expelling the barbarians. His understanding of England and the other Western powers was a limited one. He wrote:

The barbarians show no discernment about things like morality, benevolence, and justice. They are sagacious only about gain. Once they are on a war footing we may expect them to look to their own gain from beginning to end.

Shōzan was concentrating on the transition which was taking place in world conditions. He argued that the vital task of the present was to change the former prohibition on large ship construction, to build great ships in the Western style, and to establish a navy. He even argued vehemently, "What scruple should there be in revising for the present good of the Empire
a law which was established for the past good of the Empire!” And in a letter he wrote:

There are more than 1,800 shipwrecks a year taking place in the area from Sendai to Shimonoseki . . . By building Western-style large ships we can be prepared against pirates and we can prevent maritime disasters . . .

We see here that Shōzan not only advocated large ships for coastal defense but for the improvement of commerce.

We should note that to Shōzan coastal defense was not a problem which concerned the Tokugawa rulers alone. He ventured to say:

It is with extreme respect that a low person like myself dares to present these views on the great policy of the State. But the problems of foreign invasion and domestic problems are different. The problems of foreign invasion are related to the destiny of the unbroken Imperial line of more than one hundred generations—which is not to be compared with any country in the world. This problem is not just related to the prestige of the Tokugawa family alone, but concerns the welfare of all Japan. I feel that to be born in this country means to be vitally concerned with it irrespective of social position.

Shōzan’s later position was not one of opposition to the Bakufu; he supported the idea of the union of the Court and the military, which supposedly would be of benefit to both. The patriots of the time were gradually becoming aware that the problem of coastal defense was not just a Tokugawa problem but a Japanese problem. And it was Shōzan who gave clear expression to this awareness.

We must not forget that Shōzan’s awareness of the crisis facing Japan at the time of the *Morrison* incident, his view of foreign countries, and especially of England, were all conditioned by the recently ended Opium War. Two years later, in 1844, Shōzan began reading Dutch books and his opinion of the Western countries speedily changed. And in another five years, in 1849, Shōzan proposed to the Matsushiro clan that the Dutch-
Japanese dictionary, which had been prepared from Halma's original Dutch-French dictionary, be printed as a clan enterprise. This dictionary was indispensable for students of Western learning at that time and was circulating in manuscript form. It took one person a year to copy the entire volume. Shōzan emphasized that it was necessary to have a knowledge of conditions in foreign countries. His position was that the Chinese underestimation of foreign countries—calling the people barbarians and thinking only their own country good—had led to "the defeat of the country of the Duke of Chou and Confucius." He said:

Because the Chinese thought that their's was the only good country and did not realize that those countries they despised as barbarians were well-versed in practical learning, had achieved great prosperity and developed a flourishing military power, and had far surpassed themselves in skill with firearms and proficiency in navigation, when they came to war with England, they exposed their shame to the entire world, and completely destroyed the reputation established for them in ancient times by their sages and wise men.

In 1856, in a letter to Katsu Kaishū, Shōzan wrote:

The Confucian coterie does not know true learning, nor does it know in detail the conditions of the Empire. Not having observed the conditions of the countries of the world, indiscriminately calling foreigners barbarians, and not knowing how to establish in Japan the various sciences and arts possessed by foreign countries, they consequently do not know how to strengthen Japan's national power.

In 1862, in a memorial, he argued the unsuitability of a word like barbarian, which had appeared in an Imperial announcement:

I believe that it is extremely unsuitable to speak of barbarians and to despise their countries when these countries are more powerful and more fully provided with science, technology, skills, institutions, and letters than our own country . . .

I believe that rather than speak of our unique national
polity [kokutai] and political policy [seiji] which ... causes the Empire great damage and little gain ... we should cease repelling foreigners by using the term barbarian. China's calling the Japanese barbarians was a mistake, and Japan's calling foreigners barbarians was also a mistake. The Japanese ought not to follow China's mistake.

Shōzan's eyes were now open to conditions in the West. This originally started through his interest in coastal defense and military science. At the outset, however, Shōzan was not just a student of military science; he was also interested in increasing production. With a Dutch encyclopaedia as a guide, he was able to learn of the production of glass, the purification of metal ores, and was able to experiment with electricity.

We mentioned Shōzan's scientific experiments and it may seem as though he learned all this from books. Actually, there had long been an attitude of respect for Western learning in Japan—in which feeling Shōzan too was not deficient. He did, however, point up the difference between Japanese and Western attitudes towards science:

In the West nothing is stored or hidden. What in Japan is treated as an occult or divine mystery is printed and published openly in the West. The attitude, especially of the practitioners of military arts, in Japan is completely different. Yet a novice like myself by reading these Western books is enabled to know well the various principles, and thus nothing is hidden from anyone.

In a letter written in 1850 Shōzan answered a request made by Yamadera Gendaiyu for "initiation" into various "secret arts and practices," which probably meant military science, and affirmed the universal and public nature of learning. Nevertheless, the state of affairs at that time was one in which gunnery experts kept their collections of manuscripts hidden and dealt with their craft as with a difficult-to-transmit occult practice. Fukuzawa said:

To borrow a book one had to bring a suitable gift, and if one said one wanted to make a copy of the book there was a
fee... which went into the special receipts fund of the Yamamoto house...

Looking at things like this today we may feel that Shōzan’s behavior was natural. At the time, within the framework of Japanese exclusionism, his attitude was extraordinary. Indeed, some people believed that one reason Shōzan was later assassinated was his love for Western learning.

Yokoi Shōnan’s assassination, which was a consequence of his having made allowances for Christianity, was similar to Shōzan’s. The opposition between open and closed minds was not only a feature of this period but continued long after the Meiji Restoration. Many tragedies and clashes took place as a consequence of it. Shōzan, for example, earned the hatred of bigoted people because he used a Western-style saddle when riding! Even though this was a trivial thing, it was nevertheless a symbol whose significance was not lost on Shōzan’s contemporaries. In this connection, directly before his assassination in a letter to his mistress, Ochō, we may note his patriotic resolve:

I was pleased to receive your letter of the third of this month. I was relieved to learn nothing is changed with you. I too am in good health. Kaku [Shōzan’s son, Kakujirō] too is in good health, so please don’t concern yourself. You are right in your surmise that I am worried. Yet other people are not in the least concerned over the things I am worried about... I hear that I will be attacked in my house. When I go out there is opposition confronting me in handbills, posters, etc., but I think nothing of it. Whenever I go out on horseback I use a Western-style saddle. Although Kakujirō uses a Japanese saddle... I have not used this even once. Although there are fools who reproach me because they do not understand the purpose of good things, I deliberately use the saddle. There are also all kinds of people opposing me, who appear to want me to change my opinions, but I have maintained them singlemindedly. This is not new with me. I hope to plan for the future of all Japan; I cannot alter this
hope. I exerted myself over this for thirty years and for
nine years I received severe censure. I am deeply concerned
about the Emperor and the Shōgun, everybody of good intent
knows this . . . If a misfortune should happen to me, Japan
will quickly enter into a civil war. Although I extremely
exceed the duty of my station, I believe that the outcome of
the present controversy and Japan's future depend on me.
I have resolved that Japan's life or death is parallel to mine
and I am indifferent to the various criticisms of people . . .
I am not worried . . .

From the description above we can state that Shōzan's
thought was significant because he was a Confucian. Specifi-
cally, he emerged from the Chu Hsi school and later paved the way
for modern experimental science in Japan. Originally he studied
the Sung school of Confucianism and was especially interested
in Shao Kang-chieh. Shōzan did not like the Ou Yang-ming
school of thought and felt that the Oshio Heihachirō uprising
in Osaka was symptomatic of the weak points of this school of
thought. Shōzan's natural philosophy was in accord with Chu
Hsi's principles of Nature.

Dutch learning greatly broadened Shōzan's vision. He
traveled to Edo to study in 1833 and became a student of Satō
Issai. Later he wrote the following in his Dai Issai Sensei Iboku
(Posthumous Autographs on Issai):

The master (Issai) stressed the Ou Yang-ming school and
did not like Chu Hsi's conception of the Principles of Nature,
whereas I, having mainly accepted Chu Hsi's system, explored
with this the Principles of Nature . . . I supplemented the
deficiencies of Chinese thought with European thought. And
for these reasons I completely differed from the master.

In his letters and other writings there early appeared
words like experiment, experience and observation. He wrote:

Wherever one looks in Western writings they all stress
exact experimental methodology. And using methods like
these it is possible to produce splendid crystal-like glass, wine,
and it is possible to raise silkworms without damage . . .
He also wrote, “European scholars respect observation and have long ago destroyed frauds.”

It may seem strange to us that Shōzan attempted to explain the principles of gunnery on the basis of the I Ching (Book of Divination), and yet his ultimate objective was a mathematical experimental science. In connection with this, he said, “Mathematics is the basis of all science.” What we see here is a transition in him from the rationalism of Confucianism to the mathematical natural science of modern Europe.

We must now examine Shōzan’s conception of the relationship between Eastern and Western learning. He wrote in the Seikenroku:

The superior man has five joys: the joy of living with one’s parents and one’s brothers in health; the joy of serving Heaven without dishonor and not causing dishonor to one’s inferiors; the joy of partaking in the education of superior youth; the joy of being born after the unfolding of Western learning and thus knowing things which the ancient sages did not know; the joy of being able to benefit the people and acknowledge one’s gratitude to the country by means of Eastern morality and Western arts and sciences.

And to make the meaning more specific he wrote in a letter:

It is inevitable that Chinese learning by itself is disparaged as baseless. Western learning by itself contains no investigation into the principles of morality. Therefore, even if one accomplishes great things which astound people, still these things are separate from the deeds of the ancient sages. If the gap between Western and Chinese learning is not closed it will be difficult to achieve perfection.

Shōzan expressed this concept or the interdependence of the two learnings in a short poem he wrote:

Eastern morality, Western technique
Mutually complete a circular pattern:
The girth of the earth is ten thousand Ri
half of it should not be missing!

He also said: “Unifying morality and technology—Asia and
Europe—is like completing a circle. If one part is missing, the circle remains incomplete.” Shōzan did not assume that Eastern morality was superior to Western technology; he wanted to join the two together. In a letter to Katsu Kaishū, he wrote:

We aspire to Western learning not for the purpose of political administration, but only to adopt technological skills. It is a guarantee against underestimating the Westerners.

Shōzan did not go beyond regarding the West as a machine civilization and the East as spiritual. Nor can we deny the feasibility of the integration he suggested. This kind of Japanese thought persisted through the Meiji period and we ought not to reproach Shōzan for this. Indeed, despite the alteration of the form of this problem, it remained a fundamental problem of intellectual history throughout the Meiji period.

Finally, we must note that Shōzan’s world consciousness was far in advance of almost everyone at that time.

In his famous Seikenroku, in a final rhetorical flourish he wrote:

When I was twenty I felt related to one province; after thirty I felt related to Japan; after forty I felt related to the five continents.

Shōzan was remarkable in that he was able to attain a world consciousness while living under the conditions of that time. His rationalism as expressed in the formula “Eastern morality, Western technology” was not enough to make him aware of the depth of the problem implicit in this relationship. In this regard Yokoi Shōnan had a deeper consciousness of the spiritual nature of the problem.

3. Yokoi Shōnan (1809-1869)

Shōzan and Shōnan were acknowledged by some people of the period to be persons deserving respect because they developed new intellectual constructs. For the same reason, however, they were detested by other people and were finally assassinated. Within the limits set by their period, which was one of crisis, they were both patriots and precursors. It is difficult to single
out, either before or after them, any person who can fit so simply into the same category. It should be noted that the structure of their consciousness as precursors was the obverse of their zealous activity as patriots. Theory made them precursors of the modernization of Japan; patriotism forced them to implement their ideas.

Precursors are people who have preconceptions at a time when the average person cannot envision the future. Precursors are those who give advice about the unfolding future, who warn of its possibilities. In Japan, to be a precursor meant "to be a trail-blazer of the Empire." When we pose the problem of the thought of the precursors during the closing years of the Bakufu, this must be taken into account.

These people deserved to be called precursors not simply because of their foreknowledge, but because they attempted to confront the problems of the time with this foreknowledge of the future. Shōzan's writings—despite their imperfection and simplicity—make this clear. I feel the same thing can be recognized in Shōnan, as well. Moreover, we might add, that Shōzan, with his rationalism, attempted to confront the scientific and machine civilization of Europe: Shōnan, with his historicism, tried to confront the political and religious aspects of Europe. We can recognize Shōnan's new intellectual construct in his rather original historicism. Katsu Kaishū states in his memoirs that when Shōnan was asked for his opinion on some issue he always replied, "Today I think thus, tomorrow I may think differently." This was unusual for that time in that it showed a futuristic concept, which was not typically Eastern. His attitude appears vividly in a letter to Tachibana Iki (1831-1881), a student of his who played a part in strengthening Edo in 1854. He wrote therein:

Anything will turn out well without the slightest meddling. If not this year, then next year, or the year after that, or in a lifetime, or even after death. I believe that to serve with sincerity is the moral way.

In this direct way, without "meddling" he urged letting
nature take its course. What Shōnan meant by nature was rather a different thing from Shōzan. Shōzan’s "principle of Nature" pertained to this world. But Shōnan’s principle of nature was a principle running through the past, present, and future. This was clearly explained in the Shōzan Kanwa (Quiet Conversations in Shōzan). In this work there is a record of a conversation with Motoda Eifu (1818-1891), who visited Shōnan while the latter was in domiciliary confinement. Motoda Eifu became the tutor to the Meiji Emperor. He was a Confucian scholar, an educator, and participated as an advisor in drafting the Imperial Rescript on Education during the Meiji period. Shōnan said: "A person must know that there are three stages. Heaven, from the ancient past to the distant future is immutably one. Similarly, a person is a small Universe —those who went before and those who come after—we together, are people of three stages and form a whole in the universe. Those who went before me contributed to the works of nature and transferred their contribution to me. I, having received this, will transmit it to those who come after me. They, in turn, will bequeath it to their descendents. Past, present, and future generations, though standing in three stages, are all children of one Heaven and have the duty of fulfilling its edicts.

Confucius received the teachings of Yao and Shun and he in turn bequeathed the teachings of these sages to the future. This is not limited to Confucius alone. To be born means to have the duty of serving Heaven...although our bodies are in a process of transformation, this principle unifies past, present, and future. Other than serving Heaven we need no profit, fortune, or prestige.

These words of Shōnan’s suggest a relationship between macrocosmos and microcosmos. Since the present stands in an organic relationship to the past and the future, the present foreshadows the future, is pregnant with the future. These concepts are of deep interest.

Shōnan’s historicism, it should be said, took the reigns of Yao, Shun, and the Three Dynasties as the archetype of history.
We must now examine Shōnan’s original interpretation of Confucian learning.

When Sakuma Shōzan interpreted the Sung Confucian teachings on the Principles of Nature (Rigaku) rationalistically, he was attempting to find a tie to modern European natural science. Shōnan, by giving Confucian teachings a Kogaku (Ancient learning), anti-Sung interpretation, recognized the reigns of Yao, Shun, and the Three Dynasties as a model. We might add that while Kogaku in China meant going back to pre-Han Dynasty Confucian texts, in Japan, with Yamaga Sokō, Itō Jinsai and Ogyū Sorai, it meant simply an anti-Chu Hsi, Sung interpretation of Confucianism, an examination of the Confucian texts themselves.

In substance, Shōnan explained, the study of the Principles of Nature to the Sung Confucians meant merely “with reason and spirit to observe and study the Principles of Nature.” In Yao, Shun, and the Three Dynasties, the emphasis was rather on “the study of the Principles of Nature in order to assist Heaven” and “the study of the Principles of Nature in order to attain the welfare of the people.” For this reason, Yao, Shun, and the Three Dynasties were truly worthy of reverence.

The Shōzan Kanwa imparts this as follows:

The broad scholarship of the Sung Dynasty... was mainly concerned with the Principles of Nature... It has no conception of the physical existence of Heaven and Man. Heaven was said to be Reason. Respect for Heaven was to be maintained by this spirit of Reason. By saying that the study of the Principles of Nature led to knowledge of the Principles of Matter... the Sung Confucians showed they did not understand the plans and devices of Yao, Shun, and the Three Dynasties. By examining the Spirit of Yao, Shun, and the Three Dynasties, we can see that Heaven was reverenced as if there really was a Creator who dwelt on high... For this reason, in the realm of matter too, Yao, Shun, and the Three Dynasties, having received the Mandate of the Creator directing them to expand the works of Nature, reached into mountains, rivers,
plants and trees, birds and beasts... They exerted themselves in using the Principles of Nature for opening the land, governing the fields, and ministering to the welfare of the people. Water, fire, wood, metal, earth, and cereals they used. There was no land which stood outside the Realm. This was the real way of showing reverence for the Creator—to assist in the administration of the Divine Creation. The Sung Confucian concept of administration was not like that of the Three Dynasties. If, as in the period of the Three Dynasties, there was the study of the Principles of Nature in order to assist the divine work of Heaven, then in the Sung period too there should have been a way, as in the West, to introduce many things within the provinces of water, fire, wood, metal, and cereals to assist the welfare of the people... Because this was not so, the administration of Yao, Shun, and the Three Dynasties with regard to the study of the Principles of Nature and the Sung Confucians' study of the Principles of Nature must be considered as completely different. The Sung Confucians said that even one tree and one blade of grass had a principle and must necessarily be studied. Yet, while they achieved the production of plants and trees, they did not think of attaining the welfare of the people...

This interpretation by Shōnan of the Confucian teachings, his concept of Heaven as not just a principle but rather as a personalized Creator, became the basis of his closeness to, and familiarity with, Christianity. We must note here his emphasis on practical learning, his pragmatic interpretation of Confucianism. When we examine the "six provinces" Shōnan spoke of (water, fire, wood, metal, earth and cereals) the question arises, is there not a qualitative difference between the first five and the sixth (cereals)? The former are elements existing in nature; cereals, however, are human products. Chu Hsi interpreted the first five as kinds of spirit (Ether) and added to these the sixth, cereals—thus making "six provinces." Shōnan rejected the metaphysical and rationalistic interpretation of the five as types of spirit, and from the standpoint of viewing all
six as necessities of life, spoke of them as the "six provinces which are necessary to daily human life."

In the main, Shōnan distinguished between two attitudes towards learning. The first was simply to know about things, which he stigmatized as "marginal" knowledge—or the type of knowledge encompassed in margin notes. This knowledge came from reading books. He used the word shiru (to know) to express this. In contrast to this stood what he called gaten (understanding), which resulted from touching on the true nature of things and developing insight. This kind of learning made it possible to act, to acquire wisdom. It was a practical learning. The difference between shiru and gaten was the difference between knowledge and wisdom.

Shōnan expressed this difference saying:

In learning, knowing and understanding are two different things. Useless is the knowledge of the principle of the world and of manifold things and their variations if there is no practical way to apply it . . . On the other hand, what is called understanding means that if we read books and understand their principles deeply, these become our possessions and the books themselves become nothing but dregs which can be discarded. The principles which have now become ours by this method can be used and applied to separate and discrete things . . .

It is obvious that having made this distinction in learning Shōnan was not content just to study the scholars of old. He studied what these scholars had studied, that is to say, where they quested he quested. And, indeed, Shōnan said:

The scholars of later generations do not understand anything of daily life but only perceive that which pertains to books. They do not learn what the scholars of old learned, and they are therefore the slaves of these scholars. When one contemplates studying Chu Hsi, one should think about what Chu Hsi studied. If this is not done, one will end by being a slave of Chu Hsi. In composing a poem by studying Tu Fu one must think about what Tu Fu studied, and in this
case it would be well to trace these studies back to the Han, the Wei, and the Six Dynasties.

From this we can understand in what sense Shōnan thought of the rule of Yao, Shun and the Three Dynasties as an archetype of history. Shōnan, not desiring to become a slave of the scholars of old, studied what they studied. In doing this he went back to the reigns of Yao, Shun, and the Three Dynasties—not simply for the sake of knowing these, but for the purpose of understanding. With Shōnan it was not the study of the Principles of Nature by the continual search for the underlying principle, but rather the study of the Principles of Nature to assist the work of Heaven and to attain the welfare of the people. This was the difference between Shōzan’s Sung Confucian rationalism and Shōnan’s historicism based on the ancient learning. In view of this difference it is clear that though they both recognized the significance of Western civilization their focus on this civilization was vastly different.

Shōzan was an advocate of expelling the barbarians in the 1840’s and by the early 1850’s had changed to advocating the opening of the country. Shōnan changed to advocating the opening of the country in the middle 1850’s. This intellectual change was probably a consequence of reading Wei Yuan’s Haikuo T’uchih (Geography of Foreign Nations). Motoda Eifu wrote in the Kanreki no Ki (Record of Sixty Years):

One day I was listening to Master Yokoi’s teachings in which he was giving his opinion on opening the country. He said that the way of universal reason calls for opening the country. The West will before long be seen here. If administrative measures are adopted, the decline of the Empire will be reversed and in the twinkling of an eye it will forge to the front of the states of the world as a rich country with a strong soldiery. To establish this practically, we ought to start first of all by friendly relations with America. If someone like myself were employed in this endeavor, I would first, upon going to America, engage with sincerity
in consultations by which government finances could be made sound and production and trade promoted. Above all things, the founder of America, Washington, always aspired to end war in the world. War in all countries leads to the misery and unhappiness of the people; this is unbearable. By consultations with America the destructiveness of war can be avoided. Whether Washington was a sage after Yao and Shun or a superior person I cannot know. In these days, however, what Harris advocates is reasonable. The arguments of those who profess to support the cause of the Empire are crude. This is because they do not know the truth about foreign countries.

Shōzan stressed the opening of the country in the interest of national defense; Shōnan advocated opening the country because trade and intercourse were "world principles." Shōzan often referred to Peter the Great, extolling his accomplishments; Shōnan praised Washington. This wide difference even in the choice of heroes was closely related to the differences between Shōnan and Shōzan. While Shōnan supported the slogan Rich Country, Strong Soldiery, he had deeper reasons for favoring the opening of Japan. When his two nephews were sent to study in America in 1866, Shōnan penned the following famous lines to them:

Master Western technology in order to make clear the Way of Yao, Shun, and Confucius. Why be content just with a rich country, or a strong soldiery! Spread the cause of justice and humanity in the world.

This quotation about making clear the Way of Yao, Shun, and Confucius by mastering the technology of the West seems at first glance to be the same as Shōzan's "Eastern morality, Western technique" formula. Shōnan, however, added the statement that a rich country and strong soldiery were not enough, that justice and humanity must be spread through the world. This cast his thought in a different frame from Shōzan's simple formula.

It is precisely at this point that we can recognize Shōnan's
rather deep feeling for Christianity. As we noted above, Shōnan felt that Christians were superior to Buddhists since their religion preached ethics. Tokutomi Roka (1868-1927), in his Takezaki Junko, noted that the female educator Yajima Kajiko (1832-1922) reminisced about Shōnan, saying:

When I think of Yokoi Shōnan, I still remember that he wanted to know all about Christianity. This was the period before the Restoration; it was a period of restlessness and excitement, when people were saying that foreign ships would be coming before long. I heard from Yokoi that, 'Whether Jesus was God or man, one thing is certain, not until He died by crucifixion was His task accomplished. The crucifixion was His success.' Among other things, he said that he heard that in the West eras were reckoned from the epoch of Jesus. Yokoi wanted to learn more of Jesus but this was impossible at that time.

The above is indirect evidence of Shōnan's interest in Christianity. We have Shōnan's own words in the following poem.

The West is religiously orthodox,  
Westerners even call themselves orthodox;  
Religious doctrine is based on a Creator.  
The people are led by commandments;  
Virtue is encouraged,  
And evil-doing is punished;  
Both high and low give credence to this,  
Western institutions are founded on this religious doctrine;  
Government and these teachings are not separated,  
The aspirations of the people are in accord with this;  
In Japan there are three doctrines,  
And there is nothing the human spirit can rely on;  
Shinto and Buddhism are difficult to give credence,  
Confucianism has degenerated to rhetoric
and literary embellishments;

Government and doctrine manifest
The evils and confusion consequent upon this.

In Shōnan's diary there is an entry to the effect that in September, 1868, in Kyōto, Mori Arinori, Samejima Naonobu, and Shōnan himself spent an evening discussing the American deliberative body. Since Mori and Samejima were Christians, it is likely that the discussion covered Christianity as well. This is supported by a letter Shōnan wrote in September, 1868. Shōnan was exceptional in that, in addition to European politics, he gave his attention to the inner spirit of the West and had feeling for Christianity. That he was exceptional in his quest for the Christian God can be said only if we exclude Niijima Jō, who had earlier gone to America, and Nakamura Masanao, who at the time was a student in England.

4. Yoshida Shōin (1830-1859)

To speak of Shōin is to bring to mind the Shōka Sonjuku, the private school established by him. We are also reminded of the great men of the Restoration: Takasugi Shinsaku, Kusaka Genzui, Katsura Kogorō (later known as Kido Takayoshi), Shinagawa Yajirō, and others who emerged from this school. In a general way it can be said that Shōin was the teacher of these men. If we think about the similarity of their ages, the correspondence they exchanged, and the friendship among them, then at least as far as these people were concerned this school, in which they all shared the same aspirations, was in the nature of a fraternity. Shōin's role in this fraternity was that of an outstanding senior member rather than that of a teacher. While Shōin was the leader of the group, it would be even more accurate to say he symbolized the essence of the school. Be that as it may, when Shōin was in Noyama prison, the opinions he held and the policies he advocated were not necessarily supported by men like Takasugi and Kusaka. Shōin's own feelings were like the feelings of leaders who have been opposed and deserted at one time or other by their comrades. Those, like
Irie Sugizō and Nomura Wasaku, who demonstrated complete unquestioning confidence in Shōin were extremely few. When the radical nature of Shōin’s thought increased there were also people who felt he was mad. This was borne out in some bitter letters Shōin wrote to his friend Irie:

What can be happening to me? I have already become a madman. Every principle in the Confucian canon has been employed to attack me, and I have had no words to defend myself. All I can do is gnash my teeth and let my tears flow over the course of events. Other than this all is blackness. Looking at your letter I was reminded that there is such a thing as paternal affection—however, I cannot say this about most people in this world... Did they become loyal only after they had examined whether or not it would bring advantage or merit? Were they not loyal retainers because conditions seemed unbearable?

This letter was probably written after March 16, 1859. When his feelings seemed to have calmed, in April, Shōin wrote:

From excessive anger I have now come to the point where nothing exasperates me. Should I again become angry, please forgive me.

Shien, Shien [Irie was popularly known as Shien], you should cease being indignant. Do I hold my life dear, am I irresolute, is my learning advanced, has my filial piety become attenuated? While I do not quest death, neither do I avoid death. In prison I do as much as prison conditions permit. When I shall be free I will do as much as is possible under such circumstances. And, while I am not saying anything about the trend of the times, still I expect I shall once again be imprisoned, and, in all likelihood, executed.

Sakuma Shōzan was Shoin’s teacher, and when Shoin’s plan—made at the suggestion of Shōzan—to smuggle himself abroad had failed, they both were thrown into prison. The young Shōin, in the above-cited letter, leaves with us a strong impression of the depth of his feelings.

In January 1858 Shōin composed his essay “Kyōfu no gen”
(Words of a Madman). This began with the following words:

The gravest peril to the nation is that it does not know that it is experiencing a grave peril. Were it known, would not some plan have been devised to meet it? The way things are the collapse of Japan is certain. Is anything conceivably more disastrous than this!

This essay concludes as follows:

People call me a madman, which I am not. However, I do not bemoan even their use of this word madman, since sages too have been called madmen.

In this essay he styled himself "fiercely indignant man" and only metaphorically did he call himself "madman" in the "Kyōfu no gen" We must examine the reasons for Shōin's extremism.

In a letter he wrote to Nomura Wasaku, at about the same time as the above letter to Irie Sugizō, Shōin rejected cheap heroics in connection with death. He said:

I agree with your resolve when you say 'to die with patriotic indignation is easy, to meet death tranquilly is difficult'—this is truly well said. It may be easy to swim with the current and die in battle, but to die at this time [i.e., isolated because of their beliefs and principles] is extremely difficult.

Someone like Sakura [this is Sakura Ninzo] says that though death is easy he will not die vainly. And in our clan all our comrades say the same. This is a great lie! Why should death be easy? Since there is no second life, to die is very difficult . . . In the time I have been in prison I feel I have made much progress. We do not have more than one life, let us therefore value ours highly. Let us expend our lives only in an extreme emergency.

One day later he said the same thing in another letter to Nomura:

The end of life is death. For this reason to die is difficult . . . Japan is on the verge of chaos and this state of affairs cannot be endured. It is said that this is a reason to die. Yet I disagree. If Japan is reduced to a state of anarchy, I would have to exert all my power. And in such a case I must live—
not die! There have never been such portents of evil in Chinese or Japanese history as there are at present . . . we are facing the destruction of the country . . .

As these letters indicate, Shōin's attitude contained a resolve to die in an historical crisis. If this type of thinking—the idea of dying in an historical crisis—can be called existentialist thought, then Shōin can be considered a type of existentialist thinker. That Shōin was an existentialist can be detected from his ardor for sincerity and from his attitude of accepting illusions rather than facing reality. In contrast to Shōzan, who liked Shao K'ang-Chieh, one of the leading neo-Confucians in the Sung period, Shōin delighted in Li Chê-wu, a follower of Ou Yang-ming.

From one of Li's books he quoted the latter's theory of the sincerity of children and wrote to his friend Irie:

A child's heart is a true heart. False people's words are false, their deeds are false, their writings are false. False people delight in false words, false deeds, and false writings. Without falseness they are unhappy. This is the state of the present world. It is certain that in this world for every one person with the true heart of a child there are many who are wicked, whose hearts are full of hate.

In his margin notes, alongside the passage about false people, Shōin deliberately wrote: "The officials of the government who preach about loyalty are all examples of this!" It is also obvious that Shōin included society in this savage criticism. We see this in such phrases as:

- It can be accepted that society is false.
- If one thinks about people today—they are all deceitful.
- Truly, the people are like drunkards, they understand nothing that is said . . . they never become indignant over national affairs . . .

Such phrases occurred frequently in Shōin's writings. Shōin felt that in this false world the only proper attitude to adopt was not one of glorious deeds but simply one of sincerity, the attitude represented by the "sincere heart of a child." Only
such an attitude was incorruptible, was the "great moral obligation," was "imperishable truth."

The affairs of the world are like a dream, if even one of these endures it will suffice . . . Life passes quickly, like a dream, like a fantasy. Censure and praise—both are momentary; success and failure—both are ephemeral. If even one of these does not perish it will suffice.

All these phrases by Shōin give us insight into his character. Whether Shōin was, in his words, "entirely absorbed," or whether he "did not quest ultimate solutions," the fact remains that the most important question to him was "whether or not a goal has been set." He stressed this many times and it is this trend in his thought which marks him as an existentialist.

Shōin's existentialism was not founded on Christianity. He was a samurai who revered the Emperor, an Imperial loyalist. Shōin did not think of the crisis facing Japan as the "spiritual crisis of the modern age," but as a concrete crisis fraught with the dangerous possibility of the downfall of Japan. Shōin was for this reason a staunch advocate of expelling the barbarians.

As we stated above, Shōin was deeply worried over the danger facing Japan. Drawing on the words of Ssū-Ma Tê-t'sao of the Minor Han dynasty (c. 221) he said, "When we know the exigencies of our time we become men of superior ability." In more modern language this refers to people who strive to meet a crisis when they are aware of its existence. Shōin found such people among those for revering the Emperor and expelling the barbarians. We must also note Shōin's original interpretation of these views. And especially we should note that in order to realize these ideas he advocated reform of the State in his Rō-oku no setsu (Discourse on the Old House) and in his Sōmō Kukki no ron (On the Rise of the Non-Affiliated).

Shōin was not simply an obstinate advocate of keeping Japan closed. Shōin, who said about his teacher Shōzan that "he was the only person of outstanding ability in Edo, a man of intelligence, burning with patriotic indignation, a scholar . . ."
was also in agreement with his theories. Shōzan had said that Japan should not permit herself to be forced open by the West, should reject the American demands, and then proceed to open the country of her own accord. Shōin affirmed this in a letter in which he wrote:

My teacher Shōzan is extremely sharp-sighted. In his opinion it would be good if we open Japan. In this event we could have trade and communication at our own convenience. If Japan is opened by others the preservation of our country will be completely impossible. I agree with this. And if you examine Aesop’s *Fables* carefully you will find particulars which will enable you to understand the present day barbarians.

Since Shōin was in agreement with Shōzan’s views, he followed Shōzan’s suggestion that he learn as much as possible about military methods and even considered smuggling himself abroad.

We must also realize that Shōin was not a complete advocate of overthrowing the Bakufu. The person to whom Shōin sent the above letter had initially inspired him with his ardor for reverencing the Emperor, and appeared to have been thinking of pushing this idea to the point of overthrowing the Bakufu. In his *Noyama Goku Bunko* (Noyama Prison Essays), written in 1854-55, Shōin took exception to the theory of overthrowing the Bakufu as a basis for reform because he felt that the subsequent disintegration of Japan could not be stopped. Shōin felt that “requesting the Emperor to overthrow the Bakufu is not good” and he cited the struggle between the Wei and the Chin. The conclusion of this struggle had been the defeat of both and the victory of the Hsiung Nu barbarian tribes.

Chin overthrew Wei. The lords and retainers of both were lacking in foresight, they destroyed each other. They removed the capitals, they knew no regrets and finally they were ruined. Posterity can only feel sorry for them. [For Japan too] the great enemy is outside the gates. Can this be a time for criticism within the country! The lords of the country should
consult together and offer guidance to the Bakufu and should devise plans for strengthening the country. If this is not done . . . decline will follow and outside barbarians will take advantage of this.

In the early 1850’s Shōin was a gradualist and certainly did not contemplate overthrowing the Bakufu. For Shōin, the “great enemy” was outside, therefore Japan could not afford internal criticism. In effect, this was his position: The Tokugawa are respected by our clan-lord, therefore we too must follow our lord and proffer council to the Bakufu. This was still the logic of feudal hierarchic thought. The Bakufu, however, violated the Imperial Edicts time after time, and to Shōin the Bakufu seemed to be selling out Japan’s independence to the barbarians. He thus tried adopting extreme measures like the Ōhara policy (he thought to further his plans by supporting the Kyōto kuge, Ōhara Sanmi) but they all failed. He ceased relying on government officials for reforms and as a non-affiliated samurai—he had by now severed his ties to his clan—Shōin began to have recourse to direct action. This was the origin of his advocacy of a “rising of the non-affiliated”—a rising of low-ranking samurai who like himself were no longer bound by loyalty to their clans, who had attained freedom of action.

Shōin wrote of this in a letter to Nomura Wasaku in April 1859:

The measures taken till now were deplorable. These were based on the idea of cooperation with the government, which was an utter mistake! From now on we will change to a policy of non-affiliation.

In a series of essays written at the beginning of 1859 there is one “Addressed to Shien.” Shien, as we said, was Shōin’s friend Irie Sugizō. Shōin developed his “theory of the old house,” which was a metaphor for Japan, saying:

The world today has become like a crumbling old house. This is obvious to everybody and it seems to me that if a strong wind were to arise it would be overturned. If, afterwards, the house is rebuilt, the decayed rafters discarded,
and new timbers assembled, it will become beautiful to behold. Many of my friends think to hold off the wind and rain for some months by altering a beam here and a rafter there in that old and decaying structure. They regard me as a heretic and shun me accordingly. That this is not the case with you I know in my heart.

This "theory of the old house" indicated that Shōin was thrusting aside his gradualism and espousing extremism. His schemes for drastic state reform were embodied in his advocacy of the rise of the low-ranking non-affiliated samurai.

Shōin was fascinated by such phrases as "a medicine which does not produce dizziness does not heal." He loved to quote Sun Tsu's, "To be plunged into destruction is by-and-by to exist, to be cast into jeopardy is by-and-by to live."

Shōin's consciousness and expectation of crisis was continually reinforced. It is therefore not strange that he believed that only through destruction did building become possible. Indeed, by 1859 Shōin began to make such statements as:

I feel that in the present circumstances neither reverence for the Emperor nor expelling the barbarians is possible. This dilemma can be thrust aside only by destroying it. Only then will it be possible to accomplish our aims.

As we said previously, Shōin was disturbed by the unprecedentedly evil omens which "betoken the passage of Japan from orderly rule into chaos and ultimate destruction." It appeared to him that the people, after two hundred and fifty years of Tokugawa peace, were utterly without spirit and without integrity. Even if the country lost its independence, he felt the people would selfishly continue to pursue their slothful existence.

With this in mind he wrote in his "Kimi Bunko" (Essays for 1859):

Informed people understand that there is no opportunity for reverencing the Emperor and expelling the barbarians when the Tokugawa are not yet destroyed...Maybe, once the Tokugawa are destroyed, rival lords will arise making
possible whole Japan’s conquest and annexation by the barbarians. These people still continue to live in perfect contentment and compose paeans to peace. I have made this observation as early as the first month of last year.

Shōin’s reference to “last year” meant 1858. This was probably the period in which Shōin began to put into practice his extremist policy as the only possible course. From Shōin’s point of view these policies were necessary because of the condition he described in the foregoing. And, as he said, it was therefore a great mistake to have relied on the officials of the government—clan or Bakufu—for reforms. Shōin said therefore:

Alas! The flesh-eaters [a classical Chinese allusion to great officials] are base, they are destroying the country. How do we know that the lower orders [“the grain-eaters”] may not be doing the same?”

Here Shōin quoted from Li Cho-wu, saying:

Li’s metaphor—finding a hero among the ordinary people is like fishing in a well—I think is brilliant. There must be someone among the non-affiliated samurai who can get things done! The affiliated samurai lives on his stipend, he only desires luxury, beautiful women and delights in his beloved children. This sort of samurai has no room left for reverencing the Emperor and expelling the barbarians.

We see, then, that by 1859 Yoshida Shōin no longer expected reform to be initiated by responsible government officials and had also lost hope in the ordinary samurai who lived on a stipend from his clan. Shōin concluded that the only group which could help Japan was the ronin group, the group of low-ranking samurai who like Shōin had forfeited all stipends and was now “non-affiliated.”

The following was addressed to Kusaka Genzui in 1859. Shōin wrote:

Those who think that when a situation arises men of ability will be forthcoming are shallow indeed. If this were so, would we have so many examples of the ruin of families and the destruction of countries! Did not Ch’ü Yuan [statesman
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of the period of Warring States in the declining years of the Chou Dynasty, ca., 290 B.C., from the state of Chu] die ignominiously! Did not Yueh Fei [during the decline of the Sung Dynasty] die by execution! Look at the periods of the destruction of the Sung and Yuan Dynasties!...The base people destroy the country internally, enemy countries seize the opportunity to do this externally. The same theme runs from ancient times to the present. People of spirit must know how my tears gush upon writing this. Oh woe! If Heaven has not yet eschewed Japan there will be great heroes among the emergent non-affiliated people...Only if these heroes approach the ultimate of loyalty will we have evidence of Heaven's protection.

The Bakufu and the feudal lords are already besotted and there is no way of supporting them. There is no hope except in the rise of the unaffiliated samurai. We are not forgetting the obligations to our clan, the virtue and grace of the Imperial Court. With the power of the emergent non-affiliated lower samurai the clan will be maintained in the short run; in the long run the revival and resuscitation of the Imperial Court too will be achieved. Though the task appears above such low-lash samurai, these samurai can be designated men who rendere great service to our country. These unaaffiliated samurai will in no sense rank beneath someone like Kuan Chung.

In his denunciation of the high officials Shōin wrote:

The present feudal lords who speak of reverencing the Emperor and expelling the barbarians are like toads aiming at the governance of the Realm...there is no recourse but for stout-hearted men to weep at this state of affairs. Alas, because I cannot simply sit by and witness the destruction of the divine-country, I have taken great pains with various policies: the Fushimi policy, the Ōhara policy. I have raised disturbances in the country having wanted to place people in a situation from which there would be no turning back.

I am become one of the non-affiliated and if I am released
from confinement, I will achieve my ambition, though I have to do it by myself and though I become known for violence. ...I understand the principles of justice and right behavior but I am not one to bide my time. How can then the rising of those who stand outside the clans or the Bakufu be dependent on the strength of others!

These, then, were Shōin's views on the rise of a group standing outside of, or not affiliated with, public office of any kind. There still is a question over the interpretation of this advocacy of Shōin's. We can scarcely deny that Shōin was calling for an upheaval, nor did he shrink from violence. Shōin frequently used such expressions as: "the period for the complete alteration of the state of affairs in the Realm," "the ripe time for a great change," "not to shed blood means not to be capable of discussing the concerns of the Realm." At any rate, Shōin viewed the period as one of upheaval, as one in which it would be difficult to avoid the sight of blood. That Shōin planned on something close to revolution is obvious. Yet we must also carefully note the following points in Shōin's attitude. First, he thought of a great change, an upheaval, but never really of a revolution. Revolution to Shōin was something Chinese, something which fundamentally distinguished Japan from China.

China, Shōin said, was "the country of revolution." Japan was a different matter, "we have received the edicts of the Imperial ancestors; the grace and virtue of the successive Emperors have been vouchsafed us; we must with one accord affirm this, we must maintain this for all generations."

What Shōin was really aiming at when he said that the emergence of the non-affiliated samurai would support and advance the cause of both the clan and the Court, was the resuscitation of the Imperial institution. Shōin even planned a coup d'etat to keep his clan lord, Lord Mōri, from leaving Kyōto. Shōin explained this, saying:

By repeatedly discussing national matters with our honorable and just lord, and having him receive in audience patriots
who stand outside government and by having him consult with them on current affairs, within a month patriots will assemble in Kyōto from all quarters. The Great plans of national policy can then be determined. If, at that time, there are any who stand in our way, they can be executed. By killing some people we can wipe out differences of opinion ... Those who at present merely 'aspire' to a national renovation, 'plan' for a restoration, are like those who wait for the waters of the Yellow River to flow clear.' If there is no rising of the non-governmental patriots, there will be no possibility of security or stability... It is only through these samurai on the outside that the base and evil people will be excluded and the virtuous, gentlemanly, righteous ones will be enabled to assume their proper place!

In a letter Shōin wrote:

Where does ultimate righteousness and the essence of just conduct reside today? I humbly submit these are to be found in the Emperor, one or two Court nobles, Lord Mōri, and myself. I follow my lord; the Court nobles, obey the Emperor, and if we do not make a clean sweep of knaves and scoundrels then the ruin of our dear country will follow as a matter of course... therefore we have need of the non-governmental patriots.

It is thus clear from the foregoing that Shōin’s objective was an imperial revival like the one which took place in the 14th century. At that time the Emperor attempted to reign in fact as well as in name, but was forced to give way before the power of the Ashikaga family which founded a new military government. In any event, these plans of Shōin’s were not revolutionary, they were restorationist.

Next we should take note of Shōin’s plans for a coup d’état. The following quotations make clear that these plans, even if the Bakufu were overthrown and the country unified, were aimed solely at protecting the country from the foreign powers. Shōin wrote:

If the Americans do not destroy the Tokugawa we must
give great assistance, military supplies, and provisions. Once Japan become a vassal state, she will perforce be destroyed. Though I am called a man who loves violence, I do not want my country to come under American hegemony.

Shōin also wrote: "If there are non-governmental patriots Japan may escape such a fate—though I am dubious." Therefore, Shōin brooded over the fact that

...present conditions are such that the feudal lords are not wise in the ways of the world; the Court nobility too are rather poor in this, leaving only the band of patriotic outsiders and the latter are without power. Suitable answer cannot be given to the question as to whether it is a clever plan to take advantage of the various peasant riots occurring in the Empire.

Of course, the latter should not be taken as expressing concern with the solution of socio-economic problems. Shōin was only concerned with whether it would be wise to take advantage of these problems. Shōin was primarily concerned with political upheaval.

In the foregoing we outlined Shōzan, Shōnan, and Shōin’s thought during the closing years of the Bakufu. To be sure, there were others at this time, Hashimoto Sanai, for example, who should have been noted. It was, however, in the thought of the three we dealt with that the main intellectual currents of the period could be seen. And it was with these patriots and precursors—all met violent deaths—that the slogan "Revere the Emperor, Expel the barbarians" became transformed into "Revere the Emperor, Open the country." It was thus that the Tokugawa age gave way to the new Meiji era.
PART II. 1870-1880

CHAPTER 1.

FUKUZAWA YUKICHI AND THE ERA OF CIVILIZATION
AND ENLIGHTENMENT

1. The Tragedy of Intellectuals and Ignoramuses

One of the greatest writers of modern Japan, Mori Ōgai (1862-1922), wrote a sketch called *Tsuge Shirōzaemon*. Tsuge was the man who cut off the head of Yokoi Shōnan in January 1869, in Kyōto, in the vicinity of the Shimogoryō Shrine. It should be noted, moreover, that while Tsuge has been forgotten, Shōnan is well remembered as one of the patriotic precursors of the intellectual change that precipitated the Meiji Restoration.

Ōgai graduated from the university and was living at home; his younger brother Tokujirō was still a student at the university. Once Ōgai questioned his brother about some of his fellow students, asking him whether there were any outstanding or especially noteworthy people in his classes. Tokujirō promptly brought up the name of Tsuge Shikata. The latter was a pale thin-faced youth with knitted brows, the son of Tsuge Shirōzaemon. Many years later in 1913, this same Tsuge Shikata paid an unexpected visit to Ōgai and told him the dramatic story which became the substance of the *Tsuge Shirōzaemon*.

Tsuge Shikata said he was the son of that Tsuge Shirōzaemon who had cut off Yokoi Shōnan’s head. Since his childhood he had aspired to vindicate his father; however, when he became an adult he realized that his father was not killed by men but by the law. He felt as though he had lost his purpose and that his life had become meaningless. At present (in 1913), however, he only wanted somebody to write his father’s side of the story. If he could but leave posterity with this, it would suffice, he said. It was in this vein, Ōgai wrote, that Tsuge
spoke to him of the historical facts he had been able to discover about his father, Shirōzaemon. The sketch Ōgai wrote is in itself of tremendous interest. For our purpose it is sufficient to analyze the reasons for Shōnan’s assassination.

Ōgai has set it down as follows. Tsuge Shirōzaemon grew up during a tumultuous period; he matured amidst the din of rumors about the “black ships.” It was the period already discussed in connection with the debate over whether or not to open the country. Certain it is that when Tsuge listened to the talk going on around him, he heard words like *righteous* and *irresolute*: this one was dubbed a righteous person, that one, an irresolute person, a vacillator. These were the terms people at that time used when evaluating others. *Righteous* was he who was for revering the Emperor and expelling the barbarians. People who valued courage and integrity advocated reverencing the Emperor and expelling the barbarians. Consequently, to be called *irresolute* meant to favor supporting the Bakufu and opening the country.

There is something strange about this. Originally, say in the 1830’s, to be for opening the country was equated with being progressive, with favoring a bold policy. There is no clearcut explanation for this reversal. Why was reverencing the Emperor now connected with keeping the country closed and expelling the barbarians? Why did supporting the Bakufu now mean opening the country and friendly relations with the outside? There are no sufficient reasons to explain this. A reason of sorts can be found in Chinese history, which had hitherto provided many models for Japanese behavior. To argue for peaceful relations with the barbarians was irresolute because Ch’in Kuei (1090-1155) of the Sung Dynasty had done so and the result had been to “open the country” to the Jurchen Tartars. The Japanese were probably afraid that to open the country to relations with the West would have similar disastrous results. Also, the Shōgun, it was argued, was not living up to his title. Shōgun was a shortened form of the title *Sei-i Tai-Shōgun* or “Barbarian-suppressing Generalissimo.” By not subjugating
the barbarians the Shōgun was proving himself irresolute. However, despite the vagueness of this kind of reasoning, the fact remains that in the mass public opinion of that time righteous meant to be for reverencing the Emperor and expelling the barbarians; irresolute meant to support the Bakufu and advocate opening the country. Tsuge was reared in the midst of such a public opinion. As Ōgai wrote, “Tsuge wanted to grow up as quickly as possible and he wanted to take his place with the righteous ones.” He studied fencing and became a praiseworthy youth. At the time he killed Yokoi, Tsuge had just turned twenty-two.

Public opinion, then, influenced Tsuge. This public opinion was little more than mob psychology. Informed people looked at the trend of history and knew that the opening of the country was unavoidable. They were also aware of the impossibility of expelling the barbarians. Nevertheless, the later worthies of the Restoration boldly preached expelling the barbarians because they considered it to be a policy perfectly suited for overthrowing the Bakufu. Inoue Kowashi (1843-1895), in a series of his papers collected during his lifetime, called Goin Sonko, has dramatically noted this in his tales of Iwakura Tomomi (1825-1883) and Tamamatsu Misao (1810-1872). These worthies, however, guarded this secret well and it was not known to most people. In Shōnan’s case the circumstances were different. Shōnan was a scholar. He had studied Confucian learning and knew that in any comparison between Western culture and Japan’s, the former was by far the superior. Therefore, Shōnan sent his disciples to Nagasaki to study Dutch gunnery under a certain Watanabe Keita, a follower of Takeda-shima Shūhan. In 1854, Shōnan himself went to Nagasaki to try to meet with the Russian envoy. The policy Shōnan advocated called for a union of the Court and the military, of those supporting the Emperor and those loyal to the Bakufu. Also Shōnan advocated opening the country. It is of interest that Shōnan worshipped Washington as a perfect model of a statesman and acknowledged the worth of a republican form
of government. Shōnan also grieved over the stagnation of Shinto, Confucianism, and Buddhism in Japan. He said that in Europe Christianity had unified the public mind. The people of Shōnan’s time, however, interpreted his words to mean that he advocated a policy of dethroning the Emperor and was betraying Japan to the foreign powers. Under the sway of this kind of public opinion Tsuge and his comrades, wanting to cleanse the Court of corrupt elements, assassinated the 61-year-old Shōnan.

Ōgai set great store by this tale, which he felt came straight from the heart, and he took down Tsuge’s story almost verbatim. The only additions Ōgai made had to do with supplementing Tsuge’s account with chronological materials based on historical research. He scrupulously avoided appending his own thoughts or feelings to the narrative. Therefore, this sketch is as close to being a veritable record as is possible.

The feeling the sketch evokes is that Tsuge Shirōzaemon was merely the instrument in the assassination of Yokoi Shōnan, it was public opinion that was really responsible. Two or three days after the assassination of Shōnan the following bills were posted at every crossing in Kyōto.

On the fifth day past, the scholar Yokoi Heishirō [Shōnan] was cut down in broad daylight in the Street of the Temple. One person was arrested and the remainder of the band is being zealously pursued, it is said. Although no person of the group who cut down the aforementioned evildoer is well-known, it can be assumed that the deed derived from their complete patriotic sincerity. The corruptness of Shōnan is universally known. He was a sycophant of the former Bakufu and, awful to relate, he advocated the idea of dethroning the Emperor, intending harm to the Imperial Line which has reigned for unbroken ages. Righteous patriots killed a wicked traducer, who was in league with the outside barbarians, who had engaged to spread Christian teachings in the Empire... He intended to make our splendid god-country a vassal state of the ugly barbarians who are like unto dogs and sheep...
We heartily approve of the sentiments of the group who cut down this evildoer, regardless of their crime... they will be later forgiven...!

This type of public opinion was so prevalent that even in the Imperial Police Department there were many who felt the assassins ought to be dealt with leniently.

Obviously the elements of a true tragedy are present here. The basis of this tragedy lay concealed in the clash between intellect and ignorance. Specifically, the tragedy lay in the conflict between Yokoi's knowledge and Tsuge's ignorance. Tsuge was spirited, patriotic, upright, but utterly stupid. He knew nothing of the state of the world and he had not the wisdom of age. Sakuma Shōzan's assassination was of a similar nature, as was that of Ōkubo Toshimichi (1830-1878) and Mori Arinori (1847-1889). In the periods immediately preceding and following Perry's arrivals, this clash between intellectuals and ignoramuses followed a regular pattern. As a mitigating circumstance, it might be added that the ignoramuses were sincere if misguided patriots. This was also noted by Ōgai in his sketch and must be taken into account in interpreting the trends in the beginning years of the Meiji period.

Finally, one thing which cannot but strike us anew is how the condition which prevailed during the first and second years of the Meiji era, as described here, changed with such frenetic rapidity in a bare three or four years. In these days there persisted in the public mind the feeling that to be for opening the country was to be irresolute, to be for expelling the barbarians was to be righteous. However, by Meiji 5 and 6 a remarkable reversal had taken place. Public opinion now worshipped what was called "civilization and enlightenment." This was a gigantic transformation of values, a real revolution in value consciousness was taking place with astonishing rapidity.

The patriotic precursors we discussed, people like Sakuma Shōzan and Yokoi Shōnan, had contributed to the intellectual ferment in the last years of the Bakufu. In July 1873 a group
of intellectuals—the first really self-conscious intelligentsia in Japan—formed a club whose activities were to be of crucial importance in guiding Japanese thought. The sixth year of Meiji was 1873, whence the club derived its name, the Meirokusha—literally, Society of the Sixth Year of Meiji.

When Mori Arinori, who had been Chargé d’Affaires in the United States, returned to Japan in 1873 he and some other representative intellectuals assembled and founded the society.

In February 1874 the society began to publish the Meiroku Zasshi (Meiroku Magazine). The Meirokusha was in the vanguard of the civilization and enlightenment movement. When we think that only a few years earlier public opinion was favorably disposed towards Tsuge Shirōzaemon, we can truly sense the rapidity of the transformation Japan was undergoing. We must now turn our attention to this phenomenon; we must examine the new public opinion and its relationship to the Meirokusha. We will attempt to explain the thought of the members of the society and its influence on public opinion.

2. The Period of Civilization and Enlightenment

The period from 1873-1877 has usually been designated by Japanese cultural historians as the age of civilization and enlightenment. During the final years of the Bakufu the slogan had been “Revere the Emperor: Expel the Barbarians.” Now the leitmotiv was “civilization and enlightenment.” All effort was now devoted to not falling behind in the race to be civilized and cultured.

As we indicated, this new development did not immediately follow on the Restoration. Even though the famous Charter Oath of Five Articles in March 1868 offered an appropriate point of departure for the new Japan, for at least four years afterwards public opinion conceived of direct Imperial Rule as a going back to the ancient Japanese past. This was not especially strange. The Meiji Restoration had, after all, taken place as a movement for “restoration.” Public opinion was structured on this concept, and among the leaders of that time there were
not a few who cherished such a conviction. The administrative reforms of July 1869, the second year of Meiji, placed the Department of Shinto above the Council of State. This was a restorationist measure, an attempt to revive the ancient Taihō Code of the eighth century. The promulgation of the Imperial Rescript of January 1870 (Meiji 3) making Shinto the fundamental faith of Japan was in accord with the backward-looking nationalism of Hirata Atsutane (1776-1842). All over Japan fanatic attempts were made to implement the government’s call to suppress Buddhism.

Basically, however, the trend towards opening the country was a trend towards modernization. Those policies which conflicted with this could have no permanence. In July 1871 (Meiji 4) the territorial clans were abolished and a modern prefectural system established. In August the Department of Shinto was subordinated to the Council of State, and in March 1872 (Meiji 5) it was altogether abolished. The policy of converting Japan into a modern state became dominant in 1872. It was demarcated by such measures as the Conscription Law (1872), the promulgation of a modern school system—at least on paper—and the Land Tax Reform of 1873. The school system was to be modeled on that of France, but with some reference made to the American system. Japan was divided into eight university districts; each district was in turn subdivided into 32 middle school districts; these were subdivided into 210 primary school districts. The total number of small school districts came to 53,760, which meant one school for every 600 persons!

The general policy of opening the country and the specific measures taken by the government to modernize Japan provided a tremendous stimulus to the trend to civilization and enlightenment. These policies of the government encouraged the astonishing transformation of values we have noted after 1872. Now those still influenced by the traditional Confucian concept of the “relations of sovereigns and subjects” and in favor of “closing the country and expelling the barbarians” were considered
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obstinate, old-fashioned, and indeed, ludicrous.

In dealing with the change in values it is convenient to discuss first the transformation in the manner of life and then the change in the goals of life itself. We will thus come to understand in what sense the men of the Meirokusha represented the period of civilization and enlightenment and why their thought was both a reflection and a critique of this period.

A. The Transformation in the Manner of Life

In 1871 a postal system was organized between Tokyo, Kyōto, and Ōsaka. The old-fashioned system of runners was replaced. How surprising this change was we can judge from the writings of Fukuzawa Yukichi (1834-1901), who first observed a modern postal system in Paris in 1862. In 1872 railroad service was initiated between Shimbashi Station in Tōkyō and Yokohama; gas lamps were used at the gates of the Imperial Palace and other places; by 1875 there were 162 gas lamps between the Kyōbashi and Manseibashi districts in Tōkyō. This was the period in which brick buildings were first erected on the Ginza, Tōkyō’s most fashionable avenue, and Western-style soaps, watches, and umbrellas became popular. Western-style umbrellas had become so popular that in 1873 ¥410,000 worth were imported! Kanagaki Robun (1829-1894), in his famous Aguranabe, satirized the society of that period. In this work there is an incisive portrayal of a young man wearing his umbrella the way a samurai wore his long sword, and wound around his girdle like the short sword is the thick chain of a watch. Watches and umbrellas, these had become symbols of civilization and enlightenment! This book was written in 1871, and, using the popular lampoon style of the Tokugawa period, Kanagaki poked fun at the words and attitudes of the people who used to assemble in the Western-style restaurants of the time. The following is a typical scene: “Samurai, peasants, artisans, merchants, young and old, men, women, wise men, fools, rich, poor, all of these, so long as they eat meat, are not culturally backward.” Kanagaki then went on to describe the
hero of his first tale, "a man who instantly loves whatsoever he hears about the West." This section is masterfully written and worth quoting at some length:

He is a man in his mid-thirties, polished and shiny—he seems to use soap morning and night, his hair is smoothed back but looks as though it grew out but three months ago from the traditional cut, he reeks of eau de cologne...a silk umbrella is at his side, he has a cheap watch, bought by painful contrivance, which he periodically takes off from his neck not to see the time but to show people. The chain seems to be only gold-plated. He speaks to his meat-eating neighbor...saying.

"Say, this meat's delicious! Why haven't eaten it before now! In the West they've been eating mostly meat for some 1,620 or 30 years. Before this, cows and sheep belonged to kins or their stewards and weren't eaten by the common people. Now our country has been opened to civilization and enlightenment and I'm glad we too can eat meat now."

The Aguranabe was more than a simple portrait of manners—it was a satire on the typical lover of things Western. As a satire, it was of course an exaggeration. Yet it makes it possible for us to feel something of the period. Another writer of the period described a beautiful woman entering a Western-style, meat-serving restaurant, saying, "When such a beauty can openly enter a meat-serving shop without showing any concern...this is truly the essence of civilization and enlightenment!"

Why did this embody civilization and enlightenment? Because, "Japanese, while born intelligent and skillful, are extremely deficient in stamina." Had they been induced to drink milk from infancy, been raised on meat, their stamina would have been increased. The reasoning behind this was that "the cow being a stolid beast, those who are raised on its meat become like cows in their endurance."

The essence of that period can also be found in the edict on bobbing hair which was issued in 1871. Even by the end of 1897, when I was a child, the following song was still current.
Rap a shaven head and out comes the cry:
   "Vacillating! Irresolute!"
Pound on a bushy-haired head and it cries:
   "Restore Imperial Rule!"
But tap a Western-style-coiffured head and you hear:
   "Civilization! Enlightenment!"

Needless to say, the shaven head was the pre-Restoration samurai hair style and symbolized the movement of expelling the barbarians; bushy hair was the symbol of the samurai who had broken with the Bakufu and were in the forefront of the movement to restore the Emperor to power. This gives us an indication of how even hair styles became symbols of Western-ism. The new hair styles, of course, made hats necessary—in a country where head covering had largely been used only in inclement weather. Even women were affected by the craze for Western hair styles. The following item appeared in a newspaper of the period:

There is a certain store in Asakusa where they try to be very Western. The owner's mistress and child have their hair cut Western-style. The owner's wife is very upset since her hair too may have to be cut this way. Her grief is in vain. Despite her pleading, she will be forced to have her raven locks cut.

Another newspaper article writes of a young woman who was seen in the Nihonbashi district in Tōkyō wearing Japanese-style leggings, straw sandals, and a Western-style hair cut. She said she was from the province of Shinshū and longed very much for Western learning, but since her parents would not hear of this she had run away and come to Tōkyō. Now she was going to look up Mr. Fukuzawa and beg him to take her on as a pupil! Other newspaper articles in this vein were plentiful. Indeed the craze for emulating the West, as seen in such things as hair cuts, had gone so far that the government finally issued a directive in which it was pointed out that the "hair cut edict" applied to men and that women did not have to abide by it but could follow the former styles!
B. The Transformation in the Goals of Life.

It is obvious that by 1871 and 1872 a change had taken place in the style of Japanese life. The items just presented show this in concrete form. Japanese modernization along Western lines—although almost as a caricature—could be seen in the paraphernalia of everyday life. Umbrellas, watches, meat-eating, and haircuts were down-to-earth manifestations of civilization and enlightenment. On a more spiritual level a change in the aims of life too was taking place; this is somewhat more difficult to trace. Fukuzawa wrote a pamphlet in 1877 on the old feudal system and, concluding his introduction, he said his purpose was to provide historians in the future with some idea of conditions in the old territorial clans before the Restoration. Fukuzawa succeeds in helping us to understand conditions in the former clans. According to his pamphlet the number of samurai affiliated with the Okudaira clan of Nakatsu, in present day Ōita prefecture, was approximately 1,500. If we group these according to function and status there were over one hundred gradations. If, however, we look at these, roughly, as upper and lower samurai, then the ratio of lower to upper was three to one. Fukuzawa pointed out that there was a strict division between upper and lower samurai; no matter what the ability of members of the lower group, they were never able to rise into the upper group. When foot soldiers, for example, encountered great officials of the clan they had to kneel to the ground. The upper samurai addressed the lower samurai as kisama (the familiar form of you); the lower had to address the upper samurai as anata (the formal form of you). We cannot go into detail, sufficient to say that while there were divisions within the two groups there was also mobility. Between the two groups, however, the lack of mobility was almost like a natural law; it was accepted without question. Fukuzawa also pointed out that the division between the upper and lower samurai was so absolute that they could not even inter-marry. There was of course a great gap in income between them and education and customs too were different. These differences, as
noted by Fukuzawa, also applied to other social groupings. We need not elaborate on the well-known differences in the status of peasants, artisans and merchants. The society was indeed a hierarchic one.

The Meiji Restoration destroyed this system completely. Deprived of their special privileges the former samurai had to look for new means of livelihood. The place of the former samurai class was taken by the new government officials. Small wonder that satirists took delight in poking fun at the new goals of life—"government service" and "commerce." In any event, the popular words of the day were government service, commerce, meat and Western-style haircut.

In a satire called Konjaku Kurabe (Comparison between Past and Present), an unemployed person receives a letter from someone saying: "I am happy to hear that you are healthy and are receiving 'government service.'" Thinking the letter to be cynical, when next he met the sender he scolded him. The sender laughed and replied: "Please forgive me, I really didn't know the meaning of 'government service.' Lately everyone likes to use this term—I thought I too would use what everyone else was using." This is an example of the confusion resulting from the Sino-Japanese neologisms which abounded and whose meanings were often not clear. It is interesting that the writer of the letter used the expression "government service." Dr. Haneda Tōru once said to me that when he was a child he used to hear his mother sing this song:

From out of the West
in flew the civilization and enlightenment bird;
Nesting in a chair-tree,
he sang 'Salary! Salary!'

This harks back to the time when government offices were first furnished with chairs and vividly evokes the picture of the new government dignitaries sitting in their Western-style chairs. Clearly, these new salaried officials were the envy of many.

The Aguranabe, which we cited above, also contained references to the other popular term of the period, "commerce."
A man says, "In the world today commerce comes first." A rickshaw puller, meeting one of his comrades, would say, "Hello Sir! How is commerce today?" or "How has commerce been going recently?" or "Any good commerce lately?" In another place there is a passage which runs, "Have your son study Western learning as soon as possible. In the present circumstances he has no future without Western learning." Western utilitarianism which found expression in this primacy of commerce became dominant in an age in which civilization and enlightenment were tied to the worship of the West.

We must realize that the foregoing sketches were caricatures made by satirists, yet they were based on some real aspects of the Japanese social scene. The period of civilization and enlightenment contained much that was bizarre, but average people also took pride in confronting the "barbarian customs of the past" with the "civilized customs of the present." We must now examine the part played by this intellectuals, the men of the Meirokusha in the period of civilization and enlightenment.

3. Origin of the Meirokusha

The Meirokusha arose in 1873, during the very height of the civilization and enlightenment period. It was conceived by the former Chargé d’Affaires in the United States, Mori Arinori, and Nishimura Shigeki (1827-1902). Nishimura described the origins of the Meirokusha in a work called Ōji Roku (Record of the Past).

In the summer of 1873 Mr. Mori, who was formerly from Satsuma, returned from America...and met with me. He said: ‘In America scholars form learned societies where they can mutually study the arts and sciences and hold lectures. The public benefits from this. In Japan scholars are isolated and without mutual communication. The public is little benefited by their learning. I should like to organize Japanese scholars into the type of scholarly society prevalent in America. The purpose of the society shall be mutual discus-
sion and study. Of late we have witnessed the moral decline of the Japanese people and the end is not yet in sight. Here indeed is a real task for scholars! If we establish a society, its purpose should be to advance learning and to establish models of morality.' I thought this good and agreed... The society was called the Meirokusha because it was established in 1873, the sixth year of Meiji. Up to that time Japanese scholarship had been limited to the learning of Japan and China and Western learning was relatively unknown. The teaching of the Meirokusha was largely confined to new Western theories and many government officials and scholars came to listen and participate. Subsequently a magazine was published called the *Meiroku Zasshi*, which was the progenitor of Japanese magazines.

There are points in Nishimura's account which are inaccurate and these will be dealt with later—in the main, however, it is reliable. The fact remains that Mori Arinori, Nishimura, and, later, some others comprised the ten founding members who inaugurated the Meirokusha. The organization was patterned on academies abroad. At first Mori and Nishimura tried to talk Fukuzawa into accepting the post of president, but Fukuzawa refused and Mori became president. This led to some delay, as did the setting up of the rules of the society; consequently, the real activities of the Meirokusha did not begin until February 1874 when the *Meiroku Zasshi* was published. The journal was published semi-monthly from February to October; after November it appeared three times a month and its circulation was said to have exceeded 3,000, which was considerable for that time. Considering the fact that the largest newspaper in 1874, the *Tōkyo Nichi Nichi Shinbun*, had a circulation of 8,000, we can appreciate the extraordinary interest with which people welcomed the magazine.

The activities of the members of the Meirokusha centered chiefly on the magazine, and every month on the first and sixteenth the members assembled in a restaurant in the Tsukiji district in Tōkyo, exchanged information and engaged in dis-
cussion.

Probably the chief focal points for public opinion at this time were the Meirokusha's public speaking society and the Petition for the Establishment of a Popular Assembly. The latter will be discussed in more detail later. It is of interest to note that the Meirokusha did not have politics as its main purpose and yet, through its magazine and the speaking society it organized, it was increasingly drawn into the political convulsions which the Petition initiated. The background of the Petition can be traced to January 1874. The former members of the Council of State, Soejima Taneomi, Gotō Shōjirō, Itagaki Taisuke, Etō Shimpei, together with Komuro Nobuo—who had just returned from England where he had been studying European parliamentary systems, Furusawa Shigeru, Yuri Kimimasa—the author of the first draft of the Charter Oath of Five Articles, and Okamoto Kenzaburō, submitted a signed petition to the government calling for the establishment of a popularly elected assembly. At first glance it might appear that conditions in Japan had by now reached a high level of sophistication. This was not so. Even such an obvious requisite of an informed public opinion as the ability to communicate intelligently was, given Japan's recent emergence from a hierarchic feudal system, brought about after much effort. Language difficulties were enormous and the intellectuals seriously questioned the adequacy of the Japanese language as a vehicle for intelligent and rapid communication in the modern world.

Fukuzawa Yukichi was the one who attempted to quiet the misgivings of his fellow intellectuals respecting the Japanese language. For years he had been working to enrich the Japanese vocabulary so that Western-style speechmaking would be feasible. Words like speech he translated as enzetsu, a Sino-Japanese compound he constructed from elements meaning approximately "to widely explain"; debate was rendered by the word tōron, combining "dispute" and "opinion." Fukuzawa and his friends often met at this home or at theirs to practice speechmaking. They soon became self-confident and skillful
speakers.

Fukuzawa then broached the subject of speechmaking to members of the Meirokusha like Mitsukuri Shūhei, Tsuda Shindō, Nishi Amane, and Katō Hiroyuki; they did not feel it was feasible. Mori Arinori especially felt that the Japanese language was just not suitable for speeches and he was completely opposed to speechmaking.

Some time later a meeting of the Meirokusha took place in a restaurant. Fukuzawa described this session, saying:

I stood up and said, "Gentlemen, give me your attention. I have something to say. Please seat yourselves around the table." I stood near the edge of the table. This happened to be at the time of the Japanese punitive expedition to Formosa in 1874. I spoke about this for from thirty minutes to an hour and then sat down. When I questioned them as to whether they understood what I had said, they all understood very well indeed. I concluded that to say that one cannot make speeches in Japanese was either blind credulity or cowardly evasiveness. Had not my recital, which they admitted they understood, been a speech? This was my victory for the idea of speechmaking.

In 1875 the first public speaking hall was established on the campus of Keiō University.

According to the quotation from Nishimura Shigeki with which we began this description of the Meirokusha, the members from the very outset made speeches. From Fukuzawa’s account we realize that Nishimura’s reminiscences were mistaken on this point. The people of the Meirokusha were the most advanced and knowledgeable group and they were the first self-conscious intelligentsia in Japan. The majority of this group had come into contact with American and European life. By speechmaking, by means of the Meiroku Zasshi, they were able to keep the public informed. Even in their private lives and activities there was much that attracted the attention of society. The press eagerly reported on these activities.

Among these famous people the one who first celebrated
Christmas was Nakamura Masanao (1832-1891). Religious freedom was instituted in 1875 and in the December 26 issue of the Tokyo *Akebono Shinbun* it was reported that:

On the evening of the 24th, Christmas Eve, the celebration of the nativity of Jesus took place at the residence of Mr. Cochran, a teacher in Nakamura Masanao’s school. The people present, General Viscount Saigo’s wife and daughter, made a magnificent floral presentation.

And in February 1875 in the *Tokyo Nichi Nichi* there appeared under the heading “Mori Arinori’s Fancy Wedding—Fukuzawa Yukichi Witnesses Wedding Contract,” a description of the Western-style proceedings. The article read in part:

The bridegroom was in formal attire and the bride wore Western dress, her face covered by a white veil. The bride and groom walked arm-in-arm. In front as witness was the well-known Mr. Fukuzawa Yukichi...After the ceremony... there was a Western-style banquet...

The wedding contract, the ceremony itself—walking arm-in-arm with the bride—was Mori’s way of putting into practice his belief in equal rights for women.

Mori expressed his views in an article entitled *Sai shō-ron* (On Wives and Mistresses) in which he vigorously championed the rights of women. It appeared in the *Meiroku Zasshi* in five installments, running from May 1874 to February 1875, and provoked much controversy. It goes without saying that a Western-style wedding caused quite a sensation at that time. Kimura Tadashi, Mori’s biographer, wrote:

Everybody thought this wedding novel; Mori, however, desired to have society adopt this form of wedding ceremony.

Fukuzawa Yukichi’s writings, too, contain many attacks on what he considered the evil practice of keeping mistresses. This time-honored Japanese custom made equal rights for women impossible. Of course there was much opposition to Mori’s and Fukuzawa’s position among other members of the Meirokusha. Various articles expressing somewhat contrary views were published in the *Meiroku Zasshi*, including “Mistaken
Opinions Currently Held Concerning Equal Rights for Women" by Katō Hiroyuki (in No. 31), "Doubts about the New Views Keeping Mistresses" by Sakatani Shiroshi (in No. 32), and "Concerning Equal Rights for Men and Women" by Tsuda Shindō (in No. 35). We can sense something of the atmosphere of the period from the fact that such problems were considered to be real ones and were seriously argued.

Today most people remember Mori Arinori only as the Minister of Education who was assassinated in 1889, the same day the Meiji Constitution was promulgated, by a fanatic named Nishino. Mori was not just a politician; at the very least he was one of the leading intellectuals of the period. He had originally come from the province of Satsuma and had gone abroad for his education. During the late 1860's he spent some time in England and the United States, and returned to Japan in the first year of Meiji. It was at the end of this year that he and Yokoi Shōnan, as already related, "had passed an evening in pleasant conversation mainly concerning the American deliberative body." As early as 1869 Mori advocated abolishing the samurai custom of wearing swords. This brought him into conflict with the backward-looking restorationist sentiment of that time, and despite the protection of Iwakura and Okubo he was forced to resign the position he then held as Administrator of Schools. From the end of 1870 to 1873 Mori was the first Chargé d'Affaires in America; returning to Japan that same year, in July he promoted the establishment of the Meirokusha.

When Mori was Chargé d'Affaires he became well acquainted with the Christian thinker Niijima Jō (1843-1890), who was also in America. He studied Mill and Spencer and published a pamphlet in English called "Religious Freedom in Japan." Mori himself contributed much to a work he compiled and edited called Life and Resources in America. In his "Religious Freedom in Japan," he presented a rather advanced type of thought. He wrote:

It should not be forgotten that progress is achieved only by passing through ordeals... The benefits conferred by social
revolution have adequately been experienced by our people, especially in the last twenty years. This quotation merits attention since it contains one of the earliest statements in which the Meiji Restoration was equated to a social revolution. Mori felt that religious freedom was extremely important for Japan’s future. He quoted the words of the American educator, Horace Mann, to the effect that religion was primarily a personal, an individual matter. Therefore, no person, no government, had the authority to disallow beliefs which were deeply cherished by people.

Mori’s progressivism at that time rested on the belief that human betterment could be achieved by freedom of faith and by education. He expressed this in these words:

Only when an apple becomes ripe can it be said to be an apple in the true sense; only when a human being is educated can he be said to be a human being in the true sense.

Later, as Minister of Education, Mori became a “Japanist” type of nationalist; at this time, however, he was a progressive. He had surveys made pending the establishment of kindergartens and devoted himself to the education of women. It was through his influence that Tsuda Umeko and her group were sent to America, and it was Mori who won over Kuroda Kiyotaka to this idea.

Mori’s advocacy of equality for men and women during his Meirokusha period and also his vehement arguments against the evil custom of keeping mistresses followed from his support of education for women. He felt very strongly that “Those who marry their mistresses are possibly honorable, those who do not are certainly disgraceful.”

Mori began his career in the diplomatic service, and during the Meirokusha period he was serving as an assistant in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. He was a sterling diplomat and served Japan well. From the standpoint of the history of Japanese thought, however, Mori’s great achievement was the Meirokusha itself.

The people of the Meirokusha held leading positions in all
fields. They were enlightened thinkers who opened new paths and on this account were justly held in high repute. Today, although older people may have heard of Nakamura Masanao (1832-1891) or Kato Hiroyuki, Nishi Amane and Nishimura Shigeki have been forgotten, not to mention the other members of the Meirokusha. It must be stated that these men were not very original thinkers and it is quite natural that they have been forgotten. History, however, does not depend on the decisions of one or two outstanding geniuses or heroes, nor does it depend entirely on the masses. There is a middle group whose activities, feelings, and thought play an important part in determining the course of history. Individual members of this group may be completely forgotten; the historical importance of the group is abiding. This has been the case with the Meirokusha which played just such a part in influencing the spiritual form taken by the Meiji era.

Fukuzawa Yukichi, in distinction to his contemporaries in the Meirokusha, is still remembered and highly esteemed. This is somewhat unfair since there is at least as much reason for remembering Nishi Amane, Nakamura Masanao and Kato Hiroyuki. Only in one sense does Fukuzawa stand apart from the others: he was the most representative thinker of the age of civilization and enlightenment.

We can distinguish three phases in Fukuzawa's career. During the first phase he attempted to give his contemporaries a survey of the world outside Japan. His activities were indeed impressive and he published many works which were widely read in the years from 1862 to 1869. A listing of Fukuzawa's works during these last years of the Bakufu would include such titles as Tōjin Ōrai (Comings and Goings of the Foreigners), Seiyō Jijō (Conditions in the West), Seiyō Tabi Annai (A Guide to Western Travels), Kyūri Zukai (Illustrated Account of the Natural Sciences), Sekai Kunizukushi (About All Countries).

Fukuzawa's publications during his second phase, 1869-1877, included the following works: Gakumon no Susume (The Encouragement of Learning) and Bummei ron no Gairyaku
(Outline of Civilization). In these two works we can vividly see Fukuzawa the enlightened thinker. The last period lasted from 1877 until his death in 1901.

It is unquestionably true that Fukuzawa made significant contributions to the destruction of the old feudal Japan and was active in the building of the new Japan. Indeed, of all his manifold activities those related to these areas were the most striking. We must attempt to analyze the motives that urged him on.

We can get some clue to Fukuzawa’s activities during the last years of the Tokugawa period from his writings. His attitude had become one of despair over the feudalistic conservatism of his contemporaries and he came to loathe those of them who seemed madly absorbed in politics. We can sense that Fukuzawa’s last hopes reposed in learning and scholarship. He wrote of his attitude towards the Bakufu after the armies supporting the Tokugawa were defeated in the battle of Tōbafushimi, saying:

When Shōgun Keiki returned in defeat from Kyoto to Edo, conditions really became awful. The government, the people—all was confusion! Rumor was everywhere. The military, the long-sleeved doctors, the priests, all busied themselves with politics. People meeting each other on the streets talked of nothing but politics.

Some people talked of making a stand at Fujikawa, some of defending the steep Hakone mountains. When Fukuzawa once met Katō Hiroyuki and another person coming from Edo Castle, clad in ceremonial dress, he thought they had probably come from an audience with the Shōgun.

Fukuzawa asked, “How will all this end? Will it come to a fight or not? You people know about such things. I’d like to know too!”

They said, “Supposing you did know, what would you do?”
“What would I do! Don’t you know! If it came to a fight, I’d pack up and run; if not, I’d calmly stay! That’s why whether there’ll be war or peace is important to me!”
Hearing this, Katō's eyes grew round with anger. "What kind of frivolous talk is this! It's sheer foolishness!"

Fukuzawa said, "I'm not in the least frivolous, everything I have is at stake. Fighting or not fighting is your privilege. For my part, I want to be ready to flee at a moment's notice!" Katō really went into a rage upon hearing Fukuzawa speak in this way.

Fukuzawa adopted such an attitude because he abhorred the feudal Bakufu. At no time was he a supporter of the Bakufu. "I very much abhorred the clique-like oppressive exclusionism of the Bakufu and could never serve it," he said. But, on the other hand, he never supported the Imperialist-Loyalist cause either. The Loyalists with their terrible idea of expelling the barbarians were, if anything, even more abhorrent. "The Loyalists are even more extreme advocates of expelling the barbarians than the supporters of the Bakufu. I cannot support such violent people," he wrote. Fukuzawa felt that whichever side won out Japan would fall into a state of chaos. What was to be done? This inability to choose between two equally repugnant alternatives was the key to Fukuzawa's attitude. He sought refuge in learning and withdrew from practical affairs at the time of the Restoration. Fukuzawa's description of his activities during this crucial period shows us a man who has completely withdrawn from the battle raging around him:

In the month of May of the first year of Meiji (1868) a great battle began in Ueno. Theatres, story-tellers' halls, exhibitions, restaurants, teahouses, all closed down. The 'City of the Eight Hundred and Eight Streets' was in utter desolation. The state of confusion was such that I could not comprehend what was happening. Still, I kept my school going. The guns were firing away in the Ueno district and my school was in Shinsenza, almost five miles distant. Therefore, I was not afraid of stray shells. I remember that at precisely that time I was lecturing on economics from an English book.

There was also a strong undercurrent of loneliness which
pervaded his feelings. He said:

I was truly in despair, yet, being a Japanese, I could not be idle. Leaving politics to chance, I devoted myself to teaching the younger generation what little I knew of Western learning. I busied myself with writing and translation work on the chance of being able to lead the Japanese people into civilization, and I did this despite my lack of support, despite the fact that I stood alone.

After the victory of the Loyalists a temporary government was set up in Osaka. Kanda Köhei (1830-1898), Yanagawa Shunzō (1832-1870) and Fukuzawa himself were invited to join this government. Fukuzawa refused and when Kanda Köhei, who had accepted, urged him to join, he said:

Each man's actions must be in accord with his own inclinations...You, following your principles, have elected to serve this government. I, in accord with mine, refuse to do so.”

Instead, Fukuzawa gave himself over entirely to teaching and to his literary activities.

In this first phase, then, Fukuzawa was in a sense apolitical. This attitude derived from a feeling of mistrust for the aims of both sides in the struggle which marked the last years of the Bakufu. The main characteristics of his thought at this time combined a protest against feudalism with an advocacy of modernity.

Fukuzawa felt that in one important aspect the West had achieved superiority over the East: the West used reason and mathematics in everything. The rationalism of the West was thus entirely different from that rationalism which we have noted existed in Confucianism. The West also was characterized by a spirit of independence and self-respect. Fukuzawa stated it in this fashion:

If we conclude that the building of a rich country and the achievement of a strong soldiery are steps in the direction of the greatest good for the greatest number, then Eastern countries are in this respect inferior to Western countries.
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If, somehow, the condition of a country is a product of the education of her people, then the difference between East and West must be based on the difference in education. By comparing education in both areas—the one based on Confucianism, the other on enlightened civilization—we see that the West has two advantages: a learning based on mathematics and reason and a spirit of independence.

Fukuzawa welcomed modern Western civilization, which he felt had these important characteristics—mathematics, reason, independence—by way of furthering his criticism of antiquated feudal Japan. His activities were not those of a scholar, but rather of an enlightened critic and educator. While he had no organized philosophical system as such, his thought had logical coherence.

Fukuzawa's view of history was a comprehensive one. History had meaning only as the history of civilization. As a youth Fukuzawa had studied Chinese learning in his clan school. He became familiar with many of the Chinese classics. In later years Fukuzawa spoke of this early period, saying:

I was especially good at the Tso Ch'uan. The average student stops with three of four kan of the Tso Ch'uan's fifteen kan. I read through the entirety of it, and I reread it about eleven times! The places I found interesting I committed to memory.

As an adult Fukuzawa became a zealous student of Western learning; he also traveled and came in contact with the real life of the West. The difference between East and West made a deep impression upon him. More than anything else, Fukuzawa felt the overwhelming superiority of the West. He attempted to explain this gulf between Eastern and Western civilization historically. It was his feeling that were he just to succeed in clarifying this one point Japan would be in a better position to attain the high level reached by the West.

Fukuzawa's historical outlook was based on the view of the history of civilization of Guizot and Buckle. In this view history advanced in three stages: from savagery to barbarism
to civilization. From savagery or nomadic hunting to early agriculture was one stage; barbarism was mainly an agricultural feudal stage; civilization was the progressive, scientific stage of modern society. In this view Africa was savage; Turkey, China and Japan were barbarous; America and Western Europe were civilized. The pattern of progress for Japan should be to leave barbarism and attain the stage of civilization. It went without saying that Japan should "make Western civilization its objective.” If Japan was to progress then it had to use the West as its model, since civilization in the West was almost by definition one of unlimited progress.

In attempting to chart Japan’s course to Western civilization Fukuzawa defined civilization, saying:

Civilization comforts man physically and elevates him spiritually…Civilization advances the well-being and dignity of man, since man acquires these benefits through knowledge and virtue. Civilization can be defined as that which advances man’s knowledge and virtue.

Fukuzawa felt that a balance between physical comfort and spirituality was desirable since the happiness derived from comfort alone was like that of an ant. Contrariwise, to seek only lofty spirituality was to quest for a life like Yen Hui’s, a life in which everybody would live in wretched alleys and drink only water. Therefore, “if both spirit and body are not benefited we cannot speak of civilization.” The attainment of this balance between comfort and spirituality was possible through the progress of man’s knowledge and virtue.

When Fukuzawa spoke of knowledge and virtue he explained that he meant intellect and morals. In both he distinguished between the public and the private spheres. Private morals were the virtues of the individual heart: faithfulness, honesty, modesty, politeness. Public morals were concerned with the relations between men in society: honor, fair play, the golden mean, courage. Private intellect meant the knowledge of physics, chemistry, biology, and other natural sciences. Public intellect was knowledge beneficial to society: economics, politics.
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Setting up a scale of importance, he put public intellect above all. He felt that morals had remained almost unchanged throughout history, but intellect had shown marked growth and progress. If there had been any broad social benefits derived from morals this was so because morals too had benefited from the progress of intellect. As Fukuzawa expressed it:

Morals have made no progress from generation to generation. From the beginning of the world to the present their nature has not changed. This is not so with intellect. For every one thing the ancients knew, modern men know a hundred; what the ancients stood in awe of, we belittle; what they thought wonderful, we laugh at. The subjects of intellect increase day by day, its discoveries are manifold...Progress in the future is beyond all imagining.

Fukuzawa, as we said, attached more importance to intellect than morals in the progress of civilization, but it was what he called public intellect that he esteemed before all else. The essence of civilization, he felt, was to be found in man's domination of nature, in the liberation of man from nature, in the utilization of nature for man's happiness, in the freeing of man in society from blind authority and oppression. Concerning this, he said:

It we can say that nature has been conquered by the human intellect, her provinces penetrated, the very secrets of creation discovered, and that nature has been harnessed, then there is now nothing in the world which can withstand man's courage and intellect. Man can now make nature serve him...already we see the forces of nature shackled...What reason have we to fear making the power of intellect serve us! ...It no longer suffices to put our trust in the words of sages. ...It no longer suffices to envy the rule of Yao and Shun... What the ancients achieved is of their time, what we achieve is of our time. Why study the past to function in the present! If we put forth all our energies there will be nothing in the world that can block the freedom of our spirit. Once we acquire freedom of spirit, can our bodies be restrained!
The sentiment of this passage expresses Fukuzawa's entire philosophy and convictions and also bespeaks his pragmatic intellectualism. He presented mathematics and reason as those things in which the East was most deficient. Fukuzawa, clearly, did not advocate learning for the sake of learning, but learning for the sake of human beings. Learning was for administering the state and fostering the well-being of the people. In this sense the private intellect was subordinate to the public intellect.

Fukuzawa, we have said, defined civilization as the progress of intellect and morals. In describing how intellect was to be advanced, Fukuzawa said, "In the world of faith there is much falseness; in the world of doubt, much truth!" In the civilized world, the West, doubt led to the discovery of truth and made progress possible. Indeed, "If we look for the origin of Western civilization, it comes down to one thing: doubt!"

In barbarian countries, he said, human beings doubt one another but do not question the underlying principles of matter. A good example was feudal Japan, where "human relations were characterized by extreme suspicion and jealousy, but no one doubted the underlying principles of matter or, indeed, even questioned what was unknown."

Fukuzawa also stressed the importance of experiment, for it was "as a result of hundreds and thousands of experiments that progress has taken place." Politics was not the root of civilization, but just a part of it. He considered that civilization and politics together progressed as a consequence of many experiments. In short, the progress of intellect was a result of doubt and experiment.

Fukuzawa felt that the good in human society was the result of intellect, the evil, of ignorance. He said:

There is a Western saying that the severity of government is due to people's ignorance. Even without severe government, however, the ignorance of people courts disaster. Also, "there is nothing more detestable and wretched than an ignorant and illiterate people." According to Fukuzawa, even courage was the result of intellect.
Underlying Fukuzawa's interpretation of the history of civilization was a spiritual or idealistic view of history. This was rather surprising since superficially Fukuzawa's concept of learning seemed to be based on pragmatism.

Fukuzawa reviled the feudal system as a system which gave preference to the well-born. At the very beginning of his Gakumon no Susume he said, "Heaven sets no man above his fellows, nor does it set any man below them." He advocated the equality of all people. Fukuzawa also believed that the West excelled because it possessed a spirit of independence and self-reliance as well as reason and mathematics. This spirit of independence he felt would be of tremendous importance for Japan. Feudalism was destroyed by the growth of a consciousness of the dignity of man, by putting into practice the ideas of independence and self-respect. Here too, Fukuzawa's concept of the role of intellect was apparent. He recognized that human beings were by nature free and equal although, practically speaking, there were differences between high and low, rich and poor. Nevertheless, it was intellect that elevated some and it was ignorance that reduced and lowered others. Status differences were based in the final analysis on the differences between intelligence and ignorance. Since Fukuzawa concluded that the real differences which existed among human beings were ascribable to the existence or absence of knowledge, he advocated the encouragement of learning. He did not feel however that this was everything; he also placed emphasis on character and temperament.

What Fukuzawa meant by kifū was not the spirit of the individual, it was what we today would probably call the spirit of the age, the temper of the times, or even national spirit. Fukuzawa often made reference to the spirit of civilization, or national sentiment. He wrote:

When we speak of national sentiment we mean, in connection with time, the temper of the times, with people, popular sentiment, in reference to a country, national customs. The spirit of civilization is all of these... Therefore, we can say
the spirit of civilization is national sentiment, morals, and customs.
Fukuzawa said that the spirit of civilization originated in something akin to a world spirit, or to Mencius' "great moving force."
He wrote:

...Certainly one should be able to disclose something which is abstract. Yet, this thing is extremely difficult to formulate. When it is nurtured and it develops it can encompass everything in the world. When it is suppressed it withers to the point where not even a vestige of it remains. This world spirit advances and retreats, has successes and failures, it is in constant motion...."

This spirit of civilization, or world spirit, was entirely different from the externals of civilization. Above all, the difference between the civilizations of Asia and Europe lay in the differences between the externals of civilization and the spirit of civilization. Fukuzawa went one step further: the substance of this spirit which could not be seen or heard, he said, resided in the force of the independence of the people. The following quotation shows this:

Schools, industry, the army, the navy—these all are only part of the concrete form a civilization takes. Limited to this, it is not difficult to build a civilization. Though these may be acquired with money, there still remains one intangible in a civilization. This cannot be seen or heard, bought or sold, borrowed or lent. Universally, it is located in the people and its function is a powerful one. If it is absent, everything, from schools on downwards, will be of no real use. Truly the spirit of civilization is gigantic and powerful. What is this spirit of civilization? I say it is nothing other than the force of the independence of a people.

Fukuzawa, in answer to the question as to how to foster the independence of a people, said: "What makes an individual independent makes a country independent."

Fukuzawa deplored the fact that "Japan is only a government and not yet a nation!" He also said, "In Japan there is
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a government, there is no nation.” Put bluntly, “We can say that from ancient times to the present Japan has not constituted a nation.”

To Fukuzawa, the relationship between the government and the people was a contractual one:

The peasants cultivate rice and nourish the people, the merchants serve society by buying and selling goods. This is the function of the peasants and merchants. The government, by establishing laws, suppresses evildoers and protects the good. This is the function of the government. Since the government produces neither food nor money, yearly taxes are paid by the peasants and merchants to supply the treasury. This constitutes the contract between the government and the people.

Consequently, the government does not just bestow favors on the people, it also receives favors from the people. This is an example of reciprocity and equality. There is no basis whatsoever for specially designating the government as lordly and the people as base.

Fukuzawa was rather sketchy in his Outline of Civilization, however, his ninth chapter on “The Origins of Japanese Civilization” is very tightly reasoned. He argues therein:

In the society of the warriors we hear of meetings, separations, assemblings, dispersals, advances, retreats, successes, failures; in the world of the common people we do not hear of any kind of movement—they only engaged in agriculture and served the warrior society. For this reason, seen through the eyes of the people there was no distinction between the Imperial House and the military. The victories, defeats—the destiny of the warrior society—did not, as far as the people were concerned, differ from climatic or weather changes; they could only witness these developments mutely.

...Generally, it can be said there is no history of Japan but only a history of Japanese government!”

The upheavals that past historians had spoken of were merely changes in government. These upheavals did not advance
civilization in Japan.

Fukuzawa said that a nation has a two-fold character. Its people are at the same time both masters and servants.

When one hundred people set up a company and establish the rules of this company, these hundred people are the masters of the company—but, in the sense that no one can violate the established rules, they are also the servants of the company. Similarly, a nation is like a company, the people are like the members of the company: every individual has the double role of master and servant.

To Fukuzawa, this was the original relationship between the people and the government. Fukuzawa drew from this his concept of the rights and duties of the people. But, as we saw above, the Japanese people in the past had only functioned as servants; they had lost their function as masters.

For this reason he said, "In Japan there is a government but not a nation." A true nation had to have this two-fold character of master and servant. Taking Fukuzawa's theory of the spirit of a nation and his definition of the two-fold function of a nation, it is obvious that he was not simply an advocate of pure individualism but believed in a type of nationalism. Fukuzawa also recognized that with the development of civilization the world would become one, but in the present stage he advocated the type of nationalism discussed above.

At this point it would be well to summarize Fukuzawa's theories. His theory of progress was based on his view of history. History was really the history of civilization. Civilization developed in stages: savagery—barbarism—civilization. Japan was moving from barbarism to civilization. Education was a key factor in this progress. Education had to be based on science, which in Fukuzawa's view developed from curiosity about the principles of matter, doubt, the examination of facts, and experimentation.

When Fukuzawa spoke of temperament or spirit he was referring to the spirit or temperament of nations. A nation had rights and duties. This Fukuzawa derived from his "compact
theory” of the relations between the nation and the government. To be a nation meant to be both ruler and ruled simultaneously. The Japanese were not a nation since, historically, they had only been subjects. Japanese history was the history of Japanese governments. The people played almost no part in Japanese civilization. Progress for Japan would depend on the people becoming a nation by assuming the dual role of ruler and subject.

Fukuzawa wrote that “the present world can be designated as one of business and war.” Therefore, he felt that the greatest problem in the present was foreign relations. To think of abolishing government in such a world is “only the opinion of those comfortably situated.” Fukuzawa said:

First the Japanese state and the Japanese nation ought to be firmly established, then we will be able to speak of civilization in Japan. Without a Japanese state and a Japanese nation, we cannot speak of Japanese civilization.

Further:

The independence of our country is our objective; our present civilization is a means of attaining this objective. I used the word ‘present’ in a special sense—the intellectuals should not overlook this. This admonition makes his intent clear. He felt keenly the special obligation of intellectuals in furthering progress. We must examine Fukuzawa’s concept of the duties and obligations of the intellectuals in the “present.”

Fukuzawa was an advocate of people’s rights but he was not a humanist. He advocated self-respect and independence, liberty and equality, but his concept of rights and duties was based on rationalism, not on fraternal humanism. Fukuzawa was not actuated by love for his fellow man. He was rather too much the intellectual for this.

Fukuzawa was an advocate of progress and, before all else, an opponent of feudalism. However, he was not a socialist and he hated revolution. His emphasis on independence could not be harmonized with socialism, which he felt attributed the differences between high and low to the social and economic
system. His concept was that such inequality was invited by
the individual himself and was a consequence of ignorance.
Fukuzawa esteemed economics: “the independence of the in-
dividual begins with the independence of his household eco-
nomy.” Thus he said:

If you pursue agriculture—become a great farmer, com-
merce—become a great merchant. Scholars should not be
satisfied with petty comforts...To strive for gain is to strive
for something reasonable.

This was basic to this thought. He was not yet aware of
the evils produced by the unrestrained competition in modern
society. He did not endorse revolution. He felt that true
progress in civilization depended on the spiritual development
of the people alone.

A sudden blind upheaval can only replace violence by vi-
ience and stupidity by stupidity...there is nothing in the
world as inhuman as civil disorder...Such evils as fathers
and sons killing each other, brothers hating each other, arson,
and slaughter must not happen!

He fiercely rejected as blind and stupid the successive peasant
uprisings then taking place in Japan.

There is nothing in the world more miserable and hateful
than the blind stupidity of the people. From extreme lack
of intellect they have become utterly without shame. Because
of ignorance, they plunge themselves into poverty and famine,
and without thinking this to be their own fault, they blindly
hate their richer neighbors, join political factions, and even
go to the extreme of violent uprising. Is this not truly
shameless!

The majority of the uprisings which occurred at the time
were more often reactionary than progressive. We can look
at a typical riot in July 1873 (Meiji 6) in Tottori which involved
almost a thousand people. The rioters itemized their demands
and called for:

1. The lowering of rice prices.
2. The banning of all traffic with foreigners.
3. Abolition of the military conscription law.
4. Abolition of primary schools.
5. Opposition to the solar, or Western, calendar.
6. Opposition to the law ordering Western-style haircuts.

That same July a riot involving ten thousand people took place in Sanuki and there was rioting in Fukuoka; in August there was also a riot in Shimane; all of these were similar in nature. It is true that there were good economic reasons for these riots, yet this alone does not make them progressive.

Many of the peasant uprisings of that time occurred because of the Conscription Law. The government at the time of the promulgation of this law had attempted to stress the duty of the subject to serve in the armed forces and had used the term *ketsuzei*, literally *blood tax*, to dramatize this. The peasants assumed, mistakenly, that the government was going to extract blood from them!

In the case of the Fukuoka riot, as well as some of the others, the rioters demanded the reinstitution of the former district governors and the reappointment of the former samurai and rejected the new government officials. These movements differed from the peasant riots of 1884 and 1885. Fukuzawa, not unreasonably, said about this early rioting:

The riots occur because the new laws have been misinterpreted. These riots use force to destroy rich people's homes. The rioters get drunk on sake and steal money. This sort of action cannot be considered human behavior.

Fukuzawa essentially believed in gradual progress which would follow with the enlightenment brought by knowledge.

With respect to international relations, Fukuzawa favored the policy of "Rich Country, Strong Soldiery." This was a statist position, yet in domestic politics he was a believer in democracy and was opposed to absolutism and authoritarianism. Fukusawa also believed in nationalism. But he felt that only the spirit of an independent and free people could build a nation. He said, "As there is over an ignorant lawless nation a harsh government, so is there over an educated law-abiding nation a
good government.” Therefore, for good government to be possible a good nation must first be formed. Furthermore, for the formation of a good nation Fukuzawa relied on the intellectuals of the middle class.

Fukuzawa’s position was:

The civilization of a country does not arise from the government above nor is it produced by the humble people below. Civilization always arises from the middle strata. When these are joined to government then civilization can succeed. Reflecting on the various histories of the Western countries we realize that commerce and industry were not established by governments; they originated in the thought of the intellectuals of the middle class.

Now we can proceed to Fukuzawa’s view of the function of the intellectuals. To Fukuzawa all living things maintain life by harmonizing outside stimuli with inside reactions. This was also the case with the organism called the State, with its outside stimuli from the people and its inside response from the government. He wrote “The State is like a living force, the people are the stimulus from the outside.” Consequently, “not until the people and the government are harmonized and stand together is success possible.” He deplored the condition of Japan at that time since the people were dependent solely on the government, everything was done by official permission.

The schools are officially licensed, sermons or moral preachings are officially licensed, cattle raising, sericulture, and indeed eight out of every ten enterprises are connected with the government...The flattery of the official, the awe and idolization of the official is ugly and unbearable.

Fukuzawa felt that in such circumstances “the vigor of the people and the spirit of civilization tend to retrogress.” This always led to reverencing the officials, to despising the people, to despotic government. “The government remains a despotic one, the people remain dispirited, powerless and ignorant.” The solution to this problem rested with the intellectuals. That is to say, in Japan the intellectuals were in the
position of a middle class. Therefore, rather than serve with
the government they should remain on the outside and, while
engaging in criticism of government despotism and restraining
it, they should enlighten the people. The intellectuals can thus
exercise the people’s function as a stimulus or goad to the
government. In Fukuzawa’s words, “The intellectuals, to destroy
these evil practices, should be non-governmental.” And because
“there are many things in human affairs which ought not be
the concern of government” Japan’s true independence and
progress cannot be attained by the government or by dependence
on the government.

Fukuzawa spoke of Keiō University, which he founded, as
“a concrete example of non-governmentalism.” The existence
of Keiō he felt was a reproof leveled at the scholars of the time
who were eagerly accepting government employ. Since there
were many among the Meirokusha people who held important
governmental positions, a lively controversy was provoked by
this kind of criticism.
CHAPTER II.

THE PEOPLE OF THE MEIROKUSHA

1. The Theory of the Obligation of the Intellectual

Max Weber has said scholarship should be free of value judgments. In his famous lecture on "Learning as a Vocation" he stated that scholarship meant only the quest for clarity, that one should have the strength to face facts as they are. The quest for learning ought not to necessitate a decision as to "which god among many rival gods we should serve," nor, indeed, was such a decision feasible. To speak of deciding among rival gods was the same as to say that we were selecting a value system to make supreme and to which to give our approbation.

I have no intention of arguing the correctness or incorrectness of this, nor will I go into the question as to whether choosing among rivals means to commit oneself to a decision even if only in Karl Jasper's sense of an "existential decision."

The fact remains that the logical nature of European speculative thought, especially in its modern thoroughgoing form has made it possible for it to attain to this freedom from value. We must now attempt to trace the rise of this concept of learning which we can call learning for the sake of learning, or truth for the sake of truth, in Japan.

Nagayo Sensai (1838-1902) followed Fukuzawa as the head student in Ogata Kōan's private school for Western learning in Osaka. Upon Ogata's recommendation, Nagayo became a student of Pompe van Meerderoat, the resident Dutch physician in Nagasaki. Nagayo, as was the case with most of those who took up Western studies at that time, expected to be initiated into the mysteries of practical medicine at once. Dr. van Meerderoat taught, however, that one could study medicine only after first mastering mathematics, physics, chemistry, and
physiology. Medicine, he said, required a broad educational background. Medicine itself, he said, made no distinctions in rank or wealth. Sensai was greatly impressed by this. Some time later during a debate between Koch and Pettenhofer, Pettenhofer, to test his own contention, wanted to drink a solution containing cholera bacteria. When Sensai read about this in a foreign newspaper he was deeply touched. His son, Matao, said that Sensai had then lectured him and the other children about the importance of defending one's beliefs and that where a scientific truth was at stake one must even risk death to defend it. Matao had intended to matriculate in law but was persuaded by his father to study medicine instead. Sensai said:

The vocation of the politician is inferior to that of the scientist. The scientist deals with the unlimited phenomena of life. Be a scientist! And since medicine is the science which deals with the most complex phenomena of all—the human body, be a doctor!

The foregoing is symbolic of the change which was taking place among the intellectuals. Learning in Japan originally meant "moral training, the regulation of one's family, the administration of the state, and the tranquillization of the realm." The natural sciences were thought of as techniques rather than as genuine learning. Traditional learning was from the very outset of a different character than that learning for the sake of learning we mentioned above.

There is some question as to whether the awareness of pure learning which is possessed by the cultural or spiritual sciences appeared during the Meiji period. It is certain, however, that in the case of the natural sciences—as illustrated in the above story—signs of this type of learning could be seen in the Meiji period. In the Meirokusha we see no evidence of the pure learning type of cultural science concept. The people of the Meirokusha were concerned with the mission of the intellectual. They were concerned with the attitude the intellectual should assume in order to fulfill his obligation, his function. And it was the intellectual's attitude especially to-
wards the government which drew their attention. The debate over these issues which appeared in the *Meiroku Zasshi* presented the various patterns of thinking of the Japanese intellectuals of that time. Their later thought was also prefigured in these articles and therefore they merit attention.

We can summarize the articles by stating that over the question of the obligation of the intellectual vis-à-vis the state and society there were three positions:

1. The obligation of the intellectual can be best fulfilled by remaining outside the government, criticizing politics, and enlightening the people. In this way the intellectual can render service to the state and society.

2. The obligation of the intellectual can best be fulfilled by being inside the government, giving proper guidance to politics, and leading the people. In this way the intellectual can render service to the state and to society.

3. The obligation of the intellectual can best be fulfilled, irrespective of whether he is inside or outside the government, by seeking his own welfare. The obligation of the intellectual is to fulfill his obligation to himself.

The first and second positions were taken by Fukuzawa Yukichi and Katō Hiroyuki respectively. The third position was adopted by Mori Arinori, Tsuda Shindō, and Nishi Amane.

2. Katō Hiroyuki

In 1876 Fukuzawa wrote:

Ever since the opening of Japan she has been forced not only to establish a state, but to build a government. The abolition of the old government made this necessary. The abolition of the old clans, the setting up of prefectures, legal reforms, the establishment of schools, the publication of newspapers, the abolition of the custom of wearing swords, the bobbing of hair, all bear witness to the fact that Japan has become a new country. The transformation in man and in all these other things is attributed by many to the single event of the restoration of Imperial Rule. Human affairs,
the goals of the human spirit are considered to be determined by the government. In my opinion, the government itself is a part of human affairs... and the entire transformation I have described... can be considered as the transformation in the spirit of the people of Japan. For this reason I say the government is not the origin of the transformation in human affairs, but the result of the transformation in the human spirit.

This was a positive assertion by Fukuzawa to the effect that real progress in history was not simply a consequence of political transformations. The basis of this progress must be sought in the transformation of the human spirit. The progress of the people, indeed, could be considered as true historical progress, as the progress of civilization. Fukuzawa wrote this when the intellectuals who advocated progress supported the thesis of popular rights, and conditions in Japan were agitated by the fervent debate on the popular assembly.

Fukuzawa directed his criticism against the "present day intellectuals who devote all their energies to governmental concerns and who spend no time in their own fields." He claimed that there was much in society besides politics which afforded practical scope for implementing the obligation of the intellectual. The intellectual ought to place his trust in society. In presenting his thesis on the obligation of the intellectual, Fukuzawa distinguished between the government and the people. He compared the government to an endogenous organism—an organism growing from within; the people were the outside, or exogenous, stimulus. The intellectual was the bridge between the two.

Katō Hiroyuki agreed with Fukuzawa's views, which compared the government to a vital force supporting or maintaining itself from within and the people to an outside stimulus. He felt, however, that Fukuzawa valued the external stimulus more than the endogenous organism. Katō felt this endogenous organism was more important to Japan than the external stimulus of the people. Consequently outstanding intellectuals should be encouraged to enter the government and thus give
guidance and enlightenment to the people. This was the true obligation of the intellectual in the present.

Fukuzawa's position that the obligation of the intellectual was to remain non-governmental, Katō felt, was a distorted point of view. There are two extreme positions in thinking about politics. One is that of liberalism, which has contributed much to Europe's modern period but tends to run to extremes and "desires to reduce state power and increase the power of the people as much as possible." This position, Katō said, led to the enervating of state power.

The other way of thinking about politics, which is in direct opposition to the above, is that of the advocates of communism. This position "strives to enhance the power of the state and reduce the power of the people. Agriculture, industry, commerce—all these should be administered by the state itself." It goes without saying that this way should not be adopted. Fukuzawa's slighting the state and placing emphasis on the function of the people as a stimulus meant to court the danger of falling into the evil ways of liberalism.

Katō Hiroyuki was born in 1836 and came to Edo from Tajima. His family had for generations been instructors in the Kōshu style of military arts. When he was eighteen he came to Edo and studied under Sakuma Shōzan. At nineteen he began to study Dutch learning under a disciple of Tsuboi Shindō, called Ōki Chueki who later took the name Tsuboi Hōshū. In 1860, when he was twenty-five, Katō was appointed as an instructor at the Bansho shirabe-sho (Office for the Investigation of Western Books) and, by himself, began to study the German language because "I had heard that Germany was the country of all the European countries whose arts and sciences were most flourishing." Katō began by studying from Dutch-German conversation books. And, as he himself said, "This was the beginning of the study of German in Japan."

When he was twenty-six he secretly wrote a book called Tonarigusa (Neighboring Vegetation) which purported to be a criticism of Chinese foreign policy—but was a thinly-veiled
criticism of the Bakufu. Many years later he said:

I had done some reading in Christian books but was not particularly moved by them...because I had no feelings for Christianity I ceased to occupy myself with it. Thereafter, the books to which I devoted myself were those concerned with philosophy, morality, politics, and law; these subjects held deep interest for me. What created this interest was, in the first place, the idea that human beings are equal and from birth are endowed with rights—that is to say, the theory of natural rights. Today, of course, these ideas are old; still, I was tremendously impressed that Westerners had this type of thought. And since this type of thought had not existed in China or Japan, I felt this to be wonderful and considered these ideas to be veritable truth. In some such way I was able to do something fresh intellectually, and after this I wrote all kinds of books. The first of these, however, was Tonari-gusa.

In Tonari-gusa Katō wrote that the decline of the Ch'ing Dynasty in present day China and the insults suffered at the hands of the West were not solely the consequences of deficiencies in military preparations. The decline was rooted in the deficiencies of the Chinese polity, in the loss of unity among the people.

It is an art to govern with benevolence and to be able to unify the people. Though this art does not exist among the Chinese, still it can be said to be an indispensable necessity for administering the empire.

Katō felt that proper government was possible in a constitutional monarchy. He wrote about this in some detail.

Katō distinguished four types of political structures:
1. Royal despotism—the government of an absolute monarch.
2. Constitutionalism—a division of powers and obligations between the rulers and the ruled.
3. Aristocratic absolutism.
4. Republicanism—equal power for all the people.
He rejected royal despotism as well as aristocratic absolutism and felt that republicanism was too idealistic and would not be appropriate for modern “China.”

To my way of thinking, to reform the Ch’ing Dynasty it would be well to adopt some system of constitutionalism. Of course, the system of equal powers for all the people is a system which tends to elevate the man of virtue and ability and subordinate the ignorant to his rule and is probably the fairest. Since, however, it is not possible to establish a system like this at present, it is urgent for the Ch’ing Dynasty speedily to reform by adopting the system of the division of powers and obligations between high and low, and in this way replacing evil customs from the past with good government.

Katō, of course, was in reality pointing at Japan and only using China as a symbol. The book could not be published in Japan at that time and only circulated in manuscript copy. Nevertheless, this was the first work in Japan to present the concept of a constitutional system. It should also be noted that Katō based his constitutional system on the Bakufu.

Shortly before the Restoration, when Katō was about thirty, he published books dealing with conditions in the West and advocating the necessity of foreign trade.

Katō persisted in his interest in constitutional thought and in 1868 he published his Rikken Seitai-ryaku (Outline of Constitutional Systems), and in 1870 Shinsei Tai-i (The Outline of Practical Politics). The former analyzed constitutional systems; the latter described how democratic politics functioned. In the Shinsei Tai-i he wrote:

There are basically two methods in administering a country: through a judicial administrative system, and through purely administrative techniques. By a judicial administrative system we mean the basic constitutional system upon which the maintenance of order within a country rests. An administrative technique is the technique whereby at any given time order is maintained.

In the Rikken Seitai-ryaku Katō discussed what he called
judicial administrative systems and in the *Shinsei Tai-i* he went into detail on various administrative techniques. Katō felt that it was constitutional politics which made possible the attainment of the "great objective of security and order for the people." Therefore, he said, "I believe that constitutional politics is an administrative technique, and this technique we can call true or practical administration." The basis for this true administration he derived from "the nature of man and from the natural principle which governed the rise of the state." He taught the existence of human rights and their division into three groups, and he also argued for free trade because in this way the "development of civilization and culture would be promoted." This clearly was an advocacy of the natural rights doctrine.

In 1875 Katō published his *Kokutai Shinron* (New Thesis on the National Polity). Here Katō went even further in his advocacy of natural rights. He stated:

It has been taught that the true 'Way of the Subject' is to submit, without questioning whether it is good or evil, true or false, to the Imperial Will and to follow its directives ...This type of behavior has been characteristic of our national polity. It has been said that for this reason Japan's national polity is superior to that of any other country. This viewpoint is a base and a vulgar one!...Our national polity is characterized by the mean and vulgar tradition of servility, the land held to be the private property of the Emperor alone. The Emperor and the people are not different in kind: The Emperor is a man, the people too are men. Within the same species there are only divisions between high and low; there is no such separation as between men and beasts.

Katō did not, however, advocate a republican system of government. He distinguished between the national polity and the political or administrative system. The distinction he made was that "national polity is the main objective, the political system is the method of attaining this." To Katō the national polity was the general theoretical concept upon which the state rested; political systems differ from country to country in accord
with differing historical configurations. Therefore, the present function of a political system in Japan would be just one other method of attaining the objective of the age-old national polity.

The political system denoted by the word republic, Katō said, was splendid in form, but the system of constitutional monarchy was superior in actuality. Therefore, it was the latter which we should choose.

In the *Kokutai Shinron* Katō argued against the position of a section of the National Scholars of the time, whose view was that “people born in Japan exist only to serve the Imperial Will.” Katō said that in this way the people lose their own will and ultimately become “slaves of the Imperial Will,” and also, “The people of Japan will become as cattle and horses.”

It should be noted that the *Kokutai Shinron* appeared at the very same time as Fukuzawa’s thesis on the obligation of the intellectual. Katō, as we said, criticized Fukuzawa’s views. His position was based on the theory of natural rights. Consequently, it was Fukuzawa’s emphasis which he opposed. “The joining of the endogenous organism, the state, and the outside stimulus, the people, is essential at the present time. But the endogenous organism should be regarded as far more important.” Katō did not oppose Fukuzawa because he was in agreement with governmental arbitrariness. On the contrary, he was opposed to the fogyish style of thinking of the National Scholars, which was influential in the government. His purpose was to exclude this thought, but at the same time he felt that in Japan at that time it was valid for the government to encourage civilization and enlightenment.

We should also note that at the time he had already translated Bluntschli’s *Allgemeines Staats Recht* and was paraphrasing Biedermann when he said:

It is extremely difficult to know the appropriate moment to set up a determinate political system. The consequence of precipitateness is to cause great damage and suffering. The time must not be misjudged!

Katō was thus an advocate of gradualism. In the distinction
he made between national polity and political systems, we can recognize, alongside his simple natural rights theory, aspects of historical positivism. This was the basis of his theory of the prematureness of establishing a popularly elected representative assembly.

A strong expression like "The Emperor is a man, and the people too are men," which Katō had directed at the National Scholars, earned him their hatred. It came to the point where a secret order was given by the authorities to suppress the edition of the *Kokutai Shinron* in which this phrase had appeared. Later, when Katō had become president of Tokyo University and was advocating the theory of evolution, he himself attempted to suppress the book. We shall take this up later. Here we can say that the deep reasons which led Katō away from his early natural rights position to an evolutionary position were latent even at this time (c. 1875).

3. Mori, Tsuda, and Nishi on the Obligation of the Intellectual

We saw above that Mori, Tsuda and Nishi believed that the obligation of the intellectual had nothing to do with whether he was inside or outside the government. They held that it was his duty primarily to seek his own welfare and that thereby he would fulfill his obligation to himself.

Mori said that it was incorrect to compare the external-internal relationship between the government and the people to that between a living organism and an external stimulus. To Mori the government and the people, from the outset, formed a whole. "The officials too are 'the people,' likewise, the peers, the commoners, all these are 'the people.'" "The government as the government of all the people is established for the people and by the people. There was thus no reason to say, as Fukuzawa did, that the government and the people exist side by side. Fukuzawa was correct in saying that "in the advancement of civilization one should not just depend on the government." Yet, what would be the result if "all the intellectuals
leave the government service, and it is entrusted only to non-intellectuals!” This was the basis of Mori’s position: the government and the people were one. The conflicts that arose between them were due to exceptional circumstances based on the arbitrariness of government administrators.

Tsuda Shindō, too, took as his point of departure the inadequacy of Fukuzawa’s endogenous organism-outside-stimulus metaphor. He said that the comparison between the human body and the State was adequate. However, it was not accurate to say that the State was the organism and the people the outside stimulus. The outside stimulus which acted on the state was represented by foreign countries, the ‘stimulus’ to the state was foreign relations. The relationship between the government and the people was rather that between the spirit and the body! To be sure, in the body too there are certain rules which the spirit cannot disregard in its demand for compliance with its dictates. If nevertheless, this is done, the result will be the decline of the spirit and the death of the body. Nor is this all; Fukuzawa was correct in saying that the Japanese people were deficient in the spirit of self-reliance and independence. There is a popular saying which comes to us from ancient times: “One cannot reason with a crying child or with the authorities.” Therefore, “an unreasonable government order should be opposed,” and “one should exert oneself in the advocacy of the people’s liberty and self-reliance.” This, Tsuda felt, could also be done within the government. To say as Fukuzawa did that “all the intellectuals must leave official life, and must be able to be effective in private life,” was indeed extreme.

Tsuda was born in 1829 in Okayama, the eldest son of a Samurai of the Tsuyama territorial clan. In 1847 he came to Edo and became a student of Dutch learning under Itō Genboku. He also studied under Mitsukuri Gempo, also from Tsuyama, and under Sakuma Shōzan. In 1857 he became an Instruction Assistant at the Bakufu’s Bansho shirabe-sho (Bureau for the Investigation of Western Books). Nishi Amane, who was a student of Tezuka Ritsuzō, was also an Instruction Assistant
at the Bansho shirabe-sho. In 1862 Nishi and Tsuda went to Holland and studied at the University of Leyden. The two became close friends. Tsuda, in recalling his friendship with Nishi, wrote:

"I first became acquainted with the late Baron Nishi Amane when we were Instruction Assistants at the Bansho shirabe-sho. Since that time we were fast friends. We shared the same office, and we both lived in the Shitaya district. Later we went to Holland together and attended the University in Leyden. There we were taught the essentials of European political science by Professor Vissering. In our leisure time we argued with each other about various theories. Nishi delighted in Kantianism whereas I loved Comte's positivism. We were as different as round holes and square pegs, and we could not avoid arguing. Today I am still an advocate of the materialist position—the origins of this go back to that time."

In 1861, one year before he went Holland, Tsuda wrote a treatise in which he attempted to deal with the "principles of nature." In the preface to his treatise he wrote:

"There is no outside to the vastness of the void of the Universe, there is no inside to its minuteness. The Universe is eternal; without a beginning or an end. It is not bounded by time and space. Only the spirit the West calls Ether fills this void."

This essay by Tsuda contained the rudiments of his later materialism. At a much later period he wrote an essay called "Yuibutsu-ron" (Treatise on materialism) in which he formulated his materialistic views. This treatise also contained critical notes by Nishi Amane. What is of especial interest is Nishi's epilogue in which he wrote:

Many years have already been devoted to the transmission of Western learning. The sciences like physics, chemistry, geography, and mechanics, have at various times been objects of enquiry. Nothing has as yet been done with regard to philosophy. It is therefore felt that while the work on Western sciences is adequate, the intellectual-spiritual field has been
neglected. The first person to make enquiries into this field is my friend Tsuda Shindō. The present essay is a good example of this. This essay is superior to many of those by Western philosophers. I did not anticipate that after he returned from the West he would be able to produce something of such penetrating power, that he would be able to deal with such abstruse matters.

We may note here that this essay marked the first appearance in Japanese of the word philosophy. Also, it was the first time that a Western-style philosophical treatise was written in Japan.

In some lectures he gave in 1870 Nishi used the word tetsugaku as a Japanese equivalent for philosophy. This was a shortened form of kitetsugaku which Tsuda had used earlier in his essay. Nishi explained:

The word philosophy is similar in meaning to what Chou Mao-shu meant when he said ‘The saint quests Heaven, the wise man quests saintliness, the superior man quests wisdom.’

Therefore, to translate the word philosophy as kitetsugaku is also correct.

Kitetsugaku literally was “the science of questing wisdom.”

After he returned to Japan in 1865, Tsuda translated Vissering’s lectures into Japanese under the title Taisei Kokuhō-ron (The Public Law in the West). Katō Hiroyuki, in his Rikken Seita-ryaku, borrowed heavily from this work. Tsuda published articles like “The Abolition of Prostitution,” “On Torture,” “On the Death Penalty,” for the Meiroku Zasshi. Later, when the Diet was established, Tsuda was elected and served as Deputy Speaker in the Lower House at the opening session.

The most thorough and well thought out criticism of Fukuzawa’s views was that of Nishi Amane. To Nishi, Fukuzawa’s assertion about the danger confronting the self-reliance and independence of the Japanese was not based on sufficient evidence. Accordingly, he first attacked this view. In contrast to Fukuzawa’s call to the intellectuals to bestir themselves, Nishi countered by demanding that the intellectuals exert themselves
in forbearance and patience. He said in effect, it is true as Fukuzawa has said that, "the government is as yet despotic; the people as yet apathetic, powerless, and ignorant," but this has not been an overnight development. "For a period of 2,500 years oppression and servility were the usual fare of the people; these have become staples like the traditional rice and pickled radishes!"

Nishi argued that the Meiji Restoration started out with the intention of "Revering the Emperor and expelling the Barbarians."

We have come only seven years since this period, conditions cannot be changed in a hasty and flustered fashion. Even the so-called experts on Western Learning cannot claim to have penetrated all its mysteries or to have fathomed the meaning of its learning. Barely seven years ago what was called learning comprised such things as the Four Books of Chu Hsi, the Five Classics, and fripperies like Tea Ceremony, and Flower Arrangement, the attainment of skills in the use of the bow, sword, lance, and in horsemanship! In comparison with this, he felt the present truly represented progress. Nishi said, "We ought to defer to our descendents," and in opposition of Fukuzawa's gaudy theories, demanded of the intellectuals forbearance and an attitude of steadfastness.

Nishi, in dealing with Fukuzawa's thesis that intellectuals should of necessity be "non-governmental," first analyzed the premises of this concept. Fukuzawa had compared the government to a living organism and the people to an outside stimulus. This analogy is of questionable validity. Yet, if we take it at its face value then we can say that a living organism also needs salt to function properly, and the salt has to be inside it. Similarly, the intellectual is necessary to the government. The temperature outside an organism has to be maintained at appropriate levels, and the intellectual outside the government can be considered as having a similar function. The intellectual thus has a dual function. Therefore, Nishi concluded, since "People's talents or specialties differ, their aspirations too
differ—some intellectuals should be in the government assisting in its operations, some should be productive on the outside, in private life—the two are not incompatible."

Nishi's thought was on the whole moderate, but he was also an advocate of progressive theories. In the first number of the *Meiroku Zasshi* he published an article on writing Japanese with a Western alphabet; this sparked the movement favoring the use of *rōmaji*, or the alphabet, for the writing of Japanese. He also published things like "On Loving One's Enemies." Here we can see his talent as a critic of civilization. His strong point, however, was systematic speculative thought.

We will next take up the philosophical writings of Nishi Amane.

4. The Philosophical System of Nishi Amane

Mori Ōgai, whom we mentioned in connection with the story of Tsuge Shirōzaemon, the patriotic assassin of Yokoi Shōnan, wrote in 1909 a short autobiographical novel called *Bita Sekusuarisu* (Vita Sexualis). This novel dealt with Ōgai's sexual experiences as well as with other intimate aspects of his life.

Ōgai, in the section on his childhood, wrote:

I was living in the Hongō ward in Tokyo and was enrolled in a private school which taught German. I was there because my father wanted me to prepare to enter mining school. Since it was too far for me to commute to Mukōjima, I lodged at the home of my father's friend, Mr. Azuma.

Mr. Azuma had been to the West and was very fastidious about health. He was very enthusiastic about the importance of eating meat—otherwise there were no luxuries gracing his establishment. I should add, however, that a great deal of sake was consumed at his home.

Returning in the evening from the government office where he was employed, Mr. Azuma usually worked until ten or eleven on translations or general studies, following which he would drink.

Mr. Azuma's wife was a remarkable woman in all respects
and, even today in retrospect, I am forced to conclude that precious few high government officials of that time lived in households run as well as Mrs. Azuma’s. My father did well—he had indeed placed me in a good home.

The “Mr. Azuma” in the sketch was Nishi Amane and the “I” was Mori Ōgai at eleven years of age; thus the passage describes the household in the year 1872. Later Ōgai went to Germany to study medicine, returning to Japan in 1888. In 1889 he married a daughter of Akamatsu Noriyoshi. Akamatsu had studied in the West with Nishi and Tsuda, and the marriage of his daughter was arranged by Nishi who served as the go-between. In 1898 Ōgai wrote the Nishi Amane Den (Biography of Nishi Amane).

Nishi was born in 1829 in Iwami, in present-day Shimane prefecture; this was the same place where Mori Ōgai was later born. It was from Nishi’s family that the clan physicians were drawn. He studied in Tetsuka Ritsuzo’s school and, as we noted previously, he and Tsuda Shindō became instruction assistants at the Bakufu’s Bansho shirabe-sho. This was in April 1863; in October he petitioned Prince Keiki, the last Shōgun, proposing that he, Keiki, remove to Hokkaido and take the initiative in developing that area. Nishi wrote that Japan had incurred the scorn of the Western barbarians because of the evil ways of both high and low. The “evil way” of the highborn was the “extremely insolent prideful attitude which they heavy-handedly assume in all affairs”; the “evil way” of the lowborn was their “preference for excelling in idleness”; and these habits together led to “what can be designated as temporizing make-shifts” in the formulation of national policy.

When Nishi returned to Japan from Holland he became the managing director of the Numazu Military School. After the Restoration he worked in the Hyōbushō (Ministry of Military Affairs), which later became Ministry of the Army. Under the leadership of General, later Prince, Yamagata Aritomo, Nishi contributed much to the organization of the Japanese army. The Gunjin Chokuyu (Imperial Mandate to the Soldier)
was based on Nishi’s draft. Besides performing his official duties, Nishi opened a private boarding school, and in the regulations of the school the following appeared:

Modern students, with their dirty faces, disordered hair, stained clothes and torn coats, show dissoluteness and abandon. Slovenliness will not be tolerated! It is not forbidden to drink within the school premises—except that drink is intermediary to a hundred evils: studies are neglected, looseness is encouraged, the results are often lewd behavior, conflict... a hundred-fold regrets. All this is the consequence of drink. If one drinks, the amount should be appropriate to one’s constitution. Drinking is permitted after five p.m.; after bedtime drinking is forbidden...

Every day during the early evening one should go for a walk. When the weather is fine it should be about an hour’s walk. This is essential for toning up the sinews and nerves, and aiding the stomach and intestines in their digestive function...

We see in this something of Nishi’s character. The contents of Nishi’s lectures in this school were the same as those in his Hyakugaku renkan and his Hyakuichi-shinron. Later, when the Japan Academy was created Nishi was chosen as first chairman and was re-elected seven times, after which Katō Hiroyuki became chairman.

Mori Ōgai wrote in his Nishi Amane Den that “every month on six separate occasions lectures were held on what was called Encyclopaedia. This was Nishi’s so-called Hyakugaku renkan.” That Nishi lectured in his school on the sciences could be inferred from what we said of his interest in materialism. It is interesting to note that these lectures were held in 1870-1873, but only in 1932—after the discovery of written records—did it become possible to know the contents of these lectures.

Nishi’s Hyakugaku renkan dealt with the province and special nature of various types of knowledge and the methodology, premises, and interrelationships of different branches of science. In his lectures he made clear the organizational ties
between the sciences, hence the title *Hyakugaku renkan* (The Links of the Hundred Sciences).

Nishi taught that what was traditionally called learning was divided into science and technology. The study of these was the quest for truth: “If one knows origins, then the reasons for the specific form of things will be clearly understood.” To know the former is to serve knowledge; to know the latter, that is, the reasons for the specific composition of things, is to serve production. Therefore, a distinction can be made between science and technology which is related to the distinction between theory and practice. This is the basis of our knowledge, a knowledge which we can divide into science and technology. Nishi said the relationship between theory (science) and practice (technology) was that “theory was the source of science and technology.” Consequently, “theory came first, practice later . . . Theory represents the past, practice the future.” And, “science necessarily takes precedence over technology.”

Nishi divided all learning along a horizontal line as science and technology, and he divided science into pure and applied science, technology into mechanical and liberal arts. He ranged all learning along a vertical line as well. There was general science and technology and particular science and technology. Mathematics was an example of “the general, which is the underlying principle of all things”; botany was an example of “a particular, which is related to one thing alone.” Particular science and technology had two great divisions: the spiritual sciences and the physical sciences. In essence, Nishi grouped learning horizontally into science and technology, vertically into general (universal) and particular (specific). By dividing the particular in turn into intellectual and physical he completed the structure of his "Encyclopaedia".

We may remark here that the range of Nishi’s learning was truly surprising. The people of the Meirokusha generally were extremely well-educated and masters of a quite extensive academic tradition. Nishi’s *Hyakugaku renkan* was comparable to the work of the French Encyclopedists, and the early Meiji
period was comparable to the eighteenth century Age of Enlightenmnet in Europe. This rather facile comparison does not, however, explain the broad learning of these people. As a matter of fact, an even closer parallel to the Enlightenment could be drawn by looking at the generation which followed the men of the Meirokusha. The people of the popular rights movement concentrated mainly on political economy and, above all, on politics. The Meirokusha group was possessed of a broader learning and culture by far because it ranged over all areas of Western culture, not just politics or economics. The people of the Meirokusha felt it was necessary to introduce and naturalize in Japan the ensemble of Western culture. And with this fresh consciousness of theirs they were in a position to touch on all aspects of foreign culture. A man like Fukuzawa Yukichi introduced all kinds of things—from teaching methods to introductory courses in Western science. Even a theoretician like Katō Hiroyuki was ordered by the Bakufu to study telegraph apparatuses! When Nishi returned to Japan from Holland and served with Shōgun Keiki in Kyōto he performed experiments with electricity and mechanics. In this connection Nishi wrote:

I came to know Western languages and letters rather well but this knowledge was not of encyclopedic scope. I knew little of technology, of electricity, especially the intricacies of its technical application, yet I complied with the Shōgun’s orders. These activities of mine were like those of a petty official. At that time such an occupation was not considered appropriate for a gentleman. Western studies were still undeveloped. People were merely amused by new things and liked novelties, but they did not contemplate practical applications for these things. People like myself, on the other hand, in anything pertaining to Western culture tried to do rather than question the importance of what we were doing —there was no time for anything else.

Through the necessity for broad knowledge Nishi came into contact with the work of Comte and Spencer. This stimulated him to give his lectures on the *Hyakugaku renkan*.
Nishi's method was extremely interesting. When he explained various sciences he started with a step-by-step explanation of their nomenclatures. Nishi said he tried to approximate the Greek *enkyklios paideia* when he selected the title *Hyakugaku renkan* "because the structure of the world signified placing a child within a circle of sciences and educating it—and for that reason 'Hyakugaku renkan' was an appropriate term."

Concerning the translation of the word philosophy he said:

The word philosophy comes from the Greek *philo*, which in English means *love*, and *sophia*, which is the English word *wisdom*. Thus philosophy means to love wisdom.

In this way Nishi constructed many philosophical terms which are still in use in Japan. Among these words were renderings of *a priori*, *a posteriori*, deduction, induction, subjective, objective, reason, and understanding. We should also note that Nishi always found the elements of the Western terms in Chinese studies. The reason for this was not just due to his solid grounding in Chinese studies and research methods. When Nishi was attempting to naturalize Western studies in Japan—studies which were totally different in nature and origin from those with which the average Japanese was familiar—it was natural to proceed through Chinese bibliography and research. We must note the fact that we have here an interesting example of the acculturation of an Oriental and Western culture.

We turn now to Nishi's relations to European philosophers. Professor Vissering, under whom Nishi studied when he was in Holland, was a follower of Comte and it is thus clear that through his influence Nishi absorbed much of Comte's theory. When Nishi discussed historical development he made use of Comte's three-stage theory:

According to Auguste Comte, development takes place by stages. The first he calls the theological stage, the second is the metaphysical, the third is the positive stage. It is with this stage that the process of development reaches completion.

Nishi's interpretation of Comte was especially clear in his essay entitled *Seisei Hatsuun* (The Principle of the Physical
and the Spiritual) which he published in 1873. Nishi discussed Comte’s position in the chapter in which he outlined the history of Western philosophy. This he followed by a detailed discussion of Comte’s biology.

In all of this we can clearly see Nishi’s relation to Comte. A problem arises, however, when we recall the way in which Nishi divided science into particular and general sciences. Under the latter he placed what he called the spiritual-intellectual sciences. This system of classification was at variance with that adopted by Comte. This discrepancy is to be explained on the score of Nishi’s borrowing from Mill.

Comte denied the existence of independent spiritual-intellectual sciences and included these under biological science. Mill, however, acknowledged the independent nature of the spiritual-intellectual sciences. Indeed, this was the most important point in Mill’s criticism of Comte. Nishi too, expressly cited his agreement with Mill’s views as expressed in the latter’s System of Logic. The title of his essay Seisei Hatsuun was based on a phrase of Mencius’ and referred to the relationship between the spiritual and the physical. While Nishi followed Comte’s biological theory in its particulars, he still attempted to make clear the relationship between mental and physical phenomena. He ended by agreeing with Mill that the problem of making this relationship clear was an insurmountable one:

I have till now not had the ability to make clear the mutual connection between the physical and the mental. Yet, I have for some time taught their existence and have attempted to explain their relationship; which is subordinate to which, what their respective jurisdictions are.

Nishi lectured on logic, which he called chichi-gaku (“the science of attaining perfect knowledge of the principles of all things”). Logic, he said, was based on observation and experiment and he emphasized Mill’s inductive method. In 1877 Nishi translated Mill’s Utilitarianism into Japanese. We see thus that Nishi’s thought was positivist and he was influenced both by Comte and Mill.
Surprisingly, however, Nishi also showed signs of being under the influence of the Kantians. In his thinking about the principles of nature Nishi was a materialist even before the Restoration, in his view of history he was a positivist following Comte, his epistemology was rather close to Mill's empiricism, but his practical philosophy of ethics and morality was based on Kant. We cited his friend Tsuda to the effect that when Nishi studied in Holland, he "delighted in the philosophy of the Kantians." It was Kant's *In the Cause of Eternal Peace* that made an especially deep impression on Nishi. And traces of the influence of this work on Nishi can be found in his *Hyakugaku renkan* combined with Comte's "three-stage" theory. The remains of this Kantianism assumed the following form:

Each country in ancient times was under divine governance which constituted a primary stage. The feudalism of the middle-ages can thus be considered the second stage and the present day sovereign states have reached the third stage. We may however, consider the ancient and medieval periods as one stage and the present day national sovereign states as a second stage. There is thus a third stage which still remains to be achieved; the formation of a World Republic and the attainment of Eternal Peace.

Nishi distinguished between what he called soul, which was common to beasts and men, and spirit, which he said was exclusively human. In his *Hyakuichi-shiron* Nishi made this even more specific. He concluded that the human spirit contained a moral sense. This moral sense was not something which simply existed as an inherent property of the spirit, but something based on a categorical principle, something which *ought* to exist. Nishi's distinction between the physical and the spiritual was based on this distinction between being and ough-ness, between the brute soul and the human spirit, between simple existence and the presence of a moral sense.

The *Hyakugaku renkan* was also concerned with the problem of knowledge in its broadest sense; it was concerned with knowledge from the standpoint of the history of civilization.
and the development of culture. Universities, schools and even museums were the means whereby knowledge was to be encouraged. By way of contrast, he constantly drew on the Confucian academic tradition. It is here that Nishi the advocate of enlightenment emerges clearly.

Nishi summed up his belief in progress when he said: “Modern man must be wiser than ancient man, the pupil must be superior to the teacher.”

Nishi, like Comte, valued both progress and order, “political systems have need of both far-sighted deep thinking and continual reform.” Democracy contained the element of continual reform but did not have intellectual depth, foresight or planning. Aristocracy as a political system was just the opposite. In a monarchy the quality of government was dependent on the quality of the monarch. Nishi therefore felt that only in a constitutional monarchy was the quality of government assured. And this was precisely the line of criticism Nishi directed at Fukuzawa.

We turn now to Nishi’s *Hyakuichi-shinron* which he published in 1874. This work has been considered important by many because apparently the word for philosophy, *tetsugaku* appeared here for the first time. Actually, as we said above, Nishi attempted to introduce the word in his *Hyakugaku renkan* lectures in the period from 1870-1873. Most people, however, did not know of these lectures, and in the final section of the *Hyakuichi-shinron* Nishi once more introduced the word saying:

*Philosophy*, which I have translated as *tetsugaku*, means the establishment of a teaching method to expound and make clear the Way of Heaven and that morality which is manifest in the human spirit. It is a style of exposition which has from ancient times existed in the West.

This first real example of the word philosophy in a Japanese work is significant. From the standpoint of the history of thought, however, the *Hyakuichi-shinron* is important for other considerations.

The title of the work referred to a fundamental unity which
Nishi felt ought to be at the root of all doctrine. In this connection he said:

When we consider that the purport, the essential principle of all doctrines is the same, then we can indeed say that they have unity. If, on the other hand, we say the many doctrines have many meanings and that for one doctrine there is correspondingly one meaning, then even itemizing these doctrines and their meanings would not suffice.

It may be doubted that Nishi assumed that the different religions were at bottom united by some common principle. When he spoke of a doctrine or teaching, however, Nishi felt there was a common factor which united this doctrine to every other doctrine. Doctrine, Nishi said, "points chiefly to man and the moral way suitable to man." By a teaching or doctrine Nishi meant something which guided man to moral behavior. The essence of a teaching was morality.

It was, however, of extreme importance to Nishi that there should be a clear distinction made between politics—the way of governing men—and morality—the way of teaching men. He sharply distinguished between governing and teaching. Despite the fact that there ought to be a fundamental unity between these, Nishi strongly emphasized that the two did not stem from one source. He thus was critical of the Shinto derived concept about the unity of government and religion which was dominant in the early years of Meiji. He also rejected the Confucian advocacy of the unity of governing and teaching. There was thus a modernity about Nishi's thought that merits our attention.

We must now note the manner in which Nishi interpreted the Confucian doctrine. Confucian doctrine traditionally spoke in terms of an ascending sequence which led from the moral cultivation of the individual to the administration of the States and the tranquilization of the Realm (or world). The Confucians regarded moral self-cultivation and the governing of men as one and the same. This, Nishi said, was a mistaken interpretation of Confucius. Confucius and the ancient Chinese of the Chou dynasty (1122-255 B.C.) prized ceremonial by which
they meant regulations, civilization, legal systems, in short, “anything whatsoever to which some rule was affixed, was called ceremonial.”

Confucius’ primary purpose was to rectify political administration by the study and clarification of ceremonial. Confucian humanitarianism and morality was a by-product of this primary endeavor. Nishi believed that later day Confucians had mis-interpreted this and had taken ceremonial to mean a self-cultivation which in ascending spirals would lead to the “tranquilization of the Realm.” This interpretation of Nishi’s was drawn from the Ogyū Sorai (?-1728) school of Confucianism. Sorai had argued that the “way” of the ancient sage-kings was essentially this supreme regard for ceremonial.

Nishi had since his youth delighted in the study of Sorai and when he argued in this fashion his background in traditional Chinese studies was apparent. Supported by this type of Chinese thought Nishi imbibed the new Western thought. Fukuzawa too was proud of his background in Chinese learning. Indeed the stoutheartedness and broadness of cultural background of the people of the Meirokusha was primarily a result of this kind of upbringing.

The first volume of the Hyakuichi-shiron is almost entirely given over to this kind of reasoning about Confucian doctrine, the second volume is primarily concerned with Western thought. Near the end of this volume Nishi argues that there is a universal principle which is divided into the physical and the spiritual. The physical principle is the principle of nature (the external world); it is the principle which governs human beings, animals, plants. Its domination “comprehends the vastness of the universe and the minuteness of a single drop of water or of a pinch of earth.” This Nishi called the a priori principle. In contrast, the spiritual principle “is not as broad a principle, it has to do only with human beings. Without human beings it does not exist. It may be that men are not able to follow its dictates—which possibility too is based on nature—yet, should they desire to do so, they can change their ways, they can return
to it once again.” This was Nishi’s *a posteriori* principle.

It may seem strange to speak of the physical principle as *a priori* and the spiritual principle as *a posteriori* but careful examination shows us what Nishi had in mind. The physical principle is what we would designate a law of nature, in the sense of the ancient concept of harmony as the underlying principle of nature; the spiritual principle is moral law, the foundation of human society. The law of nature governs the physical universe—of which man too is a part—the moral law is based on the moral sense with which man is *naturally* endowed.

The distinction Nishi made between the law of nature and a normative moral law was similar to the division made by the philosopher Windelband when he spoke of *Naturgesetze* and *Normen*. Nishi differed in that he believed human beings were created in accord with the law of nature and then were endowed with this moral principle. For this reason he called the spiritual principle or moral law an *a posteriori* principle.

In the thought of the Sung neo-Confucianism the “way of Heaven,” or the law of nature and the “way of man,” or the moral law, were regarded as inextricably woven together. It was Nishi’s brilliant contribution that he was able to separate these. While in the main Nishi’s thought can be called eclectic, it was strongly systematic. It is also obvious from Nishi’s ability to distinguish between natural and moral law that his thought contained a strong analytic component.

Nishi’s masterpiece, however, was his “*Jinsei sanpō setsu*” (Theory of the Three Treasures of Life). An expression like “The Three Treasures of Life” today sounds somewhat archaic or hackneyed, it refers to cultural assets or cultural values (*Kulturgüter* or *Kulturwerte*). Nishi thought to actualize the three values of life by giving them ethical—practical philosophical—content. At the very least we may say—that this is putting it rather strongly—that Nishi intended to build a system which resembled Max Scheler’s concept of value ethics (*Wertethik*). The three treasures of life were health, wisdom, and wealth, and in this work of his, the following points are worth
noting.

Nishi asserted his personal ethics with a clear consciousness of the difference between them and traditional Eastern morality. It was an attempt at an ethical value transformation. He said, in effect, that he opposed the traditional morality, a composite of such negative virtues as gentleness, meekness, honesty, modesty, deference, to be content with little, and to be free from avarice. Nishi’s object was to stress positively the morality with which man was naturally endowed. He taught not blessings and woes in a future world, as many religions preached, but “the way to success in this world.” It was possible that a person hearing that the three treasures of life were health, wisdom, and wealth might say,

This is a gambler’s or a drayman’s philosophy. For strength and knowledge apart, when one lusts for money, what is one but a gambler or a puller of carts! This is a web of greed. If such a philosophy becomes the essence of morality and comes to lead the realm, it will serve to teach thieves and give guidance to robbers.

To a criticism of this nature Nishi replied that “gamblers and cart pullers” too are desirous of health, wisdom, and wealth. This was proof that all people desire these because of the moral character with which they are naturally endowed. In this concept we can recognize a transformation from the traditional negative morality to a positive morality which affirmed human desires and wants. This positive affirmation was typical of the early Meiji intellectuals. Nishi’s ethics was not merely a sentimentalized subjective morality, it was an objective morality related to life values.

Nishi’s system contained a measure of originality. The three treasures of life which Nishi presented, health, wisdom, and wealth, were not ends in themselves. The ultimate goal of life, or the primary object of life, was in the maximum of well-being. Nishi’s three treasures concept was an intermediary step, a secondary objective, in the attainment of this maximum of well-being. Without question Nishi’s position was similar
to Mill's. Just as Mill had taken over Bentham's "greatest happiness principle", making it primary and had thought of wealth, power, fame as related to this, but secondary, so too Nishi made his three treasures means to achieve what he called primary, the maximum of well-being. In these particulars, then, Nishi used Mill as a guide. Nishi himself has admitted this dependence on Mill. But, Nishi also stated that "The theory of the three treasures is from first to last a theory conceived by me; I have not dared to hope to elaborate the theories of Western philosophers." There were, however, differences in Nishi's exposition which demonstrate his originality.

Mill's secondary principle lists the desires for money, power, and fame. Desire was not, however, limited to just these three. Nishi, on the other hand, limited his secondary principle to health, wisdom, and wealth. And he presented as anti-values the three calamities, sickness, ignorance, and poverty. With respect to other persons, to cause injury to health (life) was villainy; to deceive another person was fraud; to rob another person was theft. The presentation of these was skillfully systematized. Another contrast with Mill was over the existence of a sense of obligation. Mill answered the question as to how this sense of obligation arises from the desires for wealth, fame, power, by positing the existence of sympathy. Ever since Hume, the explanation of the consciousness of obligation was based on this theory of sympathy. Nishi explained the consciousness of obligation by leading it away from an intellectual type of compassion or sympathy and asserting that this consciousness was based on the natural endowment of moral principle. To Nishi, a prohibition like that against injuring someone else's health makes for law (rights and duties); a type of "if", as in "If one can further one's position by helping (someone else) then one sholud further one's position!", makes for morality (moral obligation). Nishi differentiated between law which was negative and morality which was spontaneous and positive. This is a concept in which Kant's influence can be sensed.

Nishi valued social relations—here this means a social
consciousness—saying, "The public good is the sum total of private gains." "The theory of morality of the three treasures conceives of government as one type of association within the framework of human social relations." "I, therefore, say the theory of three treasures of life is the exposition of societal well-being." Nishi thus can be said to have influenced the Oriental style of thinking extensively. Later, in 1881 (Meiji 14), when he became President of the Tokyo Normal School he wrote in his "Resume of Arguments for Establishing a Faculty of Moral Science in Tokyo Normal School":

By fusing together various theories from our tradition and from the modern West in eclectic fashion, we can inductively arrive at one principle which can serve as a norm. If this is not done, we will not be able to provide Japan with a practical science of morality.

While there is a feeling that the contents of the above work are rather a retrogression from the "Three Treasures of Life," in the latter work, too, Nishi contemplated a synthesis of Eastern and Western thought. Nishi's scholarly activities were extremely lively in the period of the Meirokusha; the acme of these activities was expressed in "The Theory of Three Treasures of Life."

5. Nakamura Masanao (1822-1891)

In his Meiji Bungaku Kanren, (Views on Meiji Literature), Kitamura Tōkoku (1868-1894) has noted:

We recognize that Fukuzawa Yukichi was the first preacher to the common citizen in the Meiji period...While born in the old, pre-Meiji period, he completely discarded this old world...He is a calm, great reformer. His reformism is, however, superficial and does not capture the imagination of the people.

Nakamura Masanao stands in opposition to Fukuzawa. Nakamura is not a reformer but a conformist; a calm conservative, albeit, a person who is exceptional because he is impregnated with Western civilization. He is striving to
harmonize Eastern and Western culture. He attempted to rescue Confucianism and Taoism from their fate and to adapt Western dynamism to these. He worshipped Samuel Smiles' *Self Help* through the medium of Confucian thought. In his thought there was honest acceptance of these ideas, but not any fervent attempt at effectuation—he was in this sense a peaceful worshipper not fanatically attached to this worship. Because of his adaptability he was not a displaced child of the Meiji Revolution. He stands erect among the many scholars who were devotees of Chinese thought. And because of these characteristics of his, he was well able to adapt to the stream of the Revolution, and has succeeded in playing a part in the thought of this period.

Nakamura is not particularly outstanding as a reformer, but as a conservative. In intellectual circles, he is one of the most outstanding thinkers. Nakamura is thus able to maintain a rare balance between the old and new worlds. Fukuzawa and Nakamura are thus two very apparent archetypes of the intellectual currents in the new Japan.

These words of Kitamura's are typical of his penetrating power, and it can be said that in this comparison of Fukuzawa and Nakamura he felicitously grasped the characteristics of the latter. Nakamura, however, was not just a great conservative as described by Kitamura; in the period from 1868 to 1873 he was a reformer. In contra-distinction to Fukuzawa's "external reformism" Nakamura was in a sense an internal reformer.

Nakamura was born in 1832 and next to Nishimura, was the senior member of the Meirokusha group. As a child he was educated in Chinese learning and was reputed to have a remarkable memory and to be an excellent calligrapher. Entering the Bakufu's Shōheikō, the official school for Confucian studies in the Edo period, Nakamura became a disciple of Satō Issai. The year preceding this he was a student of Dutch learning under Katsuragawa Kokko (1826-1881). At that time he composed an oath comprising 10 articles as an exhortation to himself. Among these articles were things like "not to be false
in word or deed” and “in all things to take myself to task and not blame others.” Also included was an article exhorting him “not to leave my studies of Dutch books unfinished.” In 1885 Nakamura became an instructor at the Shōheikō and in 1862 he began to study English. In 1866 at the age of 35,—this was the time when the Bakufu first sent students to England—Nakamura went abroad as the leader of a student group. In 1868 he returned and following the ex-Shōgun Prince Keiki to Shizuoka, he became a professor at the Shizuoka Gakumon-jo (Shizuoka Institute of Learning). While there he published Samuel Smiles’ *Self Help*, under the title *Saikoku Risshihen* (Articles on Success in the West), and J. S. Mills’ *On Liberty*, which he titled *Jiyu no Ri* (Principles of Freedom). These volumes exerted an extraordinarily great influence.

Nakamura’s translation of *Self Help* was read by a great many people, and alongside Fukuzawa’s *Seiyō Jijō* (Conditions in the West), Uchida Masao’s *Yochishi ryaku* (Short World Geography), was one of the three books most read and discussed in Meiji. Famous Meiji industrialists like Ōkura Kihachirō and Magoshi Kyōhei were greatly inspired by reading this book. In the *Kei Shishu* (Poetical Works of Nakamura (Keiu) Masanao), there is a statement in the introduction in support of this.

Mr. Ōkura Kihachirō, reading my translation of *Self Help* was deeply impressed and encouraged in his diligence, he has become a tremendously wealthy businessman. He expressed his gratitude by presenting me with a sandalwood *hibachi*. I, in turn, therefore, composed these poems and present them to him.

In contrast, however, Nakamura’s translation of *On Liberty* offered an important strategic base for the arguments of the popular rights movement in the early years of the Meiji period. A leader of the Jiyūtō Party and central personality of Fukushima Affair, the famous Kōno Hironaka, bought a copy of *On Liberty* in 1873. He said that returning on horseback he was reading the book and it revolutionized his entire way of thinking.
Up to this point I had been brought up on Chinese Learning, and the Japanese National learning, and it not infrequently happened that I also was an advocate of 'expelling the barbarians.' What had been my style of thinking was all at once tremendously revolutionized. I knew then that human liberty, human rights, ought to be prized. And I felt that government must be conducted on the basis of a broad public opinion. I remember being deeply impressed—the idea of popular rights was graven on my heart as an article of faith and this marked a tremendous turning-point in my life... It was in March, 1873, that I read and was transformed by the book On Liberty.

Nakamura's work was, to be sure, a translation of Mill's On Liberty, but from time to time phrases of praise or criticism were inserted in Chinese (Kanbun). For example, at the beginning of Kan 2, in his translator's Preface, the following striking insert appears.

There should be limits to everything except love. ...This book argues that the power of the government ought to have adequate restrictions; these are clearly detailed. Where ought there be no quantitative restriction? I say, Love ought not have any restrictions as to quantity; God loves mankind and there are no limits to this love. For this reason mankind too loves God; the love for other men ought have no restrictions...

In connection with Mill's statement that the progress of present-day Europe was still incomplete: "Mankind has not yet once reached a stage of perfection; this stage will probably be reached in the remote future..." Nakamura wrote in a Chinese insertion, "Civilization in the world has only just begun; it is like the dawn only just arisen; if it is thought that Europe has already arrived at the stage of ultimate goodness, this is a grave mistake." This, in effect, was the way in which he capped his criticism. Things like this made this translation still more fascinating.

It was in this fashion that Nakamura, on the one hand,
gave the people of the early Meiji period a new concept of setting one's aims in life, of rising in the world. On the other hand, this work encouraged the belief in popular rights, and what should be noted in connection with this, was Nakamura's relation to Christianity. What has been quoted above with respect to "God loves mankind . . ." was a manifestation of Nakamura's Christianity. Nakamura moved from Shizuoka to Tokyo in 1872 and published a piece in the Shinbun Zasshi (News Magazine) called "Memorial on the Imitation of Westerners." At that time religious freedom was not permitted and it was still dangerous to express any views which tended to support Christianity. Consequently, this bold expression of support by Nakamura was rather startling. As indicated in the title, this was a memorial to the Emperor to imitate Westerners. He said that present-day Japan was "flourishing and progressing from day to day," but while adopting good things from the West the true source of these god things, Christianity, was still under national proscription. He said, "To delight in branch streams or tributaries, while forgetting the source of these, is, I feel, a delusion," or "like forgetting the tree and just seeking the fruit." "The new things of today are all fruit: doctrine, religion, this is the tree. If His Majesty seeks the fruit of Western countries thinking this good, then he should not question the goodness of the tree. His Majesty vainly strives to pick up the fruit bequeathed by the West and taste its excessive sweetness—but does not know how to transplant the trees and thus to continually have the fruits in Japan." Therefore, Nakamura advocated loosening the prohibition against Christianity and called for the Emperor himself to set an example in this. He said, "If His Majesty himself desires to establish Western religion, it would be well for him first to receive baptism—becoming thus a lord of the church, then the people will follow."

In 1873 he opened a private school called the Dōjinsha. This school, together with Fukuzawa's Keio University, was without peer among Japanese non-governmental schools at this time. As mentioned earlier, Nakamura and a group of people
celebrated the first Christmas Eve ever held in Japan in 1875, and it has been said that Nakamura himself was baptised. In 1878 there was a great social gathering of Christians and later there was a banquet party in Fukagawa at which Nakamura was also present. Ebina Danjō has described his pleasurable memories of this as follows.

Nakamura read the first psalm of the Book of Psalms and said that Christian literature was superior to Japanese literature; he said that there is no expression in Japan like 'The evildoer will be blown away by the wind like chaff'.

In 1881 (Meiji 14) Nakamura translated William Martín's (1827-1916) work Tendō Sogen (Source of the Way of Heaven) into Japanese and published it. The work, written in classical Chinese style, had to be punctuated and re-written with Japanese insertions so that it could be read by the Japanese. More or less decked out in Christian dogma, the book was the first of its kind to be introduced into Japan.

Nakamura's attitude as seen in the Memorial on Imitating Westerners did not quickly disappear. For example, we can look at the Meiroku Zasshi in which he published his “Views on Reconstructing the Character of the People.” In this article he fiercely criticised the Japanese, saying:

What is it that has been renovated in what has been spoken of as 'the Renovation' since 1868! It must mean the abandonment of the old Bakufu administration and the promulgation of a return to Imperial rule. To speak of the renovation of the political administration does not yet mean that the people themselves have been renovated. A political administration is like a vessel filled with water. The people are like water; in a round-shaped vessel water too is round, in a square-shaped vessel it is square. Though its shape is altered by a change in the vessel, the character of the water remains the same. While the containing vessel of the people—the government—has since 1868 taken on a superior shape or form, in comparison with that of olden times, the people still are the same as formerly, and have the same slave-like disposition: a people
arrogant towards inferiors and fawning over superiors, an uneducated illiterate people, fond of dissipation, not of reading books, a people which does not reflect on its obligations, a people which knows not the rule of Heaven.

Nakamura continued to detail this savage criticism of the Japanese and concluded that it was of most importance to renovate the character of the people. He said:

There are basically two ways to reform the character of the people; through art and doctrine. These two things are like the wheels of a cart or the wings of a bird—in that they both give necessary assistance and lead to the welfare and benefit of the people.

The time was one in which every conceivable reform was advocated—from the improvement of garbage cans to reforms in the Japanese written language. It was a period in which the advocacy of reform went to the extreme of calling for marriage to foreign women to improve the Japanese race! Nakamura, however, was concerned with the improvement of the Japanese character. For the sake of this improvement he emphasized the twin necessity of what he called Art and Doctrine.

In the Meiroku Zasshi he attempted, under the heading "Glimpses of Western Learning," to introduce modern Western thought from Bacon to Hobbes. At that time introductions to Western thought tended towards such superficial aspects as politics or economics. Nakamura stressed the broad cultural aspects of the West. Above all, he emphasized the fact that Western culture was founded on Christian thought. He wrote:

As Luther's friend, Melanchthon has said God's commandments to Moses anciently are divine exhortations and are graven on stone as an everlasting law. It is, however, a great mistake to think these alone God's commandments, because man who has his life of God is also endowed by the Creator with intuition, which is like unto having God's commandments carved by His hand, as it were, in his heart . . . man cannot adhere to the divine command graven on stone and
ignore the divine command graven in his heart! Nakamura concluded that "Melanchthon's teachings concerning the science of human ethics and moral behavior are most important and most pure."

Nakamura, in his conception of reconstructing the character of the Japanese people, spoke of Art and Doctrine as most essential. By Art he meant technics and the sciences; by Doctrine he meant morality and religion. In his conceptualization, he made Doctrine the main stream and Art the tributary stream.

In his "Theory on the Making of Good Mothers" he advocated the importance of education for women, and made love the basis of this education.

The rearing of men and women should be equal, there should not be two different kinds of education. If all human beings want to maintain the highest level of perfection it would be well that men and women receive the same rearing. By doing this, they will progress together. Pure-hearted women must go hand-in-hand with virtuous men.

From 1875 to 1880 Nakamura was occupied with the management of the Tokyo Women's Normal School. One of his disciples, Iwamoto Zenji, was the central personality of the extremely progressive women's school of education, the Meiji Jogakuen. This school was grounded in Christianity. Iwamoto was editor of the magazine Jogaku Zasshi (Women's Education Journal) which was the origin of what later became the famous Bungakkai magazine on which writers like Kitamura Tōkoku and Shimazaki Tōson served.

Nakamura was in agreement with the idea of a popular assembly and also desired international peace. We can conclude then, that in the period of the Meirokusha, Nakamura was not merely a great conservative but, as I have understood him, an internal reformer.

In the period after 1881 Nakamura became a professor at Tokyo University, lecturing on Chinese learning. The following anecdote probably dates from this period. Dr. Shigeno
Seisai (Aneki) dreamt of meeting Nakamura, who said to him, "When one leaves the present it is no longer the present; when one reaches the present it is the present." Nakamura, hearing of this dream, made this aphoristic statement into an identifying seal which he used. In a sense, if this kind of thought is expanded it can probably be regarded as a rather original conceptualization of time—a theory of time. Nakamura was not merely a theoretician, he was a practising man of virtue. He was the type of man who was called "the sage of Edogawa," and he himself used a pen name which could be rendered as "man with no quarrels." In later years, Nakamura tended to exhibit a deep interest in Buddhism. He said:

I have no intention of supporting Christianity or excluding Buddhism. Nor have I any intention of assisting Buddhism or excluding Christianity. To do so is extremely distasteful to me. When I examine these from the outside, it appears to me that both religions everywhere serve to heal the sick spirits of the masses. Though the two systems differ, both are everywhere the instrumentatilities for destroying sin and evil in the masses.

When William Martin's Tendō Sogen is examined—this is the book Nakamura annotated in Japanese—the word Heaven does not mean the sky but rather the Lord of Heaven, the Lord of Creation, the King of Kings. Therefore, Martin used the Chinese characters for Jō tei, (Supreme Emperor). Since He was the father of Creation, Martin used the characters Tenpu (Heavenly Father). This was probably a convenient way for Christianity to enter China and also it was easy for Nakamura, who developed from Confucianism, to understand. Contrariwise, it was easy for Nakamura's Christianity to once again draw close to Confucianism, as evidenced in the phrase quoted above. At any rate, Nakamura had a faith that permitted him to die peacefully. In 1891, when Nakamura died, Uemura Masahisa, in a testimonial to Nakamura, said, "Nakamura Keiū, on the day of his death, was heard to utter only two phrases, 'I have no testament; I am not suffering'. We must earnestly admire
his finding eternal peace."

6. Nishimura Shigeki (1828-1902)

Among the people of the Meirokusha, Katō Hiroyuki and Fukuzawa Yukichi represented views that were direct opposites. As noted in the expression of the theory of the obligation of the intellectual—and in the criticism thereof—Fukuzawa’s view was that the intellectual must be non-governmental or non-affiliated; Katō’s view encouraged the intellectual to enter government service. Fukuzawa’s academic background was typically English, Katō’s typically German. And yet, if we look at them from a slightly different angle, they had, interestingly enough, points of resemblance. Fukuzawa was a believer in utilitarianism; Katō, a believer in egotism. Both acknowledged the concept of the ‘survival of the fittest’, both were rationalists and realists. If we say that in this sense both Katō and Fukuzawa were joined, then, in another sense, Nakamura and Nishimura, whom we will lightly touch on, were likewise joined.

If we reflect on the characters of Nakamura and Nishimura, they too, at first glance, appear to be direct opposites. Nakamura was a warm-hearted, gentle, scholarly type; Nishimura was a public-spirited patriot. Nakamura was drawn to Christianity; Nishimura ended up opposing Christianity. The former could be described as a religious man, the latter could be characterized as a man of moral purpose. But both were idealists and believers in voluntarism—or the paramountcy of the human will—both were not rationalists, not realists. Both published opinions in agreement with the idea of a popularly-elected assembly.

Nishimura Shigeki has become known for his book Nihon Dōtoku-ron (On Japanese Morality), in which he opposed the Europeanizing tendencies of the middle Meiji period. Founding the Nihon Kōdo-kai (Society for Expanding the Japanese Way) Nishimura conducted nationalist propaganda and served as a lecturer to the Emperor Meiji. The word “Kōdo” was taken from Confucius’ Analects, “Man does not develop the
Way; the Way develops man," and was altered to suit Japanese nationalism. Nishimura's *Nihon Dōtoku-ron* makes it apparent that he was neither a narrow-minded nationalist, nor did he contemplate a revival of Confucianism. In opposition to what had hitherto been the basis of morality in Japan, the Confucian moral system, he pointed out the following five weaknesses:

1) In comparison with Western learning, Confucianism lacks precision in the formulation of theories.

2) The Confucian doctrine is replete with prohibitions and exhortatory commandments; it is poor in words of positive encouragement and lacks a progressive climate of opinion, it is rather conservative.

3) Confucianism benefits *ascendents* and is detrimental to *descendants*. Therefore, among the former there is authority but no obligations; among the latter there are obligations but no authority.

4) Confucianism elevates men and denigrates women. Men with concubines are not censured, but women, even though their husbands die, must remain unmarried.

5) Confucianism teaches that the past is good and the present evil.

Nishimura felt that deficiencies of this nature should be supplemented by Western learning, although here too he listed four deficiencies:

1) The West places heavy *emphasis* on theory and slight *practice*.

2) The West, in its philosophy, has no technique for spiritual control (self-mastery)—(although believers in Christianity have this.)

3) Western philosophers all strive to surpass the ancients and, deliberately erecting different systems, attack the philosophical systems of the ancients. Confucians have the vice of worshipping the words of sages, but, contrariwise, Western philosophers have the vice of needlessly attacking the words of the ancients.

4) There being many and diverse schools of thought in
the West, it is difficult to find a unified approach in their thought. Consequently, Nishimura said:

I intend to find a moral basis which I feel does not exist in Confucianism or Western philosophy... Yet, without abandoning either Confucianism or Western philosophy, a moral basis can be extracted from Buddhism and Christianity... a moral foundation is a prerequisite for truth in the universe. There are no two truths! If truth is not to be mistaken, it is necessary to have a moral basis. I intend to construct this moral basis in Japan. Except for truth, there is nothing perfect in the universe.

As to how this truth is to be attained, he stated, "In connection with truth no two people agree, but fact is the instrument whereby truth can be measured." Therefore, it is necessary to find truth that is based on fact, and for the purpose of doing this five methods must be used simultaneously: (1) analogy, (2) eclecticism, (3) mensuration, (4) the judgment of one's conscience, (5) informal solving of problems. And, Nishimura felt that by singling out truth, sincerity would be attained.

This was Nishimura's basic thought in relation to the theory of Japanese morality. While these views are criticised as being nothing more than eclectic, they nevertheless do not deserve to be censured as narrow-minded nationalism. The Nihon Dōtoku-ron was based on a series of lectures he gave at Tokyo University in December 1886. These lectures were famous for the fact that their strong tone of anti-Europeanization aroused the anger of Itō Hirobumi, who was pacified only after Education Minister Mori Arinori intervened. Nishimura's intention, however, was clear when he said:

While the intellectuals delight in the customs of civilization, there are many people who want daily and continual change. While I originally hoped for the flowering of civilization and culture, it was because I felt the existence of my country required this. If my country was lost then culture and civilization would be pointless.

Nishimura preached national independence and national
glory but was not a chauvinist. Later, in 1877 during the period of the rise of neo-Japanism, Nishimura was one of the people who exerted himself in making this rise possible. The Japanism of the 1887 period, however, cannot be thought to have been as fanatic as the Japanism of the post-Sino-Japanese War period. This can clearly be seen in the magazine Nihon Oyobi Nihonjin (Japan and the Japanese). One of the key figures in the Japanist movement at this time, Miyake Setsurei, wrote articles for this magazine on "The Truthful, Virtuous, Beautiful Japanese," but also criticized the deficiencies of the Japanese in articles like "The False, Evil, Ugly Japanese." In view of the foregoing, where can we place Nishimura's thought? To understand its essence we must return to the main subject, the period of the Meirokusha (1873).

Nishimura was born into the Sakura clan in 1828. In 1887 Shimada Saburō, in his Kaikoku Shimatsu (Account of the Opening of Japan), praised Ii Naosuke, and degraded Hotta Masayoshi. As a rebuttal to this work and to vindicate Hotta, who had been the lord of the former Sakura clan, Nishimura wrote a book called Korō Mondo (Questions and Answers Concerning The Late Councilor Hotta). Nishimura studied Confucian learning and later became a disciple of Sakuma Shōzan. He studied Dutch learning and English under Tetsuka Ritsuzo and served as an official in the Sakura clan until 1872. Resigning his post, he went to Tokyo where he opened a private school in the Fukagawa district. In 1873, as we mentioned earlier, Nishimura and Mori Arinori founded the Meirokusha.

When he thought about history, Nishimura concluded that the rise and fall of nations was closely connected to their moral condition. Stating that, "I am deeply impressed by Western history," he said that the rise and fall of Greece and Rome illustrated the important role of morality. It is obvious that "a country flourishes when it is simple and vigorous; extravagance and frivolity are the poisons which destroy a country."

This type of thought in comparison with Fukuzawa's "history is the history of civilization" concept seems somehow
archaic; it seems to be little more than Confucian historicism. We have seen that in Yokoi Shōnan’s case this meant using the reigns of Yao, Shun, and the Three Dynasties prescriptively. Here, with Nishimura, Western history had apparently become a source for edifying moral sermonizing. His *Nihon Dōtoku-ron* argued that the evils of government, or of political ordinances could be remedied by the dismissal of evil state ministers. For “once there is a decline in the national morality, a dissolution of the human spirit, it becomes impossible to revive the vigor of the nation.”

Nishimura directed his criticism at the state of moral confusion into which Japan had fallen since the Restoration. In his essay “Tenkan Setsu” (On Transformation) he said that there were two factors which had led to change in Japan. The first of these was embodied in the slogan “Revere the Emperor, expel the barbarians.” Nishimura said that this, in essence, meant “to love the past and hate the present, to rever superior and to despise inferiors; to take pride in one’s own country and to have contempt for other countries.” The second factor which had led to change was summed up, he said, in the worship of culture and civilization. This meant “to discard the old and to adopt the new; to despoil those above and to benefit those below; to abandon national insularity and to fraternize with foreign countries.”

The problem, however, was that the Meiji Restoration was a mixture of these two opposing factors. And the merits of the second of these, of culture and civilization, had not been adequately realized. This was the origin of the moral confusion of the period. As he put it, “The Way of Confucius and Mencius has crumbled; the science and theoretical learning of the West have not yet been adopted.” Nishimura wrote, “The present time can be compared to the period just after sunset—day has ended but the moon has not yet arisen.” Moral confusion was thus a characteristic of the transition through which Japan was going.

The core of Nishimura’s thought can be found in the pro-
posals he made for ending Japan’s moral chaos.

Nishimura followed Katō Hiroyuki as lecturer to the Emperor. And in distinction to someone like Motoda Eifu who lectured to the Emperor from Chinese works, Nishimura used Western books. He felt that to be a lecturer to the Imperial Household did not mean to say only pleasant things to the Emperor or his ministers. Nishimura felt that it was his duty to rectify their errors and to dissuade them from iniquity.

In his Shūshin Chikoku wa Nito ni arazu no Ron (The Unity of Moral Cultivation and Governance) Nishimura developed his refutation of Nishi Amane’s Hyakuichi-shinron. As we said, in this work Nishi had argued that it was necessary to distinguish between personal morality and statecraft. Nishimura’s book, however, was a reproof directed at the immoral conduct of the government officials of that time. This censure was based on his belief that private and public morality were mutually inter-dependent. He said, “The officials are physically above the masses, their moral conduct is below that of the masses.” Also, “The dissoluteness of the private [family as distinct from public] morals of the high government officials and of the nobility of late, has become a source of amusement for the informed public.” Nowadays, he continued, Japan had all kinds of restrictive ordinances and penalties for such things as exposing oneself in public, or even for relieving oneself publicly, and yet, “the evil conduct of the high officials is infinitely worse than any such misdemeanors...I earnestly beseech my friends, the officials, to govern themselves strictly, to be conscious of their duty to the country. I beseech my friends; reform your behavior, make your words a model for the Realm, make your deeds an example for the Empire!” It was this kind of censure that Itō Hirobumi took personally when he became enraged at Nishimura’s Nihon Dōtoku-ron.

7. The Libel Law and the Character of the Meirokusha

On September 1, 1875 a meeting of the Meirokusha was held. That a month had gone by before this, during which
no meeting was held, was in all likelihood due to the promulga-
tion of the Libel Law and the press laws. During the interval
between meetings the members of the society were attempting
to formulate their attitude to these laws. The laws, of course,
were aimed at the suppression of free political speech.

Article I of the Libel Law defined what the government
considered libel and slander. It stated:

Without arguing about specific cases, an act which damages
the reputation of an individual constitutes slander. Anything
which gives a person a bad name constitutes libel. Persons
displaying books, posting portraits or pictures which slander
or libel any individual will be committing a crime under the
provisions of this article.

Obviously, to lie about someone, to falsely attribute evil deeds
to someone and thereby cause damage to his reputation, is some-
thing which must be prevented by suitable legislation. In the
law of 1875, however, the phrase “without arguing about specific
cases...” was used; this could hardly be considered suitable
legislation. The broadness, the lack of precision, was dangerous.
Even caricatures and cartoons came under the provisions of
this law.

Article XIII of the Press Law was even more formidable.
“Persons writing articles which advocate the overthrow of the
government, or which advocate changing the form of the gov-
ernment, and persons writing articles which incite to violence,
shall be punished by not less than one, or more than three years
imprisonment.”

With the promulgation of these laws it became impossible
to utter even one word of criticism against the government.
Opposition to the laws was impossible since this opposition
itself came under the various provisions of either the Libel Law
or the Press Law. This, however, did not discourage opposition
and almost all the newspaper columnists and editors were
charged with violating these laws. With these events in mind,
the members of the Meirokusha assembled in September to dis-
cuss the stand the society ought to take.
Mitsukuri Shūhei, then chairman of the Meirokusha, moved that the *Meiroku Zasshi* cease publication. Mori Arinori, at that time Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs, was opposed. Mori had known earlier that such a situation was likely to develop and therefore, in February he made a speech to the members calling for the Meirokusha to avoid politics. The society's primary obligation, he said, was to further learning, education and morality. In Mori's opinion, "the aims of our society should be directed at the coming generation" and though the political problems of the moment could not be shut out entirely, the society should not make these its main concern. The Meirokusha, he felt, was primarily cultural and he wanted the magazine to continue in this vein and refrain from politics.

Fukuzawa Yukichi spoke out against Mori's opinion, and his position can be summed up in the following three points:

*First.* According to the Libel Law, to oppose another person's opinions constituted libel, to discuss the virtues and failings of the government constituted libel. Under such conditions the intellectuals would end up dominated by the government.

*Second.* The duty of the Meirokusha, of course, was to be concerned primarily with learning and not with politics. It is, however, difficult to set clear-cut limits to thought. This is especially so under present day Japanese conditions. Is it not true that today Japan "is not the Japan of the people, but the Japan of the government," and that the major part of everything which is undertaken in the country is undertaken by the government! Under such conditions we cannot prevent thought from touching on political concerns.

*Third.* Shall we continue publication of the *Meiroku Zasshi* and warp our intellectual conscience by obeying the government, or shall we stand together and struggle on, even at the risk of breaking the law? We must choose! I say suspend publication and let the country know our attitude!

The result of this discussion was that only Nishi Amane, Tsuda Shindō, Sakatani Shiroshi and Mori Arinori favored continuing the magazine; the rest, including even Nishimura
Shigeki, Nakamura Masanao and Katō Hiroyuki, all favored suspending publication. With the termination of the Meiroku Zasshi, the activities of the Meirokusha came to an end.

The most important problem in tracing the history of thought in Japan, as we have said, has to do with the relationship between traditional thought and the new Western thought. It was important therefore to see what kind of Western ideas came into Japan and how these were understood and naturalized. The Meirokusha, standing as a bridge between the old and the new, provides us with typical examples of this process.

The older members of the Meirokusha, those born in the 1820's, and the younger ones, those born in the 1840's and 1850's, all grew up within the same Confucian cultural background. From Confucianism they entered Western studies—first Dutch, later English, German and French—and determined the particular form these took in Japan. Western studies which hitherto had been concerned with medicine, astronomy, military science, were, under the influence of the people of the Meirokusha, broadened to include philosophy, political science, economics, religion and morality. The result of this new trend was that in one form or another these studies came to grips with Confucianism. And even among the people of the Meirokusha this conflict was reflected. There were men like Fukuzawa who completely rejected Confucianism, men like Nishimura who persisted in their devotion to Confucianism, and there were those who like Nishi took a middle position and attempted to make an eclectic synthesis between Confucianism and Western learning. These three basic cleavages were repeated throughout the Meiji period. And yet, despite these cleavages and the extremely sharp intellectual conflict these provoked, the members of the Meirokusha remained fast friends. The core of agreement among them was their common background, their advocacy of civilization and enlightenment and their common support of what they all agreed was enlightenment.

The next problem has to do with the role of the Meirokusha in the formation of modern Japan and the classification within
which the society should be placed. All the members except Fukuzawa and Nakamura were in the employ of the Meiji government. This fact has given rise to the following interpretation.

Ever since the closing years of the Tokugawa regime, Western learning was the monopoly of a technical bureaucracy, which structured the absolutist form taken by the government. Those engaged in Western studies were employed as technicians and, thus without marking any contradiction, they were able to continue to serve the new Imperial government as they had served the Bakufu. Their vaunted "freedom" and "independence," as well as their "civilization," did not exist outside the frame-work of the Meiji government’s enlightened despotism. This is the position of Tōyama Shigeki in his *Meiji Ishin* (Meiji Restoration).

By following an interpretation of this nature, the impression is created that these people were members of an unchaste technical bureaucracy who sold themselves to the new Imperial government and thereafter were nothing more than loyal intellectuals at the disposal of this government. Was this, however, really so?

We should have pointed out previously that this interpretation is a biased one. First, these people never considered themselves a "technical bureaucracy." Nishi, in his memorial to Shōgun Keiki, Katō, in his work *Tonarigusa*, indicated that they contemplated the reform of the feudal system rather than its overthrow. They were not technicians but public-spirited young men. It is clear that because of this they experienced danger and suffered persecution. They did not think the Bakufu synonymous with Japan! The Bakufu was nothing more than the administrative form taken by the State called Japan. And, at that, they never considered it an ideal administrative form. The problem was that the Bakufu in submitting to the West would cause the enslavement of the State called Japan. This aroused their common concern. From this standpoint, there was no reason why, when the government became the Meiji
government, they should reject service with it. It was not that as technicians they sensed no contradiction in "selling themselves to the new Imperial government," but rather that their conception was that the *State* called Japan be independent, prosperous, and strong. They were thus able to move from the Tokugawa *government* to the Meiji *government*.

There are some points which must be made in connection with the second part of Tōyama's type of interpretation, the part about "their vaunted freedom and independence..." not existing outside the "...Meiji government's enlightened despotism." This statement premises the absolute State. It assumes that the Meiji government ran about frenziedly to establish this accursed state, and the people of the Meirokusha are excoriated for having been a cat's paw in this enterprise. This kind of thinking posits a law of historical necessity. There are historical stages; feudalism, absolute monarchy, communism, and absolutism thus is as necessary a stage as that winter is the stage through which we must pass before there can be spring. We shall not at present touch on this, nor question the evil or virtue of this thinking. It is sufficient to note that in Japan capitalism, and the absolutism linked to it, is as related to the historical formation of the modern State as, say, the *polis* was to ancient Greece, or the industrial revolution was to the development of modern Europe. The modern State in Japan was modeled on the modern State in the West as it appeared to the Japanese. They wanted a strong system which would protect their independence and freedom. The state structure was designed to overtake the West and the countries of Europe and America which were respected as "advanced" countries. Nothing was looked on as more important to the people of the early Meiji period than friendly relations with foreign countries. It may well be thought that the opposite of the leading concept of that period, Rich Country Strong Soldiery, was the *possibility* of having a Poor Country and Weak Soldiery. It cannot be denied that in later years the concept of imperialism and, indeed, an imperialist movement appeared. Yet, the Meirokusha did
not desire an absolute despotism; its members only wished for a strong national state, for an independent state.

There are many aspects in which the reforms of the Meiji Restoration came to be instituted by the government, and in this regard we can use the word despotism. Still, in the early years of Meiji, the goal was a strong unified state and despotism was nothing but the means to achieve this. The people of the Meirokusha maintained a critical attitude towards the despotic means used by the government. Their knowledge was by far superior to that of the government authorities. They were proud of and had deep faith in themselves as intellectuals, to say nothing of the fact that the majority of them had been professors at the former Kaiseijo. It was possible for them to be independent in their relations with the new Meiji government. To demonstrate this, the intellectual attitudes of these people have been described in some detail. Examples were drawn from the debate over the obligation of the intellectual. The fact that the Imperial Household Lecturer, Nishimura, was in agreement with the idea of a popularly-elected assembly, the fact that others of this group on various points criticized government institutions and policies, constitutes evidence that these people were not “bought” government intellectuals.
PART III. 1880-1890

CHAPTER I.

THE ERA OF POPULAR RIGHTS

1. The Character of the Era of Popular Rights

The civilization and enlightenment movement did not end with the dissolution of the Meirokusha. The Meirokusha phase was merely one phase, the movement itself continued well into the year 1887. During this period, the drive to naturalize and digest Western culture continued without abating. There was, however, a marked difference between the lively activity of the Meirokusha phase, and the activity of the general civilization and enlightenment movement from 1877 to 1887. The people of the Meirokusha typically manifested the rich background to which they had been exposed. They were cultured people, scholars, intellectuals; their concerns penetrated many areas outside politics and were extremely broad in scope. They adopted Western civilization in toto; their purpose was to educate and enlighten the Japanese. With the generation following theirs, however, conditions had become different. Now new people who were by training and upbringing practical implementors of political theories rather than scholars came to the fore. These people were fighters not theoreticians and they fought for freedom and popular rights. Politics was their main concern.

The decade from 1877 to 1887 was a period of political frenzy, of gales and raging seas. Thus, the first decade of Meiji to 1877 was the period of an attempt to adopt the ensemble of Western civilization; the decade following was concerned with special aspects of Western culture and can be called the period of freedom and popular rights. It was characteristic of this age that the newspapers and public opinion at large were almost entirely given over to this concern with popular rights.
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There was another aspect which should not be overlooked. The early years of the Meiji period, years of the "thrusting aside of Buddhism and the smashing of Buddha," were anti-religious in nature. But, paradoxically, the time was one in which freedom of religion was first tacitly permitted and Christianity slowly established itself in Japan. Christianity as a movement did not have the liveliness of the movement for freedom and popular rights, but, looked at from the standpoint of the history of thought, it was of tremendous importance. The magazine, *Rikugō Zasshi* (The Universe), was conceived by Kozaki Hiromichi. Aided by Uemura Masahisa (1857-1925), he began publishing the magazine in 1880. It followed the *Meiroku Zasshi* as the leading intellectual magazine and was proof, as it were, of the importance of Christianity in the thought of this period. The *Rikugō Zasshi* rivalled in influence such important magazines as the *Kokumin No Tomo* (The Nation's Friend) in the later 1880's, and the *Taiyō* (Sun), in the late 1890's. The *Rikugō Zasshi* was not a narrowly Christian magazine; it was in this magazine that the first introductory essays on socialism appeared.

The magazine *Tōyōgakugei Zasshi* (Eastern Arts and Science), represented another significant tendency at this time. People connected with Tōkyō University were active on it and its chief emphasis was on the theory of evolution. The theory of evolution was positivistic and opposed to the natural law—rights of man theory upon which the freedom and popular rights movement was founded. The historicism in the concept of the survival of the fittest, lent itself to a "Japanist" type of nationalism. As a matter of fact, one of the founders of the magazine was the later Japanist, Sugiura Jūgo (1855-1924).

The decade from 1877 to 1887 embraced many aspects. It was the period of freedom and popular rights, but it was also the period in which evolutionary theory was preached. It was a period in which Christianity began to take root and also a period of positivism. It was an age of disruption, of dismemberment. The "unity" of the decade from 1867 to 1877, when
the Meirokusha was actively attempting to synthesize everything under the generic heading of "Western Culture" was gone. Now political concerns were primary, religion was secondary. As time went on, it began to be felt that man was not merely a political animal; he possessed a conscience, a soul; he possessed art, technics and history. The rise of consciousness of self later became the basis for the advocacy of a spiritual revolution in the late 1880's.

Upon examination, the age of freedom and popular rights was not, despite its extreme interest and political importance, of much significance for the history of thought. The age of freedom and popular rights can be considered the most important and progressive era in the Meiji period only if we assume that the passion for the acquisition of political freedom is of the highest significance in man's history. If however, our viewpoint is a broadly humanistic one, then we cannot perceive in this age any deep reflection of individual human problems, social problems or, indeed, national problems. The debate and discussion of this age stopped short with political movements. Indeed, we can attribute the failure of the movement to accomplish its aims during this period to this kind of shallowness.

There were two stages in the debate over freedom and popular rights. The first of these dealt with the petition for the establishment of a popularly-elected assembly. This debate, which was actually initiated by the people of the Meirokusha, was carried over into the next period by the advocates of freedom and popular rights. It formed a bridge between the age of civilization and enlightenment of the Meirokusha and the age of freedom and popular rights. The chief theme was the theory of freedom and popular rights. The second stage was the period after 1882. The main theme here was the controversy over sovereignty. As the scheduled opening of the first Diet was drawing close, the debate over where sovereignty reposed grew ever more virulent. The controversy essentially was whether sovereignty reposed in the people, the sovereign, or in a form of joint rule by both sovereign and people; whether it was
a national sovereignty or a popular sovereignty.

2. The Debate over a Popular Assembly

The debate over freedom and popular rights was at first an appendage of the political movement. In January 1874, a petition for the establishment of a popularly-elected assembly was drawn up by former members of the Council of State, Gotō, Itagaki, and others. They were critical of the fact that real political authority rested neither with the Emperor nor with the people but with a small number of officials. The petition stated in part, "Your subjects humbly submit that in examining political authority we find it does not repose with the Imperial House nor with the people, but only with the officials." This they felt, led to confusion in political administration and would "result in the decline of the State." The establishment of a popular assembly would remedy these evils by making it possible to heed public opinion and limit officialdom. The people have this as a right, "just as the people have the duty of paying taxes to the government, and the government has the right of collecting these, so too, the people have rights as subjects." The group rejected the argument that it was premature to establish a popular assembly, "We who favor the establishment of an assembly are desirous of broadening the true principle of the realm. By establishing the universal principle of popular opinion...the Empire will be encouraged, its happiness and security will be vouchsafed." While there are many problems connected with the withdrawal from the government of Itagaki and the others over the issue of chastising Korea in 1873, it is certain they did not withdraw for the purpose of establishing a popular assembly. On the contrary, it was because they had to withdraw that they petitioned for the establishment of a popular assembly. Their political activities were not motivated by the idea of freedom and popular rights, rather they utilized the idea of freedom and popular rights for their political activities.

In Numbers 3 and 4 of the Meiroku Zasshi, there appeared
criticism of the Petition for the Establishment of a Popular Assembly. This criticism was submitted by Mori Arinori, Nishi Amane and Katō Hiroyuki.

We will first examine Mori’s position. It was suggested above that the petition was a political rationalization adopted by the group when they lost their fight to force the government into a “positive policy” towards Korea. To persons familiar with the circumstances, it was natural that there would be doubt and uncertainty over the objectives of this petition since “its motives are not clear.” And in truth, Mori’s criticism comes down to this point. Mori said that the people advocating the establishment of a popular assembly were people who had formerly, as state councillors, advocated chastising Korea. During the period that these people were in government employ, in October 1873 (Meiji 6), the Press Law had come out. And today (1874) these people were preaching the evil of “the locking-up of public opinion”! Yet, this “locking-up” of public opinion was aided in 1873 when these same people concurred in the passage of the Press Law! Furthermore, had their proposal to chastise Korea been implemented, would public opinion of the Empire have been aroused by this? Was there not the danger that their vaunted popular assembly too, would in practice become an officials’ assembly! Mori’s criticism thus was essentially a political one.

In contrast, Nishi’s argument was primarily a criticism of the theory of freedom and popular rights upon which premises the petition for a popular assembly rested. We saw earlier that Nishi distinguished between the existence of a general natural law, and a normative law which was suited to human beings alone. And, in accord with this concept, the following criticism by Nishi was to be expected. Nishi said the laws of chemistry and physics, and the telegraph and locomotives based on these, are similarly operative in every country. However, the laws dealing with human beings are obviously of a different order. “The English Parliament, the French Parliament, are not similar in their principles; the English polity, the American polity, are
as opposite to each other as Heaven and Earth," he wrote. How is it then possible to think of hastily transplanting Western-style legislatures to Japan? Nishi next criticized the concept of a social contract. He said the authors of the petition for a popular assembly speak of the social contract as constituting "a universal principle," yet history would seem to indicate the unique origins of all states. These can not be consequent upon a contract of any kind. Even scholars are not in agreement about the origins of different states. Nishi was not especially concerned with the right or wrong of the concept of a popular assembly, but with the proliferation of false theory in the petition, and in the movement for popular rights. He said: "These false theories arousing public attention—if once their proponents succeed in establishing a popular assembly, a place where they can mutually consult, will not the state of the Empire be a parlous one indeed!"

Katō's position was that the establishment of a popular assembly was premature. He drew support from Bluntschli's Allgemeines Staats Recht. In England, he observed, the authority of Parliament was certainly very strong and with the exception of someone like Pitt, when a Prime Minister incurred its wrath it was his duty to resign. This was, to be sure, of benefit to England, and was probably why the educated public in England did not engage in ill-considered disturbances or acts of violence. On the Continent, however, someone like Count Bismarck, despite incurring the hatred of both houses of parliament, had the courage to remain in office. This made the revival of Germany possible. It was mainly in this sense that Katō drew on Bluntschli, saying: "This book which I have translated is not against public opinion but only argues against the willful and arbitrary spread of public opinion without reference to the temper of the times and without observing the customs and manners of different peoples."

Thus, within the Meirokusha those opposed to a popular assembly, albeit for different reasons and in different degrees, were Mori, Nishi, and Katō. Those agreeing with the idea of
a popular assembly, and pleading its cause were Tsuda and Nishimura.

Nishimura, first of all, argued in support of Soejima and his group. Certainly Soejima and the others had acted violently in publishing the petition for a popular assembly. One could not on this account assume that their views were mistaken. Many a deed of unusual merit has resulted from violence. Nishimura distinguished between "violence leading to good and violence leading to evil." The rebellion of Washington and Franklin against England was an example of violence engendering good; the overthrow of the King of France by Robespierre and Danton was an example of violence leading to evil. And the theory of a popular assembly based on the principle of the supremacy of the common people was established as valid by the fact of the wealth and power of the countries of Europe and America. Arguing in this fashion, Nishimura said that England's Parliament was inaugurated 600 years ago when her intellectual level had probably been lower than that of the present day Japan. Therefore the idea of a popular assembly in Japan is to be "deplored for its lateness, not attacked for its prematureness."

The defense of the popular assembly made by Tsuda Shindō (1829-1903), came one-half year later than the arguments attacking it which we noted above, and was published in the Meiroku Zasshi for June 1874. This article also contained a criticism of the idea of an assembly of peers. The circumstances which led to this were that the Itagaki group's petition for a popular assembly had prompted the government officials to take action. A special proclamation was issued in May 1874 asking for detailed reports on the condition of the people in the various districts, and preparation was made for the opening of the Assembly of Prefectural Governors. In June 1875, the Assembly of Prefectural Governors opened, and the special proclamation was made public. The view was current that the Assembly of Prefectural Governors would correspond to the English Lower House and the Peers' Assembly would be like the Upper House.
Tsuda's views ran counter to this anomalous theory of a popular assembly. In effect, he criticized these views as follows: the Peers' Assembly could not constitute an upper house, nor the Assembly of Prefectural Governors a lower one. A member of a parliament ought to be a person of superior knowledge; the aristocrats did not possess this qualification and, consequently, to speak of a Peers' Assembly was meaningless. The prefectural governors as deputies of the Emperor were not representatives of the people and, consequently, the Assembly of Prefectural Governors could not be a substitute for the lower house of an assembly. How then was a popular representative assembly to be formed? Tsuda's electorate would comprise those ex-samurai and commoners whose taxes came to 200 yen a year for city people, and 50 yen a year for rural people. These individuals would constitute true representatives of the nation in the assembly.

The material just presented regarding the various viewpoints of the people of the Meirokusha, supporting and attacking the idea of a popular assembly, is substantial proof that these people were not merely "bought" government intellectuals. We must now proceed to an analysis of the views of the Itagaki camp.

Katō Hiroyuki published a lengthy criticism of the Petition for a Popular Assembly prior to his short essay on this subject in the 
Meiroku Zasshi. The article in the Meiroku Zasshi was a supplement to this criticism. The following two points were the most essential in Katō's argument. First, the basic purpose behind the plan to establish a popular assembly is to inaugurate a constitutional system. The question remains, however, are the Japanese really ready to establish an adequate constitutional system? Is not the true condition of Japan one in which "there is almost no one who can explain such simple things as what is the proper sphere of government, the duty of subjects; what is the reason for paying taxes, and for military duty?" As Biedermann said, the constitutional system of a country must be appropriate to its conditions; what is suitable for a civilized
country cannot be said to be suitable for a backward country. Katō felt that this observation was very apt for Japan. In Europe too, a backward country like Russia had not yet established a parliament.

Secondly, Katō considered that Japan rather than establish an assembly, should pay attention to raising its educational level. Katō said, "It is best to create a civilized country and to pay attention to the education of its human material, in order to establish an adequate parliament." While the Petition itself did not preach an indiscriminate progress, still in terms of actual Japanese conditions, it could be criticized as so doing. To rush the establishment of an assembly under present Japanese conditions—when the people did not yet know how to make use of freedom—meant to risk the danger of disorders and rebellion. This, in substance, was Katō's criticism. The "Answer to Katō Hiroyuki," by Soejima, Gotō, and Itagaki, and the "Argument for a Popular Assembly," by Okamoto, Komuro, and Furusawa, was the response made to this criticism.

These rebuttals were based on Mill's Representative Government. Itagaki's "Answer to Katō Hiroyuki" was entirely based on quotations drawn from Mill's work. He argued against Katō's thesis that Japan was not yet ready for constitutional government because of its low cultural level. Itagaki argued just the reverse, saying:

...Japan's people are excessively docile, submissive, and shallowly civilized because of the errors of the former system they lived under. Mill has said that human progress is the consequence of dissatisfaction. How can a people who have become extremely docile in all things as a consequence of their government, who bear patiently all suffering, thinking this to be as inevitable as natural disasters, hope to rise to the level of civilization! For this reason, if we desire to advance the position of the Japanese people, it is necessary to make them reject docility and revive the spirit of native venturesomeness.

There was only one way to do this, Itagaki believed; the
old system had to be rectified. This was the only way to proper progress for the Japanese. Answering Katō's second criticism that education must come first, Itagaki again relied upon Mill for an answer. He said: “The way to teach and educate the people, to speedily advance civilization, is through the establishment of a popular representative assembly.” Itagaki considered that the way to advance the knowledge of the people was not merely through books but by having the people participate in the political affairs of the community.

We cannot go into a detailed discussion on the way in which Mill's thought was adopted by the Itagaki group. Mill's Representative Government comprises so many political, philosophical points that the Itagaki group ignored. For example, does Mill conceive political organization to be organic or mechanical? How are we to interpret his, “political organization is not built but grows”; what is the instrumentality whereby this “organic” growth is achieved? Then too, there is the problem of the relationship between order and progress. The writings of the Itagaki group also show no evidence of any reflection on Mill's concept of originality, or individuality. Mill's thought was used as a weapon for political struggle and as such, was only grasped superficially.

The Itagaki group did not go beyond Mill's surface aspects to attain deeper understanding of his thought. In terms of the concrete facts of Japan at that time, their interpretation of Mill, their method of selection from Mill, are worthy of attention. They used Mill's thought to interpret the Meiji Restoration. In the preface to the “Answer to Katō Hiroyuki” by the Itagaki group they wrote:

The great change in present-day Japan, the setting-up of this new government, are consequences of the rise of the lower orders. This all began with the preachings of wandering rōnin who had broken with their clans and were now conducting agitation among the samurai. The samurai, in turn, preached to the clan lords. Under the leadership of the young Emperor the government of the Tokugawa was overthrown
and a new political structure was built. With the publication of the Charter Oath, public opinion was to be the determinant in all things; the clans were to send delegates to take part in the affairs of the Empire. There then took place 'the return of the land and people to the Emperor,' the establishment of a unified administration over hitherto separated administrative districts, the abolition of territorial clans and the establishment of modern prefectures. These splendid accomplishments followed from the adopting of a host of opinions and from putting public opinion in the Empire at the disposal of the Emperor.

From the foregoing it is clear that the Itagaki group felt that Mill's "...nothing is more certain than that improvement in human affairs is wholly the work of uncontented characters" was certainly applicable to the role played by the wandering, discontented rōnin and lower samurai in the Meiji Restoration. Also, they felt that the success achieved was a consequence of consulting public opinion in all matters. At present, when power was in the hands of a few officials, they believed that their theory of a popular assembly would broaden the base of power and make possible the acquisition of the benefits of a more thorough-going public opinion.

Another aspect pointed out was the tendency to what later was called "clan government." Even at this time, there was a growing trend on the part of members of the stronger clans which had played leading parts in the Restoration to gather governmental positions in their hands. The Furusawa group's "Defense of the Popular Assembly" made the following statements:

Government officials are always people from Satsuma, Chōshū and Tosa; the power of government is always in the hands of these people: The highest officials, those directly appointed by the Emperor, number 67. The number of people from the four leading clans is 44.

Satsuma ......................... 18
Chōshū .......................... 12
Thus four clans out of a total of over 200 held over 65.5 per cent of the highest positions.

This work by the Furusawa group stated.

The reforms of the Restoration were accomplished by meritorious retainers, men of ability. These people and the present government officials were almost all one-time advocates of expelling the barbarians! (We too [Furusawa et al.] were formerly of this same group.) Once, however, their confusion was dispelled and their knowledge broadened, they were able to achieve the success we see today.

Statements like these were certainly directed at Katō, a former official of the Bakufu and “one-time advocate” of keeping Japan closed.

The theories of Freedom and Popular Rights, which took as their point of departure the Petition for a Popular Assembly were almost all similar to those we have presented. Later, there were also debates between radicals like Ōi Kentaro (1843-1922), and Katō Hiroyuki, but these were not too significant.

In 1879 Ueki Emori (1856-1892), who was Itagaki’s mentor on intellectual matters, published his *Minken Jiyū ron* (On Freedom and Popular Rights). In this extremely interesting and readable work he wrote:

According to Rousseau, man is born free and can be called a free animal. Therefore, statements that freedom comes from social laws and rules to the contrary, notwithstanding, it is Nature which endows men with freedom. If people do not take this natural endowment it is both a great sin against Nature and a great disgrace to themselves. Disgrace does not reside merely in taking things which should not be taken, but also in not taking things which should be taken! To steal is a disgrace, to lie is a disgrace, to be an adulterer is a disgrace; for the people not to take their natural right to freedom
is similarly a great disgrace!

In this work, Ueki’s burning desire for liberty was apparent. And while this work stirred people up, it was not especially original in its thought. Ueki ignored Rousseau’s criticism of modern civilization, his romanticism, and confined himself to using the theory of the social contract as a weapon against feudalism and absolutism.

3. The Dispute over Sovereignty

The controversy over the Petition for the Establishment of a Popular Assembly was, as we have seen, a lively one and the advocates of freedom and popular rights gave vigorous expression to these ideas. These ideas, however, were comparatively simple. The concept of the natural rights of man was accepted almost as a self-evident truth; the works of Rousseau and Mill were quoted with the reverence usually accorded sacred scriptures. This trend led to the translation of Mill’s works and Rousseau’s writings. These were translated, read and fought over. Mill’s Utilitarianism, his Considerations on Representative Government, Spencer’s Social Statics, Rousseau’s Social Contract, and various other writings were translated. It is of interest to note that Utilitarianism was translated by Nishi Amane in 1878; Fragment on Government and Social Statics were translated by Matsushima Kowashi in 1881, and Rousseau’s Social Contract was translated by Nakae Chōmin in 1882.

Of all these, Nakae Chōmin’s translation of Rousseau’s Social Contract, despite the fact that it was rendered into an extremely difficult kanbun or Chinese style, was highly esteemed by most people. We saw in the last section that Nishi raised questions in his criticism concerning the basis on which the theory of the natural rights of man rested. No attempt was made to answer these questions. This was probably typical, and showed clearly the level of the intellectuals of that period.

The year 1881, when Ōkuma Shigenobu (1838-1922) was forced to withdraw from the government, was a year of political
change. On October 14, 1881 an Imperial Rescript was issued to the effect that a national Diet would be established in 1890. This breathed new life into the newspapers and other organs of opinion. It is likely that this also led to the formation of new political parties. Public-speaking societies began to proliferate. Now too, the problem as to where sovereignty ought to repose when the Diet was inaugurated arose in concrete form and required a decision. The controversy over whether the establishment of a popular assembly was premature or not was now an academic question. The abstract theory of natural rights too was a problem no longer capable of being resolved. The actual history of Japan now entered into all these questions and as we shall see later, Katō Hiroyuki and others rejected the natural rights theory on the basis of Japan's historical experience.

There were two great newspapers representing the two main trends of that time. These newspapers, which fought out the problem of where sovereignty was to repose, were the Tokyo Yokohama Mainichi Shinbun, which was the organ of the parties in opposition to the government, and the Tokyo Nichi Nichi Shinbun, which professed to be the paper of the government party. There is a vivid portrayal of conditions of that time in the reminiscences of the editor of the Nichi Nichi, Fukuchi Gen'ichirō (1841-1906). He later became the prime mover in the Rikken Teiseitō, the party supporting the government. Fukuchi is perhaps better known by his pen name, Ouchi Koji. In these reminiscences he said:

Previously when I discussed current affairs, I did so as a believer in gradualism. To be sure, the problem of sovereignty came up as a vexatious one. I did not question the fact that sovereignty in a monarchy—whether authoritarian or constitutional—always reposed in the monarch. I published such views from time to time when the question of sovereignty arose. I felt that public opinion could not disagree with these views, indeed, how could I think otherwise! The Tokyo newspapers let their pens run on, piling article upon article and
I attacked their views. Before long, I felt these newspapers were enemies of the Empire. Hitherto, I had often had the experience of being as if in a besieged fortress surrounded by my adversaries, and normally my feelings were not much affected. When the number of adversaries refuting my views increased and they showed vigor and arrogance in their attacks on my views of sovereignty, it was frightening. The reason was that I had deeply believed that in the Japanese Empire, there could never arise such controversy over the question of sovereignty. Its occurrence was utterly unexpected. These people argued that sovereignty in a constitutional state reposed in its assembly, or that sovereignty lay somewhere between the monarch and the assembly, or that sovereignty was an omnipotent force which was not to be limited, or that the monarch possessed only a part of sovereignty. Although their views differed variously in expression, they were all joined in declaring that the principle of authority resting with the sovereign was dictatorial and not constitutional. They took turns in attaching my principle and finally attempted to crush me altogether. I felt that if this were not so we could not plan on any long-run security for Japan. Therefore, I attacked dissenting views and sought support for my theories in Western works. To my regret I could find none. While I usually felt respectful in my attitude towards the English and American scholars, I found that I differed with their views. Their works were useless to me against the weapons of my enemies. I was completely discouraged by this. Outside, the enemy was eagerly pressing on; inside, military tacticians and staff members, as it were, were rebelling against me, were in collusion with the enemy. In the face of this, was I to doff my helmet and surrender to my opponents or was I to die fighting? I was reduced to the point where I had to select one of these two alternatives!

What we have presented is a cursory outline of the debate on the question of sovereignty. The controversy flared up over two editorials. First, the Mainichi Shinbun published an edi-
torial titled “On the Location of Sovereignty.” The Nichi Nichi Shinbun then attempted a rebuttal in an editorial called “Theory of Sovereignty.”

The Mainichi argued that there were basically three views on the location of sovereignty: (1) One person, the monarch, is the locus of sovereignty. Sovereignty reposes in the monarch’s will which is the law. The monarch’s will transmits the directives of Heaven. This view, of course, is unacceptable. (2) Sovereignty reposes in the people—following traditional Chinese reasoning, “Since the Emperor Shun is a man we too are men.” But, since the will of the people is subject to endless change, it is unstable and cannot be the source of law. (3) Sovereignty neither reposes in one person nor in all the people, but in justice. The latter is the most suitable of all. Probably the basis upon which representatives in an assembly discuss with each other is the mutual quest for justice. In this connection the word seiri, which usually means right reason—truth, was their rendering of the word justice. The Mainichi’s position was that the basis of sovereignty lay in justice, and since the representative of justice was the popular assembly, then sovereignty, per force, rested in the assembly. Underlying the Mainichi’s assertion, was Blackstone’s concept that “Sovereignty is that force which enacts law.”

The Nichi Nichi maintained that the State was organic, saying: “When we say that the state functions organically, we compare it to a great body which must have a head to control it. Sovereignty is the head and brains of this organic State.” The Nichi Nichi criticized Rousseau’s theory as being “not an aspiration for amelioration but a hope for revolutionary change.” In an age of transition, this theory was not conducive to the security of the State. In attempting to determine the location of sovereignty it was possible to conceive of many origins for the various states, but that, given the “incomparable, unique and characteristic Japanese national polity,” sovereignty reposed in the Emperor. Thus, in contrast to the Mainichi which equated sovereignty with the legislative power, the Nichi Nichi took the
position that sovereignty which comprised legislative, judicial and executive powers reposed in the State which was the supreme sovereign authority. The Emperor and the State were of course synonymous.

This was the nucleus of the debate over sovereignty. At first glance the Mainichi’s position when compared to the Nichi Nichi was well organized and clear. Fukuchi’s statement about these ideas being hardfought ones was correct. Public opinion generally was on the side of the Mainichi. In the foregoing debate the theory of natural rights no longer appeared openly. Among the various articles which were written as different personalities took sides the most outstanding one was called “General Remarks on Sovereignty,” and appeared in the Yoron Shinshi (New Public Opinion Journal). The position of the Mainichi that sovereignty did not repose in all the people but in justice was simply following in the steps of the natural rights theory. The article in the Yoron Shinshi took issue with this justice theory which it argued was inadequate. From a sociological standpoint to locate sovereignty in society meant that sovereignty reposed in the people, the “stuff” of society. It was not likely that society had arisen as the consequence of a contract since there was not one historical fact which would support this concept. Moreover, if society were a consequence of a contract, it should be possible to dissolve society by public design, as it were. And yet, from the outset, this is a patent impossibility; human beings born in society have not the right to slough it off. The article expressed it thus: “It can safely be said that human beings are born into society, without necessarily claiming that they make society. Therefore, they cannot have the right to slough off society.” Sovereignty was thus made to repose both in the people and in society.

We must now attempt to see why the natural rights theory produced such criticism. This period, as we said, was one in which Rousseau and Mill were avidly read and in general, the main trend of the times moved along such lines. In 1881 excerpts from Edmund Burke’s “Reflections on the Revolution in France”
together with various others of his writings were published under the title of "A Summary of Political Theories" by Edmund Burke translated by Kaneko Kentarō." Somewhat later, in the year 1883, one part of Thomas Hobbes' *Leviathan* was published under the title *Shuken-ron* (Theory of Sovereignty). The translation of Burke was prepared under Genrōin (Senate) auspices and the translation of Hobbes was made for the Mombushō (Japanese Ministry of Education). Both were, in a sense, publications from "above," a fact not to be disregarded. There were, however, deeper, or more basic reasons why the publication of these books at this time was noteworthy. The theory of natural rights had a destructive function in Japan, it was not a constructive theory. From the closing years of the Bakufu and down to the early years of the Meiji period, the consequence of Fukuzawa's phrase, "Heaven places no man over his fellows, neither does it subordinate any man to them," was the criticism and destruction of all things feudal. There was breathed into the people a spirit of freedom and equality. The work of destruction could not continue indefinitely and society could not but change towards reconstruction. When this trend became dominant there were traditions from the past, from which society and the state could be rebuilt. Individual human beings comprised the materials for this reconstruction. Their essences, abilities, characters, were not "free and equal" despite the ideal that no man was above his fellows or below them: real human beings have never attained such an ideal.

The attempt to rebuild with real human beings, forced a re-examination of the real historical and social context within which these human beings lived. There resulted a national self-consciousness which could not but be joined to this historical self-awareness. Even Mill has said, "National character is the product of diverse causes...chief among these, however, is the similarity of political origins, the possession of a national history." It is this which provided the deeper reason for the criticism directed at the natural rights theory. This national self-consciousness which we will deal with in more detail later,
became very apparent after 1887. The evidence for its existence even earlier is afforded by the strength of the criticism directed at natural rights even when this theory was apparently the dominant political theory in Japan.

In the early period this inchoate awareness took form as criticism directed at natural rights theory from the standpoint of evolutionary theory, from the standpoint of social Darwinism. Most representative of this criticism was Katō Hiroyuki’s *JinKen Shinsetsu* (New Theory of Human Rights) which appears in 1882.


Katō Hiroyuki gave the following description of the origin of this *JinKen Shinsetsu*:

I too once worshipped the doctrine of natural rights. My early writings, the *Shinsei Tai-i*, the *Kokutai Shinron*, among others greatly evidence this orientation. Later, since I came to believe in the truth of the theory of evolution, I developed serious doubts over the validity of natural rights. When I investigated the writing of various theoreticians, I was not able to find any attacking this theory. It was in November 1879—I have forgotten the day—that I first made a speech attacking natural rights theory. I also made a similar speech on March 7, 1880. In June of that year I read a book by an Austrian which argued the relationship between morality and evolutionary theory. This book held that Darwin’s theory of evolution made possible a proper understanding of mental phenomena. It pointed out that the theory of natural rights had no validity. We are not ‘endowed’ with rights; we acquire them. For the first time I saw clearly that our rights are those which we as individuals have been able to acquire... I saw clearly that our individually acquired rights are inextricably tied to the fortunes of our country. I felt indescribable joy at finding views, which I had begun to hold earlier, expressed in this book. Later, in a German work on the
history of civilization, I again found confirmation of my view that the natural rights theory was mistaken. This book held that the strong suppress the weak, the superior dominate the inferior, that this was an unchanging law of nature from ancient times to the present. Katō clearly showed that he had serious doubts about natural rights theory as early as 1879-1880, although he did not publish his views until 1882.

In his Hiroyuki Jiden (Autobiography) he wrote: In 1882, when 47 years old, I published a pamphlet called the Jinken Shinsetsu. This was the first work I wrote since my ideas on natural rights changed....It was when I read the great scholar Buckle's classic work on the history of civilization in England that I first knew that metaphysics was an illusion. I felt then that I could not discuss anything not based on natural science. Later, when I read Darwin's theory of evolution and the evolutionary philosophies of Spencer and Haeckel, my cosmological concepts and my philosophy of life were completely changed. And because I came to the conclusion that our rights were not natural endowments but completely the products of a gradual evolution, I expounded on this subject in the Jinken Shinsetsu.

Katō Hiroyuki had espoused the natural rights position at a very early period. His book Tonarigusa, which he wrote during the closing years of the Bakufu, was based on natural rights theory and was the first exposition of constitutional theory in Japan. As late as 1875 he wrote in his Kokutai Shinron: "The Emperor is a man and the people too are men....The Emperor and the people are similarly members of the human race. Therefore, while the Emperor may exercise authority, he never has the right to treat the people as cattle." This same Katō Hiroyuki who in 1881 became president of the new Tokyo Imperial University was now (1882) attacking the theory of natural rights. For this reason, there was a school of thought which believed that the change in Katō's viewpoint was not based on scholarly conviction but on political exigencies. This
interpretation made it clear that now Katō’s “true character” as a “bought” government intellectual plainly emerged.

We cannot agree with this view. The change in Katō’s viewpoint did not first begin at this time; it was not a sudden, a flustered change. As stated earlier, Katō’s thesis during the Meirokusha period, on the prematureness of a popular assembly was already a sign of this change. Katō himself said:

Even during the Bakufu period, as I stated previously, I went as far in my advocacy of constitutional government as to write books like Tonarigusa and Rikken Seitai Ryaku. And, when the theory calling for the establishment of a popular assembly arose in 1874, I should, of course, have been very much in agreement with it. The question arises as to why I attacked this theory. At the time I wrote the aforementioned works my learning was still extremely shallow; it was a case of seeing beauty elsewhere and immediately desiring to emulate it. When I examined from an historical standpoint the prevailing condition of state rehabilitation, I felt the immediate establishment of a constitutional system was inappropriate. My idea in the period of the Bakufu that a constitutional system had to be established was pure academicism. Moreover, in view of the aforementioned historical and prevailing state conditions, my thinking fluctuated from the concept that the immediate establishment of a constitutional system was not possible to the position that it was premature, and I largely attacked the opposing concepts. Whereupon gossip began to noise it about that I was secretly acting at the behest of Kido Takayoshi in espousing views of this nature, that I had become a ‘lantern-bearer’ or booster of the government. While I was being thus eagerly defamed, it goes without saying that a great man like Kido Takayoshi was not the kind of person to do anything so base. Nor am I the kind of base person who acts on the request of another and who would argue for something that was opposed to my way of thinking.

Katō stated, then, his thesis regarding the prematureness of a popular assembly was based on his conception of actual
"historical and prevailing state conditions" and not upon the request of Kido Takayoshi. Katō was a realist, and later even called himself a materialist and a believer in the doctrine of self-interest. It was his sense of reality that made the theory of natural rights conceptually inadequate. To Katō the scholar, however, there was an even more important reason for his dissatisfaction; the theory of natural rights could not be proven in terms of scientific positivism. It could not be established as a concrete natural phenomenon, but was an abstract construct of mind. This, therefore, was the deeper reason why Katō was forced over to the Darwin-Haeckel theory of evolution, to the theory of the survival of the fittest. And, indeed, upon examination of the contents of Katō's Jinken Shinsetsu this become obvious.

In the latter work Katō stated that Rousseau was "a proponent of chimeric ideas, without precedent from ancient times down to the present." The theory of natural rights, he said, could not be established as an historical fact by proof or test; it was nothing more than a wild fancy. On the other hand, the theory of evolution which taught the survival of the fittest, really was a manifestation of a universal law. In the face of this great truth the natural rights doctrine should vanish like a mirage. Katō expressed this even more clearly in the following:

According to this theory, the gradations of inferior and superior exists in plants and animals and is a result of the double process of heredity and mutation. Consequently, to accomplish the purpose of the maintenance and growth of life, mutual competition is generated in which the superior always conquers and the inferior is defeated. Only in this way is life carried on. By this means alone is it possible to transmit one's acquisitions to one's descendents, and this eternal and unchanging principle of nature can be said to be the supreme rule for all. The universe is like one great scene of carnage. In order to preserve their existence and to aggrandize themselves, all things are in constant competition on
this battle field and strive mightily in this battle to the finish. The result of this is always the confirmation of the principle of survival of the fittest.

And also:
The fact remains that the survival of the fittest is easily proven by the historical evidence of societies from ancient times to the present and, perforce, wipes out any specious proof of the existence of natural rights to liberty, independence, and equality.

Katō concluded:
The division of all mankind into inferiors and superiors leads to a continual struggle for the survival of the fittest. This great standard is law for all things and is truly eternal and unchanging. It is plain that individual men and mankind in general are never naturally endowed with rights to freedom, independence, and equality. The proponents of wild fancies, not being able to know this indisputable and clear principle of truth, have eagerly advocated natural rights. These people do not know that such rights as we do have are those which have been taken by force from others...

Katō Hiroyuki first criticized the theory of natural rights from the standpoint of the doctrine of evolution. Following this, he argued that all sorts of human rights originated in progressive stages as acquired rights, not "natural rights," and were consequent upon the growth and perfection of the State and the establishment of a solidly-based society. Finally, to plan for the progress of these rights he adopted the doctrine of gradualism which depended not on universal suffrage but on a restricted electorate. This, in short, was the content of Katō's Jinken Shinsetsu.

Katō's views immediately led to the publication of a great number of criticisms. Yano Fumio, in his Jinken Shinsetsu Bakuron, (Refutation of the New Theory of Human Rights), which appeared in December 1882 (Meiji 15), argued as follows: Katō Hiroyuki said that the survival of the fittest was a universal law, this was an illogical contention since it overlooked
the existence of a distinction between human law and the law of nature. The rights of human beings are separated into legal and moral principles and the former are based on the latter. The source of moral principles is, furthermore, based on the fact that heaven endows human beings with reason. This is what is meant by naturally endowed human rights, or natural rights. This is not, as in the laws of nature, something which takes place spontaneously, but is from time to time violated. Yet, this violation notwithstanding, it is precisely in the existence of the right to oppose that man’s natural rights are expressed. Thus Yano said:

A tyrannical government is biased and partial in its attitude towards the people, to one section it affords an irrational happiness, to another, irrational hardship. These classes are extremely unequal and greatly unbalanced; one segment of the people thus inflicts humiliations on the other segment. To prevent this inequality and unevenness which leads to the irrational inflicting of humiliation, to escape this by the power of that rationality which is a concomitant of equality is consequent upon the natural right to equality.

Baba Tatsui, in his Tempu Jinken Ron (On Natural Rights), published in January 1883, and Ueki Emori, in his Tempu Jinken Ben, (Defense of Natural Rights), published at the same time, attempted similarly to refute Katō Hiroyuki. The basis of Baba’s argument was that there was in truth a distinction between tangibles and intangibles. The truth for mankind was made up of abstract principles like liberty, equality, happiness—in other words, spiritual principles—and one of these was the principle of natural rights. In this connection Baba wrote: “Katō Hiroyuki supposes that because men have from ancient times struggled for existence, and have often left evidence of having made progress, that this is how progress is accomplished. Katō then presents this as the only way in which progress is made.” It was stated in Ueki’s work that a human being has the right to devote his life to happiness, this very right of existence is a naturally-endowed right and is proved by the fact
that only human beings have the impulse to quest happiness. In Ueki’s words,

For this reason, I leave off questioning these articles one by one and instead add only one word by way of summing up: the word happiness. From this word the rights man is naturally endowed with should be clear. Man’s aspiration for happiness is something which comes from nature. And by the fact that man acquires happiness he demonstrates that he is fit to receive this gift. Therefore, for man to plan on happiness is in accord with reason, which is an attribute of man, and it is moreover proper for man to achieve this. This is a right which concerns man! Can this then not be called a natural human right!

We have presented the gist of Katō’s Jinken Shinsetsu and the criticism against it. This debate makes us feel the following two things. First, speaking from the standpoint of those advocating natural rights—Yano, Baba, Ueki—at whatever point their criticism is examined, their concept of natural rights was never simply based on natural law. It must be acknowledged to have been an “ought” type of concept, a normative concept. This is the meaning of statements like “the power of rationality which prevents irrational humiliation and infringement on the rights of others,” of “precisely the way in which human progress should take place,” or “that reason which should, properly, accomplish this.” They had not, as yet, come to the point of having adequate theoretical awareness of, or reflecting critically on, their intellectual position. Had this awareness appeared, it would have manifested something resembling idealism. This inchoate idealism prepared the way for the spiritualism or idealism of the later 1880’s. Next, Katō’s evolutionism and his concept of the survival of the fittest, which was combined with a thoroughgoing positivism, was, in the late 1880’s, joined to the conspicuous imperialism of that age. There was also an aspect in which evolutionism as a species of historicism was joined to nationalism and at tempted to find in Japanese history the proper way for the Japanese state. It was the Tōyō Gakugei
Zasshi which preached Darwin’s and Haeckel’s positivism (scientism) and evolutionism (historicism). Toyama Shōichi, (1848-1900), who stood rather close to the evolutionist position, criticized Katō in an article which appeared in the above magazine. In view of the influence of Christianity on Toyama he will be taken up in the next chapter.
CHAPTER II.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE NEW SPIRIT OF MEIJI

1. The Advent of Christianity and its Adaptation.

Nakamura Masanao and Mori Arinori we have described as people who early developed deep feelings for Christianity. We especially described the importance of Nakamura’s concepts in this regard. The members of the Meirokusha drawn to Christianity, however, were not just limited to these two. Tsuda Sen, who founded the first agricultural school in Japan, was baptized on January 3, 1875 (Meiji 8). Also, Sugi Kōji was sympathetic to Christianity. Today there is scarcely anyone who knows who Sugi Kōji was. The study of statistics in Japan was begun by Sugi. His daughter, Seiko, was the wife of Takayama Chogyū, one of the outstanding literary figures and critics of the mid-Meiji period. Sugi was an extremely interesting “Meiji type.”

The other members of the Meirokusha had come from the samurai class, Sugi alone was a commoner. He lost his parents when he was a child and was later apprenticed to a watchmaker in Nagasaki. At that time one of the most direct contacts with foreign culture could be had through watchmakers. Becoming well-acquainted with the Dutch scholar group, Sugi went to Osaka and enrolled in the private boarding school of Ogata Kōan. He supported himself in his studies by working nights as a masseur, and lived wretchedly to keep himself in school. Later he came to the attention of Katsu Kaishū and became an instructor at the Kaiseijo. At the same time that he was employed in submitting translations of a weekly Dutch newspaper to the Shōgun’s Council, he managed to read some ten volumes covering the greater part of world history in two and one-half years. He reminisced about that time, saying: “When I read of the upheaval in France I was amazed; I was dumb-founded at a social upheaval like this, and I realized somehow
that there were shifting tides in the great movements of human society."

It was at this time, too, that for the first time Sugi saw statistics on Bavarian education. These statistics showed in percentages how many people could or could not read, write, and do arithmetic. He greatly admired the fact that with figures one could see at a glance the condition of a given society, and he felt keenly that for the purpose of state development this type of basic inquiry into facts was absolutely necessary. After the Meiji Restoration when the Shōgun removed to Shizuoka, Sugi followed him there. Aiming to help rehabilitate the Tokugawas, he attempted an on-the-spot survey of the condition of the people. Most people, however, were unresponsive to his investigation. Therefore, he first won over Jirochō of Shimizu, an almost legendary semi-outlaw, and, with his assistance, was said to have gone from house to house making his inquiries. This survey was suspended due to the prohibition of the new Meiji government. Later, Sugi took service with the new government and his population statistics for the province of Kai, constituted the first complete statistical survey ever made in Japan. It was on Sugi's suggestion that the cabinet established a Bureau of Statistics. This was nominally under the presidency of Ōkuma, but actually was directed by Sugi. In 1881, with the great political change that led to Ōkuma's withdrawing from the government, Sugi resigned and inaugurated a school for statistics.

For these reasons Sugi is considered the father of statistics in Japan. I intentionally introduced his biography since the attitude he assumed at the time of the surrender of Edo Castle can certainly be considered of interest. Sugi wrote about the events of that time as follows:

The ex-Shōgun had fled by steamer and returned to Edo confining himself to retirement in the Ueno district. In Kyoto, meanwhile, the ex-Shōgun was declared a traitor, since his followers had taken up arms against the Imperial Authority. Prince Arisugawa, Commander-in-Chief of the Army charged
with subjugating the East (Kantō area, etc.), was advancing on Edo. The vanguard of his army had already reached Suruga, and it was said that before long it would be breaking into Edo itself. The Shōgun's bannermen, the hatamoto, were humbly pledging allegiance to the new regime; the public mind was alarmed and there was an urgent sense of crisis.

I could not sit by with folded arms and accordingly I invited a certain Kinugasa, a district headman ("boss") of my acquaintance to my house. When I explained that 'for some three hundred years the dwellers of Edo had under the patronage of the Shōguns incurred benefits and in this time of extraordinary crisis there must be some method for showing gratitude,' Kinugasa's words were, 'It is as you say. We too are greatly concerned, but we have not been able to devise any good plan.' I replied, 'It would be advisable if the representatives of the various districts, as citizens of Edo, were to confer and go to the vanguard of the Imperial army to present petitions. They should be attired in formal clothes, but wear straw sandals to indicate their haste in departure, and should carry as food only the simplest rice-balls. In this way they may demonstrate their loyalty.' Kinugasa concurred with this and said something to the effect that from Yamanote he could probably muster some 160 people who would support this idea.

Thereupon, provided with petitions based on Sugi's draft proposal, one group went to the Itabashi district, the other to the Shinagawa entrance to Edo to entreat with the advancing Imperial armies. Sugi continued his description of conditions in Edo of that time, saying:

In those days all the learned men submitted, every official took leave from government business, which came to a halt. There was no superintendence whatsoever within the city, and thieves swaggered about in broad daylight. Fires broke out everywhere; in the temples bandits broke in and were ringing the fire bells; it was truly a period when violence and lawlessness were running riot. I had from time to time read
about anarchy in European history and now I felt very strongly that the condition of Edo at this time was what anarchy must be like.

Sugi’s attitude, as here noted, must be considered to be of interest, especially when compared with Fukuzawa’s and Katō’s attitudes at this time. Fukuzawa, it will be remembered, manifested an attitude of resignation and busied himself with lecturing at his school on economics from an English book. Katō, donning formal attire, went to Edo Castle intending to make recommendations to the Shōgun. In contrast to these two, Sugi’s attitude—the commoner’s attitude, in a sense—made him feel at a very early stage the need for some kind of political organization. In this connection, he proposed to Katsu Kaishū, “This being the state of affairs, would it not be best to take an active part in organizing a party of good, like-minded, public-spirited people?” To this Katsu made reply, “No, no. It would not be good to establish a party. In the present state of affairs it is sufficient when one succeeds in not becoming a beggar or a thief!”

It is somewhat of a digression, but in the early years of the Meiji period those who had some connection with Christianity when it entered Japan were like Katsu Kaishū, either servitors of the old Bakufu or people who had been branded as “enemies of the imperial Authority.” We will briefly touch on the relationship of these people of Christianity. We saw above that Katsu Kaishū’s outlook on life at this time resembled that of the ancient Chinese Taoist philosophers, Lao Tze and Chuang Tze. Later, however, from a letter he sent to Niijima Jō, encouraging him in the establishment of Dōshisha, Katsu’s sympathy for Christianity becomes clear. Kozaki Hiromichi has written the following in his memoirs: (This was after the publication of the Meiroku Zasshi was suspended. At the time the Meirokusha used to meet in a Western-style restaurant called Mikawayá in Nishikicho, in Kanda.)

One time when I was present at a meeting, Count Katsu Awa was invited and asked to present his views. The primary
subject of the discussion was the ethical problem of Christianity. Fukuzawa Yukichi had stated that while there were many points which ought to be studied in connection with the morality of Christianity, the inadequate moral and filial relationship between parents and children could be considered a defect of Christianity. This, Count Katsu made answer to at once. He said, in effect, that for every one thing known about Christianity by Fukuzawa there were two things he did not know. The people who are completely unable to see the practise of filial piety among the Westerners in Japan are not few in number. At present, there is an American named Whitney who has been living at my home for an extended period. Recently his mother died after having been ill. She had one son and two daughters, and it goes without saying that they nursed her while she was ill. After her death, for a period of four weeks, they went to visit her grave every day; down to the present they still go every Sunday to visit her grave. The people of my household can not help being deeply impressed by this.

Mori Arinori, who was present at the discussion, added to Count Katsu's words to the effect that, in general, among those Americans who profess to be Christians, there are very few who do not practise filial piety. That parents are not made much of is something related to differences in the family system, but it cannot be said that this indicates lack of respect or filial piety. Thus it was that Fukuzawa was refuted.

In another place Kozaki wrote, "... I struck up a friendship with the three great personalities of the former Bakufu, Katsu Kaishū, Yamaoka Tesshū, and Ōkubo Ichiō. Among these three Katsu Kaishū can be said to have been a secret supporter of Christianity. He was an extremely sagacious person, and he concluded that Japan must become a Christian country in the future. He was always warning us that he knew this would not be an easy thing and that the missionary work should not be precipitate." It is certain that Katsu had some such under-
standing of, or, at the very least, sympathy for, Christianity. Ōkubo Ichō, who was just referred to, was the person who supervised the wedding of Mori Arinori which was earlier mentioned. Ōkubo at this time was governor of Tokyo and later became a member of the House of Peers. He was famous for not having uttered a word for ten years! Further, according to Kozaki, Yamaoka Tesshū too had an appreciation for Christianity. There are innumerable other examples of this kind. It has been said that the able Yamamoto Kakuma, who was a very prominent patriot from the former Aizu territorial clan and who rendered assistance to Niijima Jō in the founding of Dōshisha, was drawn to Christianity after reading William Martin’s book. The fact that there were many illustrious people who had been connected with the former Bakufu who now, in the early Meiji period, were sympathetic to Christianity is certainly worthy of attention. The fact that a majority of the members of the Meirokusha had been connected with the former Bakufu’s Kaisei-jo School and were now, in the early years of Meiji, receptive to Christianity, was not only simply based on economic or class-status reasons, but more importantly because of the historical and political changes in the position of the former rulers.

We mentioned in connection with Christianity among the members of the Meirokusha, besides Nakamura and Mori, such people as Tsuda Sen, Sugi Kōji, and Katsu Kaishū. In the period of the Meirokusha even someone like Nishimura Shigeki, indeed, surprisingly, someone like Nishimura too, was a zealous student of Christianity.

While the above was in reference to the Meirokusha period, in the age of freedom and popular rights, too, there were many people among the fighters for popular rights who had sympathy for Christianity and can be singled out. Yano Fumio, Baba Tatsui, and Ozaki Yukio were among these. Shimada Saburō and the first president of the lower house of the Diet, Nakajima Nobuyuki, received baptism together. Thus the Christian aspect of the movement for freedom and popular rights should not be
slighted. And, as will later appear, the movement in connection with the “Spiritual” Revolution of the late 1880’s must be regarded as having been influenced by Christianity.

There is, in connection with understanding the history of Meiji thought, an extremely important problem with respect to how Christianity was adopted and how it was used. In the first half of the Meiji period Christianity was connected with the popular rights movement; in the latter half of the period Christianity was linked to the Socialist movement in Japan. It must also be said that the problem of Christianity was never solely confined to the politico-economic aspect, as the above would seem to suggest. The Oriental outlook on life, or *Weltanschauung*, was deeply shaken by its contact with Christianity and the emergence of true romanticism and idealism in Japan also can be found in this. We will take these questions up later. For the present we have to consider why some of the most important people, Niijima Jō, Kozaki Hiromichi, Uemura Masahisa, and Uchimura Kanzō converted to Christianity.

2. Conversion to Christianity

Niijima Jō was born in 1843 in the Annaka territorial clan residence in Edo. His family were middle-ranking samurai of the Annaka clan of the province of Jōshū, in modern Gumma Prefecture. His father as well as his ancestors were zealous “idolators.” A great number of gods and the votive tablets to his forebears were all worshipped at his home. As a child, Niijima wanted to grow up to be a magnificent and famous samurai and artlessly offered his prayers to these gods to be granted the wisdom and skill necessary for this purpose. As was the case with Fukuzawa Yukichi, Niijima too was possessed of a free spirit which was manifested in his impatience with servile flattery to the clan lord or to senior clansmen. He learned the art of fencing, studied Chinese books, and Dutch learning. He read articles concerning the United States, and he eagerly wanted to know about conditions abroad. It was also during this formative period that he read a Japanese
translation of *Robinson Crusoe* and was deeply impressed. Probably it was for some such reason that he enrolled in the naval training school established by the Bakufu in Edo.

This was the period which resounded with the clamor for "Revere the Emperor, Expel the Barbarians," but the Annaka clan, en masse, flew the banner of "Support for the Bakufu." Niijima, on the contrary, was won over to the side of the samurai supporting the Imperial cause, although even here he demonstrated originality. That is to say, he had religious inclinations. As previously stated, Niijima had read American history, a short world history, and various pamphlets published in Shanghai by Williams. What most aroused his curiosity were books relating to Christianity. Among these, he read a Chinese translation of the Bible which touched him very deeply. I shall present some quotations from his writings in this regard.

Niijima said:

Hitherto I was partly a skeptic but also I partly cherished feelings of devoutness. While I first learned the name of the Creator of Heaven and Earth from Dutch books, these did not pierce my feelings as the time when I read the story of Creation in the Chinese translation of the Bible. From this latter work I perceived that the Universe did not come to be accidentally, but was created and formed by unseen hands. And one day when I happened to be reading selections from this Chinese Bible, I first encountered the phrase, ‘Our Heavenly Father,’ *Tenpu*, which still more strengthened my feeling of devoutness. I was able to understand that God was not merely to be revered as the Creator of the Universe but as the ‘Heavenly Father’ of all mankind. In essence, the gradual clarification of my vague conceptions concerning the Divinity, a vagueness which I had been unable to perceive for the past twenty years, was greatly owing to books like these. It was at this time that, as my study advanced, there followed an inexhaustible flow of questions. I wanted to ask for explanations of these but the status of Japan in those days as a closed country afforded me no opportunities for meeting
with foreign missionaries. And yet the longing locked inside me could not be suppressed by this. Finally I made up my mind and resolved to go to a country where the gospel was freely propagated. The result of my acquiring the knowledge that God was the Heavenly Father of us all was that I believed that He was not to be reverenced merely as one would one's parents. I accordingly came to feel that Confucius' doctrine relating to filial piety was excessively narrow. I bethought myself, rather than be under the rule of my parents I should be under the guidance of God! When once I felt this, to hesitate or vacillate in quitting my family became unbearable. Lingering feelings of love were extinguished, and in the end I had no alternative but to put my lord and my family behind me and to resolve to leave my birthplace.

Niijima took passage to Hakodate in Hokkaido, there he became a seaman and managed to get to America. This was in 1864 when Niijima was 21. In America he studied at Amherst College, entering in 1867. We must unfortunately omit the various interesting experiences and adventures Niijima had in this connection. In 1874 he returned from America, and in 1875 he founded Dōshiha.

From the foregoing, we can sense how he came to be led by the Christian God. First, he was born into a devout household which believed in many gods and from this he was led into the belief in one God as the Creator of the Universe. We ought to look into similar progressions, for example that of Uemura Masahisa and, the even more notable Uchimura Kanzō. Secondly, from this conceptualization of one God as the Creator and Our Heavenly Father, he became more deeply aware of God and thus came to believe that he should be under the guidance of God rather than under that of his parents. He also stated this in a separate passage, saying:

And Jesus Christ, who was the Son of God bearing on His body the sins of the world, delivered Himself up to death by crucifixion. That we designate Him the Saviour, I was also able to know. And when I happened to read these lines
I shut the book, looked around, and asked myself who it was that created me, my parents? No! It was not my parents, but God who created me!

Thus Niijima, who had been a person of extremely warm filial feeling, came to say that it was God who had created him. There exists thus a problem which should be marked in connection with the history of Meiji thought: the complete change-over from a Confucianist filial piety position to a new concept of filial relationship to God alone, as manifested above, and the opposition to this still maintained in the older viewpoint. In a sense it was a problem of individual self-awareness coupled with a consciousness of spirit. We must see how this was manifested in the case of Uemura Masahisa.

It was in 1868, exactly one year after Niijima had entered Amherst, that a father and son newly removed to Yokohama went into pig-raising. The father was called Tōjūrō, the son, Michitarō. Michitarō had barely reached twelve and was supporting his family by the wholesale purchase and resale of charcoal and firewood from Kazusa province. This boy was later to be known as Uemura Masahisa, (1857-1925).

Uemura's family had been a splendid Hatamoto family, receiving a rice stipend from the Bakufu of 1,500 koku (1 koku equals 4.96 bushels). With the advent of the Restoration the family was ruined and to carve out a new future they went into pig-raising. At first his mother and two younger brothers remained behind in their former domain in Kazusa, and only Michitarō and his father moved to Yokohama. They lived for some time poorly and roughly, lacking a woman's touch to provide even the simple refinements. Recalling that time, Uemura in his later years said: "During the period we lived in Yokohama, which was the beginning of our efforts at housekeeping, we only had one bucket. This bucket had to serve us for washing ourselves and for preparing our rice." Thinking he had to learn English to rise in the world, he attended, despite his poverty, the private school of a missionary named James Ballagh and also attended the English school of Dr. Samuel Robbins
Brown. Later this English school was moved to Tokyo and became the forerunner of the Meiji Gakuin.

At this time Uemura's mother, Sadako, also moved to Yokohama and encouraged him in his studies. In this connection, he said: "My mother was really admirable! She even sold all her hair-dressing equipment to enable me to pay my school expenses... Mother was a notable character, as befitted her status as the wife of a samurai!"

Uemura prayed before the shrine of Katō Kiyomasa, the general worshipped by Japanese nationalists who as one of Hideyoshi's officers had been the leader of one of the Japanese armies invading Korea. Uemura vowed to restore the fortunes of his family. For a period of three years he foreswore eating fish. When he entered Brown's school he could not himself fulfill this vow, so his mother fulfilled it in his stead. He continued zealously to visit the shrine of Kiyomasa. He was still a child to the extent that he made a vow of abstinence to gain the fulfillment of his prayers. How did he come from this to a belief in Christianity? He wrote as follows:

My family professing the Shinto religion, I went to the shrine of Katō Kiyomasa who had risen from being a blacksmith to become a great warrior and patriot to offer there my fervent prayers. This was because I wanted very much to also rise and make my mark in the world. Since my school friends ridiculed my convictions I left off visiting the shrine. One day I learned from my teacher, Mr. Ballagh, that Westerners also pray, except that they pray to, or worship before, one God. This greatly surprised and deeply impressed me. I immediately took this thought to heart and made it my own. Afterwards, however, when I was beginning to study theology great doubts arose. The great ambitions I had cherished were fundamentally changed. I no longer felt I wanted to be a high-ranking dignitary, but instead I suddenly had an earnest desire to become a Christian missionary. My parents were opposed to my being baptized and therefore I postponed my baptism for some months. Five years later, however,
my parents too were baptized. At that time the signboards proscribing Christianity were still standing although the persecution by government officials had become non-existant. Uemura made repeated efforts to introduce his teacher, Ballagh, to the public. He wrote articles entitled “On James Ballagh” and “Once Again Introducing Mr. Ballagh” for the Fukuin Shinpo (Gospel News-Intelligencer) in 1901.

Ballagh was the type of man who was made happy if even one person repented and before death converted to the faith. Uemura reported in this connection:

My teacher said, 'In the three years since coming to Japan I was made happy by the baptism of Mr. Yano Ryūzan. When he was about to die—he was not in any sense recompensing me for any incurred benefits or grace received, except that—he said if I go to Paradise I will mention your name to the Lord Jesus. When I heard this I was deeply touched and made exceedingly happy. Coming to a Japan in which there was not one Protestant Christian to bear fruit like this, where there are people now who by faith rise to Heaven! How blessings multiply!'

It is thus clear that Uemura’s faith was activated in him by Ballagh. The latter’s character is interesting especially in comparison with Clark of Hokkaido, author of the slogan “Boys be amitious,” or with Janes of Mt. Hanaoka. Be that as it may, it should not be forgotten that Uemura’s temperament was also such that in the beginning he offered prayers at the shrine of Katō Kiyomasa. Next we turn our attention to Uchimura Kanzō.

Uchimura himself called his work on How I Became a Christian a “log book of the soul.” Concerning his “voyage,” he wrote as follows. He was born in 1861, and was four years younger than Uemura. Uchimura was the son of a samurai, and in 1877 he was recruited from a university preparatory school into a group of students to be sent to the Sapporo Agricultural School in Hokkaido. That autumn he went to Sapporo. This was after Clark had returned to America. Clark had arrived in Sapporo at the end of July, 1876, and was employed
there for a little over eight months, leaving in April, 1877. At that time Sapporo had a population of 3,000 people. Despite the shortness of Clark's stay his influence was remarkable. People like the later "father" of Hokkaido University, Satō Shōsuke, and Ōshima Masatake had already converted to Christianity.

Prior to Clark's leaving Sapporo he drew up an "Oath for Believers in Jesus," and Satō and all the other first-term students signed it. This Oath began with the following lines:

We, the undersigned students at Sapporo Agricultural School, follow the commands of Christ and avow our belief in Christianity. We will conscientiously discharge our obligations as Christians to the blessed Lord, who by His crucifixion and death atoned for our sins. We will make manifest our love and our gratitude. We will extend the Kingdom of Christ and show His glory; we earnestly desire the salvation of those for whom He atoned by His death. For this reason we will henceforth be devoted disciples of Christ and we solemnly take an oath before God that we will without omitting or neglecting anything cherish His teachings.

Uchimura, as one of the second-term students, came into this atmosphere and was forced by the first-termers to sign this Oath. Uchimura was associated with Nitobe Inazō, and the later specialist on English literature, Sakuma Nobuyasu; they were all classmates at this time. The first to sign the Oath was Nitobe and the one who to the very end kept his faith in the "eight million gods" was the 17-year-old Uchimura. His How I Became a Christian really dates back to the events of this period. Therein, Uchimura has written the following:

All around me heroes were falling, one by one, and surrendering to the enemy. I alone was detested as a "heathen," a serpent, an idolator; I was abandoned as an incorrigible worshipper of wood and stone. I well remember the desperate pass to which I had come and the anguish of my loneliness. One afternoon I visited a local shrine of the deity I think was empowered by the government with the patronage
and protection of the district. At some distance removed from the sacred mirror symbolizing the invisible presence of the divine spirit I prostrated myself on the dry grass, and my prayers commenced like the bursting of a dam. These prayers were not slighter, less pure or sincere, than the untold prayers I have devoted since that time to my Christian God. I prayed to that protective deity for the rapid tranquilization of the rage for the new religion on campus, for the punishment of those fellows who stubbornly rejected my denial of strange gods. I prayed that this deity give assistance to my patriotic exertions. My prayers at an end, I returned to my boardinghouse. Time and again, because I was given unwelcome advice to believe in the new religion, I was troubled.

Uchimura too, finally submitted to the pressure of this “advice” and, “Contrary to my will [I had to make my confession] and also to some extent contrary to my conscience,” he signed the oath. The result of this, however, was rather surprising. He wrote in this regard:

The practical value of the new religion was immediately clear to me. Even during the period when I was putting forth all my strength to repel this religion I still felt this. I was taught that there existed in the Universe only one God, not, as I formerly believed, many—over eight million—gods. To accept that Christian belief in one God was like using an axe on the roots of all my superstitions. All the vows I had taken, my various and sundry attempts to appease the anger of the gods by prayer services had now, as a result of recognizing the existence of only one God, become unnecessary. And my reason and conscience responded, saying ‘Aye, truly!’ That God was one and that there were not many gods, these truly were glad tidings to my spirit. It was no longer necessary for me to spend every morning in long prayers to the gods of North, South, East, and West; or when on a journey to have to pray repeatedly before the shrine of each god I passed; or to observe this day for this god, that day
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for that one; or to abstain from various things because of special vows—all this was no longer necessary. I discovered the God of gods, I came to know that this God would give me protection, I became firm in my conviction that I would no longer be punished for not praying. I lifted my head high and with no feelings of guilt; before one shrine after another; Oh, how proudly I was able to pass by!"

Later, Uchimura wrote:

Thus it was that, despite my receiving the Bible from Clark (indirectly) and being introduced to Christianity by Clark (again, indirectly), I did not have the opportunity to receive my religious faith from him. I am not ashamed to confess that in matters of faith I neither directly nor indirectly was Clark's disciple. My teacher in faith was another. This person, a friend and fellow alumnus of Clark's, was none other than the president of Amherst, Julius H. Sealy. It was Sealy, not Clark, who gave me an awareness of Christ.

And furthermore, Uchimura fiercely stated:

In 1877 I heard of worldly Christianity from a worldly American in Sapporo, and under the impression that this was true Christianity I entered the church, and also organized a church, received baptism associated with believers, and to this day when I remember this mistake and confusion I am horrified! When I reconsider today I know that I was not a Christian in Sapporo.

This statement is of tremendous importance to the understanding of Uchimura's thought and faith. Uchimura's faith was something that grew in his progression from a worship of many gods to a belief in a God of gods. We do not intend to disparage Clark's influence, at least on the majority of Japanese Christians. Also, in this connection, another Westerner's name must be presented. This person is Captain Janes, who came to Kumamoto in southern Japan.

Janes was invited to teach at the Kumamoto Western School in 1871. At the time Janes was serving as a captain at the
Fortress of San Francisco, and he was invited because the Clan Lord of Kumamoto wanted a military man as a teacher. Clark had already, on a ship going to Otaru, (port in Hokkaido), had a violent argument with Governor-General Kuroda Kiyotaka of the Hokkaido Kaitaku-shi, or development bureau. From the outset Clark stressed education based on the Bible. Janes, on the other hand, copied Thomas Arnold's Rugby Middle School system, and for quite a while said not one word touching on Christianity. After three years, in 1874—probably the students had by now acquired some facility in English—Janes began to hold Bible sessions at his home for his intimate and more sympathetic students. And until the famous Mt. Hanaoka incident a very rapid development of Christian sentiment took place.

On January 30, 1875, 35 of the students who were Christians gathered together on Mt. Hanaoka and reading aloud a "Declaration of Faith" prayed to God and made a covenant. This went as follows:

We have in our past study of Christianity become extremely enlightened. We shall henceforth, by perusal of this doctrine, continue in our joyful acceptance of it. Ultimately, by spreading this religion throughout the Empire, we desire to enlighten the ignorance of the people. Those who know not the splendor of Christianity and are permeated with a stubborn adherence to the old beliefs are not few in number. Oh, is this condition to be endured without deploping it! At this time it behooves those of us who cherish the slightest patriotic sentiments to bestir ourselves, to regard our own lives as of no value, to dedicate ourselves to the elucidation of the justice and equity of Christianity. It is to this we should devote our utmost effort. For this reason it is required that those of like aspiration meet together on Mt. Hanaoka and unite their efforts in the pursuit of this faith:

1. All those entering the faith shall love one another as brethren. They shall admonish and correct one another in all things and by eschewing evil and pursuing good shall accomplish the realization of this doctrine.
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2. Those who have entered the faith and are not able to achieve the practise of this doctrine delude God and deceive their own consciences. They will of a certainty incur the reprimand and punishment of the Lord.

3. At present the majority of the people of the Empire reject Christianity. For this reason, when one of us acts contrary to the teachings of the faith he invites the calumny of the multitude and makes the accomplishing of the aim of all of us impossible. We should, therefore, exert ourselves to be diligent and prudent!

Set down, Sunday, January 30, 1875.

It is obvious from this covenant that their faith was not religiously very deep. Essentially, those who were under Janes’ guidance—in contrast to the political fanaticism of that time—truly wanted to implement the slogan “Rich Country Strong Soldiery” by the fostering of national production. To do this, however, the people had first to be cultivated and built up. Religion was necessary for this task and politics was, rather, the last stage in this process of building people. And yet, in Janes there was a religious fervor which moved people. Kozaki Hiromichi, the last person to join the group, has written:

What first greatly impressed me in this assembly were Janes’ prayers. Originally I was one who greatly disliked prayer and things smacking of religion, and yet once I heard Janes’ prayer I could not help feeling its marvelousness. Everybody, head bowed, was listening attentively; I alone, with eyes wide open, stared at him while he prayed. His face seemed to overflow with earnestness and sincerity: he prayed for those present, for all mankind, for Japan, for the world, word after word, there was great ardor. Finally burning tears flowed from his eyes. Perceiving this, even I, no matter how stubborn and indifferent, even I, could not help being deeply moved. This was the first step in the rise of my religious feeling, and thenceforth I earnestly studied the Bible and learned the tenets of Christianity.

It was in this way that Kozaki first found his way to
Christianity. He became a person filled with Janes’ excess of earnestness and warmth, which had so moved him.

The fame of the “Kumamoto Band” which was based on the Mt. Hanaoka incident became far-reaching. First. The group, person by person, comprised people who endured severe persecution. For example, one of them. Yokoi Tokio, heir to Yokoi Shōnan, went through the following experience. His mother, Tsuseko, pressed him to abandon his religious convictions, even threatening death. Yokoi described this as follows:

Mother said, ‘You are the only child of Yokoi Shōnan, you must follow in your father’s footsteps. Instead you are led astray by this diabolical religion, your conduct is misguided! I feel sorely troubled in my responsibility to my dead husband. If you fail to heed your mother’s words I have no alternative but suicide.’ And with this, she whipped out a short sword and made as if to really kill herself; the whole household was suddenly thrown into confusion . . .

Kanamori Tsurin also was one of those who was fiercely subjected to pressure. This, then, constitutes one reason for the fame of the Kumamoto Band. Another reason was the emergence from this group in the middle Meiji period of many people who were active in, and made magnificent contributions to, Christian circles. These included men like Yokoi Tokio, Kanamori Tsurin, and Kozaki Hiromichi who were just mentioned; and besides these, there were also from this group people like Miyagawa Tsuneteru, Ebina Danjō, Ukita Kazutami, and Toku-tomi Ichirō. In 1876 (Meiji 9) the Kumamoto Western School was closed and Janes entrusted his group to Niijima Jō and Dōshisha. Thus the first group of students graduating from Dōshisha were those from Kumamoto.

In the foregoing we attempted to portray the manner of the conversion to Christianity of Niijima, Uemura, Uchimura, and Kozaki. All of these people possessed special characteristics. The people affiliated with the Kumamoto Band, besides Kozaki and the other three just mentioned, those who eventually graduated from Niijima’s Dōshisha were grouped under three
leaders: Niijima, Uemura, and Uchimura. The following words by Ebina Danjō concerning this should be noted:

There are three centers of Christian leadership in Japan. These are the Agricultural School in Sapporo in Hokkaido, the Kumamoto Western School, and the school established by the missionaries in Yokohama. The focus of attention of those emerging from the Yokohama school is on the Christian church. Those coming from Hokkaido are somehow greatly infused with a spirit of individualism. Concerning this Uchimura Kanzō spoke when he came to our congregation, said that those coming from Yokohama can be said to be ecclesiastical in their orientation. Sapporo, he said, was spiritual and Kumamoto national, that is, oriented towards a national Christian church. At that time I replied to this saying, ‘You seem to interpret things only to the advantage of your place. It is probably more or less correct that Kumamoto is national and Yokohama ecclesiastical. But that Hokkaido is ‘spiritual,’ this is open to question. Spirituality is common to all three areas; it is not solely the monopoly of your area. What does adhere to you people is individualism.’ Everybody said, upon hearing this, ‘Ebina’s words have hit the mark! Uchimura has been bested!’ Yet the fact remains that the special characteristic of the Kumamoto Band is their national Christian church orientation.

These words of Ebina Danjō can be said more or less to show the trend of these three. And yet there was the case of Uemura [who came from the Yokohama group] and Kozaki [who came from Dōshisha] joining together to publish the magazine Rikugō Zasshi.

3. The Shinri Ippan (Common Truth) and the Seikyō Shinron (New Theory of State and Church)

In 1879 Kozaki Hiromichi graduated from Dōshisha and came to Tokyo and, thanks to an introduction from Matsuyama Takakichi, became acquainted with Uemura Masahisa. It was in 1880 that Kanda Naibu returned from America and, based
on his description of the young men’s associations in America, in May of that year the Tokyo Y.M.C.A., was organized. This was the beginning of the Y.M.C.A. in Japan. Following this, a Y.M.C.A. was also established in Osaka. The Tokyo Y.M.C.A. met once every month for lectures in Asakusa (Suga-chō, in a restaurant called Ibamura-ro). The place they met in was famous for the political lectures that were held there. Suehiro Tetcho, author of the Settschu-bai, apparently borrowed his first setting from this place. At the time both Kozaki and Uemura were poor speakers, and one day when Uemura followed Kozaki on the lecture platform a voice from the audience cried out loudly, "These are a couple of well-matched poor speakers!" There was a sudden roar of laughter from the audience and as a result for some time the speeches had to be suspended. During this period the proposal was made to issue a magazine; the name planned was something like Kirisuto-kyō Zasshi, (Christian Magazine), which was then submitted to Tsuda Sen for approval. He felt that a more appropriate name for the average person would be Rikugō Zasshi (The Universe) and this name was decided on. Kozaki and Uemura became the central personalities on this magazine, and from November 1880 the magazine was published as a monthly. With the demise of the Mei-roku Zasshi this magazine received the backing of many intellectuals.

As previously stated, the decade from the late 1870's through the 1880's was a period in which political fanaticism was on the rise: it was a period of political storm and stress. All this was made more complicated by the rise of extreme nationalism and patriotism. In 1880 or 1881 Christianity appeared to have good will, relatively speaking; by 1882 and 1883 suppression was on the rise. Then in 1884 and 1885, with the backing of the Westernization policy of that period, once again signs of lively activity were manifested. We can trace these changing trends through articles in the Rikugō Zasshi. We cannot go into detail concerning this. We may note, however, that in an article in the Rikugō Zasshi (No. 7, April 1881) by Kozaki Hiromichi,
under the title “On the Origins of the Modern Socialist Parties,” theories of Marxism and the activities of this movement were first discussed. This article was the first of its kind in Japan. Instead of going into detail on the Rikugō Zasshi, we will take up the special characteristics of two works by Kozaki and Uemura: Uemura’s Shinri Ippan, (published in 1884), and Kozaki’s Seikyō Shinron, (published in 1886).

When we read the Shinri Ippan today, we feel acutely a sense of admiration for the lustre and the richness of content of this work as compared to other books written at that time. The Chinese sentence structure can be felt to be somewhat severe, and yet when we read on a little, the inner nature of Uemura’s spirit is evoked for us. We shall present two or three of its characteristics which have intellectual historical significance.

This book, for its time, was an extremely high-level philosophical literary product. The word religion was rendered in Japan in the early years of Meiji as shumon, shushi, (cult, creed), or hōkyō, or kyōhō, (cult, creed); and after the people of the Rikugō Zasshi hit on the word shūkyō, this became the word still in general use for the term religion. For Christianity the terms used were things like “Jesus-doctrine,” Iesu-kyō, or Yaso-Kyō; and apparently through the influence of the Rikugō Zasshi the word Kristo kyō, (Christianity), was standardized. Among the people on the Rikugō Zasshi, however, there were some who used the expression Shin no Michi, (the Way of Truth), or simply Shinri, (Truth), for Christianity. And in this connection it should be noted that in Uemura’s Shinri Ippan the word shinri is used in this sense.

As stated in the previous chapter, the period from 1881-82 was one in which the influence of the theory of evolution began to be marked among the people of Tokyo University. Edward Morse (1838-1925), who was employed as an instructor at the University, taught a course on evolution theory called “Theory of Change,” and people like Toyama Shōichi, Kikuchi Dairoku, and Yatabe Ryökichi disseminated this theory. It was from this evolutionary viewpoint that the attack on Christianity took
place. Later Toyama became a supporter of Christianity and wrote things like "The Relation Between Social Reform and Christianity." For the time being, however, he attacked Christianity in the Tōyō Gakugei Zasshi in an article entitled "The False Arguments of Christianity." Morse had been a disciple of Agassiz but, parting ways with the latter, he became a follower of Darwin's theory. He was the discoverer of the Ōmori shell mounds and author of Japan, Day by Day.

At that time the Buddhists too attacked Christianity, but for the Christians the most serious attack came from the scholars who had espoused the theory of evolution. Kozaki wrote:

Strangely enough, the anti-Christian thought based on what was being imported from the West was even more plentiful than the anti-Christian thought based on traditional Japanese religio-moralistic thought. First and foremost in this was the theory of the clash between science and religion. Rather than use the word "strangely," looking from the standpoint of the period being one of "enlightenment" the word "naturally" should have been used by Kozaki.

This, then, was the trend of the time: evolutionists, materialists, all stressed the unquestionable "truth" of their atheism. And thus, among the Christians to whom indeed Christianity was "absolute truth" it was natural that controversy would arise over the nature of ultimate truth. This is probably the reason why Uemura entitled his first book the Shinri Ippan. (Common Truth).

Uemura's book was a criticism directed against evolutionism, materialism, and agnosticism. He exerted himself to prove the existence of God in opposition to the atheism of the people who adhered to these views. His proof rested on cosmological and moral grounds. What should be noted, however, is that drawing on Hegel and Pascal, Uemura reasoned as follows.

Essentially we are confined within limits and are creatures who because of our extreme imperfection cannot act independently. We are the weakest creatures in the universe according to Western philosophers. We are short-lived creatures and
our narrowness of intellect, too, is plain. Still, our souls are splendid. When an individual thought arises therein, of a necessity its antithesis cannot but arise. When we know ourselves to be limited, of a necessity, the antithesis to this must be the knowledge of the existence of a being without limitation. When we realize our weakness and shortlived-ness we must also be able to conceive of an omnipotent and eternal being.

Uemura's work marked the introduction into Japan of a metaphysical theory expressed with originality. This theory stated that the acknowledgement of limits, perforce, meant the acknowledgement of its antithesis—no limits; that the acknowledge-ment of the natural, meant perforce, the acknowledgement of the supernatural must be acknowledged. This coincided with the period when positivism and evolutionism were popular and must be said to have been truly startling.

What should next be noted is that Uemura's exposition is an attempt at portraying his overflowing feeling of the evanescence and wretchedness of the secular world and, as such, has an extremely rich artistic flavor. This is especially notable in the work which followed the Shinri Ippan, the Fukuin Michi Shirube, (Guide to the Way of the Gospel), which appeared in 1884. In this work many ancient Japanese poems were quoted. This was probably connected to the feeling for the ancient Japanese classics which at that time was undergoing a revival. And that a Christian like Uemura Masahisa noted this, and perhaps gave a fresh stimulus to this fervor for the Japanese classics is somewhat surprising. Uemura said,

Are not the accounts of the fortunes of the Gempei and the Tale of the Heike [the historical romance of the Taira Family] valorous military chronicles? And yet the exquisiteness of the writing is to be found rather in the pathos-laden parts. In all likelihood, pathos is a fact of existence. Since this world has been accursed with the sins of mankind, when we read these accounts, they imperceptibly sadden us. It is this that I find of great interest!
In the beginning of the period from 1887, Uemura wrote magnificent literary criticism of Browning, Keats, Tennyson, Wordsworth, and others, and influenced the leading personalities of the later Bungakkai, (Literary World). Among these, Uemura's influence acted on men of letters like Masamune Hakuchô and Kunikida Doppo. An outlook on life, a consciousness of Sin similar to that manifested in the foregoing quotation from Uemura, also became apparent in the work of these men. This outlook of Uemura's is one of the characteristics that can already be marked in the Shinri Ippan.

A third point which can be noted is that Uemura presented quotations from men like Shelley, Byron, Coleridge, Cardinal Newman, and Schopenhauer. There was also a critique on Comte, Spencer, and Mill; formerly Mill's works had been regarded as scriptures and in Uemura's work a totally different impression was presented. We can see here the existence of the seed-bed for the change in the Meiji 20's to idealism-spiritualism from the enlightenment of the first decade of Meiji.

We must now turn our attention to Kozaki Hiromichi and his work, the Seikyô Shinron.

First, we can note with interest that this work emerged from what it calls "the present day Age of Reform." It eagerly uses the expression "new Japan" and it advocates the building of new Japan by means of Christianity and the book argues for a new relationship between politics—or, more broadly, Japanese society—and the two religions, Christianity and Confucianism. It is in this sense that the title can be translated as "Argument for a New Relationship Between Religion and Politics." What stands out in this work is the use of expressions like "this age is the age of the new Japan or the age of reform"; and we can see this, for example, in the following phrases:

Truly today our country is being reborn; it is a day of the creation of a new Japan and can be said to be an unprecedented period of great reform... This reform, by destroying the old Japan and creating the new, is not different from destroying an old established house and erecting on its site a newly-
designed house from old and new timbers . . . Truly, this renovation is not just the renewal of Imperial Rule, but should be called the renovation of the State, or the reform of society . . . We ourselves are products of this great reform . . . Oh, would that today were the time when our country, casting off from the port of old Japan, set sail for the new Japan.

We have selected passages from the first two or three pages at the beginning of this work by Kozaki. These demonstrate Kozaki’s grasp of the period. In the West too, it goes without saying, there were many great reforms but these were only temporary developmental spurts within the characteristic progress of these countries. There was no comparison that could be made to the great change in Japan, in which since the Meiji Restoration a completely different culture was being suddenly imported from abroad. The political “great change was only a part of the overall social renovation” which was taking place. As such, there was urgent need, Kozaki said, for a reform of the public mind through Christianity before all else in order to truly accomplish any great renovation.

This new Japan consciousness, and the demand for a spiritual revolution in order to bring it about, will be dealt with in the next section. It was in the Meiji 20’s (1887-1897) when, above all, this was instigated by works like Shōrai no Nippon, (Future Japan), and Shin Nippon no Seinen, (Youth of New Japan), by Tokutomi Ichirō. While the movement for a spiritual revolution rapidly became widespread in this later period, it cannot but be of deep interest that in Kozaki’s Seikyō Shinron there had been a clarion call urging the identical spiritual revolution. Since this book was a greatly expanded and revised version of what Kozaki had published two years earlier in the Maishū Shimpō, (Weekly Journal), and the Kiristo-kyō Shinbun, (Christian Newspaper), it is not clear what his attitude was before this revision. At any rate, it was the position enunciated above that was contained in this work of April 1886.

Tokutomi’s Shin Nippon no Seinen was published a year earlier (1885) under the long name of Dai jū-kyū-seiki Nippon
no Seinen oyobi sono Kyōiku, (Youth of Nineteenth Century Japan and its Education). Actually this was only the latter part of the Shin Nippon no Seinen and 300 copies were printed which were distributed among acquaintances of Tokutomi. Kozaki, of course, read this work. The first chapter of the book entitled “Youth of Japan” was rewritten in 1887. Therefore, the quotation from Kozaki presented above can be regarded as preceding Tokutomi’s book in emphasizing the age of reform or the period of the new Japan.

Another point is that Kozaki makes a rather penetrating criticism of the concept of Confucian loyalty and filial piety. While this concept was perhaps useful for the maintenance of feudal Oriental society, it ought not be used in the building of a new society. This concept, with its distinctions between high and low, noble and base, and its entrusting everything in the hands of the authorities, was not a doctrine making for the reform and progress of culture.

Kozaki stated this, saying:

The worst fault of Confucianism is that it artificially establishes in society strict distinctions between high and low, noble and base. The majority of the people are regarded as stupid and infantile, and yet supreme power is given to a member of the same race who is just as weak and can as easily make mistakes in government, religion, learning: all human affairs, in short, are entrusted to this one individual.

This was the essence of Kozaki’s criticism of Confucianism, or rather, the feudal thought contained therein. The weight of his criticism was on the concept of loyalty and filial piety and the impossibility of the union between State and Religion. Kozaki, of course, also pointed out the this-worldliness of Confucianism, its optimism respecting human nature; to him the true human condition was “in the words of the Roman poet, ‘we know virtue and indeed have loved it, yet, we pursue vice’.” We see, then, that Kozaki was deeply concerned with the problem of loyalty and filial piety. It was after the Meiji 20’s that this problem became a crucial one.
In the foregoing, we can see the foreshadowing of the new trend which began in the Meiji 20's. We must now describe this new trend or this movement for a "new Japan."
PART IV. 1890-1900

CHAPTER I.

THE REVIVAL OF ART AND LITERATURE

1. The Beginning of the Meiji 20's (1887-1897)

The decade from 1877-1887 as we have noted, was marked by an intense concern with political activity. During these few years the cause of popular rights was eagerly championed and the new government itself was a proper subject for debate. The next decade, 1887-1897, was one in which the political movement gradually declined, a state-fostered capitalism now took shape and under the guise of a return to the Japanese tradition, extreme nationalism sprang up. This period was marked by a revived concern with the problems of morality and religion.

If the history of the Meiji period is considered exclusively from the standpoint of the establishment of an "absolutist state", we may define the early 1880's, when the principles of freedom and popular rights were being vigorously championed, as the most progressive period, but from 1888 or thereabouts, such political movements lost their momentum, moral and religious teachings were again preached, and there were even signs of an emergence of ultra-nationalism. These factors may lead one to the view that from the spirit of the late 1880's came to present certain reactionary aspect.

When we look at the broad sweep of the Meiji era, it becomes obvious that this decade from 1887-1897 had a significance which far transcended mere political concerns. It was in this period that the Japanese awoke to a new consciousness of self. This was manifested in the development of both individualism and national consciousness. Indeed, if we consider the Restora-
tion to have been the first revolution, then this decade marked the second revolution in modern Japan, the *spiritual revolution*.

Shimazaki Tōson (1872-1943) who entered Meiji Gakuin in 1887 has written the following description of the atmosphere of that time:

When I think about the time that I was a student at Meiji Gakuin, I remember that the revival of learning and the arts was rather remarkable at that time. The period in which I aspired to literature began at this time, when the hitherto buried Japanese classics began to be published almost every month in complete collections of literature and poetry. It was also at this time that the literature of the Tokugawa period, and especially of the Genroku era [1688-1703], was picked up from the discard into which it had fallen. Chikamatsu's collected *Jōruri*, [a kind of ballad-drama recited to the accompaniment of a *samisen*], were published; Saikaku's masterpieces were reprinted; the extant poetical works of Bashō and the poets of his school once more received attention. We young people were greatly stimulated by the rediscovery of these classics. This was a period in which we were aware of the extremely flourishing state of modern European literature. The pace of development was almost impossible to keep up with. Looking back, the world of the arts and sciences of that time could, in a sense, be called a virgin field. The Japanese language possessed no unity; the new poetry was still without form, a complete state of chaos! And yet, when we just think about the fierce ardor of those who attempted to strike out in new directions in the midst of this, somehow, we feel refreshed.

This period described by Tōson was one in which a revival of arts and letters took place. Uchimura Kanzō called it, "revolution of the nation's conscience." Before dealing with this decade, however, it would be appropriate to reflect on the general significance of the Meiji Restoration.

The Meiji Restoration as a phenomenon has few parallels. From one standpoint the Restoration can certainly be called
a revolution. The Tokugawa Bakufu collapsed and the feudal system was entirely replaced. The Meiji government began the building of a modern state structure. This process was revolutionary in the political sense and also went hand-in-hand with a thoroughgoing social revolution. We must note, however, that the people who accomplished this overturn never thought of it as a revolution. As shown in the first chapter, even someone with as strong a consciousness of the necessity for an upheaval as Yoshida Shōin said, "Their's is a country of revolution ... we follow the edicts of the Imperial Ancestors ...," by which he strongly emphasized the fact that revolution was something Chinese and that Japanese conditions were completely different.

We cannot dwell on the various interpretations of the Restoration although the history of these interpretations is itself of interest. Here it is sufficient to note that as early as 1872 Mori Arinori wrote in his English essay "Religious Freedom in Japan,"

It must be remembered that progress can only be achieved through revolutions and trials, inasmuch as such is the law of nature. The benefits of social revolutions have been amply experienced by our people ..., especially within the last twenty years.

It is obvious that when Japanese attempted to explain the Meiji Restoration to Westerners, even without any intention of calling it a revolution, the Westerners could only understand it as such. Also, the word *kakumei* which was the Japanese for revolution seemed rather a precise fit for the Restoration. When we come to the period of popular rights, it can be considered that the consciousness of what was called the Meiji Revolution had already become rather widespread. In short, during the closing years of the Bakufu, the consciousness of change had become very strong, a great upheaval in all things was demanded. This was not a conscious demand for a social revolution, still less, for a "social revolution based on a proletarian class-consciousness." In opposition to the old *government* of the Tokugawa Bakufu a new and different *government* was demanded. And
this demand was embodied in the slogan calling for "the restoration of Imperial rule."

The word restoration can be used in a concrete sense to describe the return of Charles II to the throne after the Puritan Revolution, or Louis XVIII's restoration in France. In other words, restoration usually means the return of a monarch who has temporarily been driven out as a consequence of a revolution. The restoration of Imperial rule in the Meiji period, however, has a different character. The patriots of the Restoration believed in the "Imperial line of unbroken succession" and grieved over its apparent decline. Hence, they strove to restore it to what they supposed had been its original condition. Neither the word revolution nor the word restoration adequately expresses the content of the Meiji Restoration. As a revolution it was probably more restorationist, and as a restoration, more revolutionary. Consciously, it assumed the form of a restoration, substantively, the Meiji Restoration was a revolution. It was thus both a revolution and a restoration. And if we have to use the word revolution to describe this phenomenon, it would be best to say that it began as a political revolution based on a coup d'etat, it was joined by a social revolution and much later it became a revolution in man, a spiritual revolution.

When we consider the foregoing in conjunction with what follows, the meaning of the Meiji Restoration becomes still more clear. Whatever we assume to be the dominant feature of the history of modern Europe—the rise of the modern State, modern society, science, capitalism, the industrial revolution—we must realize that none of these were conceptualized in advance. These characteristics which had their origins in the early Renaissance, were not realized by following any pre-conceived plan. To think otherwise is a naive, retrospective interpretation. In the step-by-step unfolding of the modern age in Europe we sense discovery, invention, adventure, not foreknowledge. There was neither model nor goal for this development.

In the great change which began in Japan during the Meiji Restoration, conditions were different. The Western countries,
the so-called advanced countries, served as the norm for political organization and for civilization. These countries were held up as the ideal towards which Japan ought to advance. The solutions modern Europe had worked out through a step-by-step solving of various problems as these had come up, became for Japan the way in which problems had to be solved. The answers, of course, had already been determined by the West. The way in which problems were to be solved was not by creative originality, but by copying, by adopting, and at best, by eclecticism, by selection. Especially pressing was the need to establish the modern State whose framework had already been determined. The framework was, moreover, decided on from above, it is difficult to say what was decided from below. It was also a framework determined from the outside, not from within. As the period for the inauguration of the Diet in 1890 drew close, it was natural that the problem would arise as to what the content of this framework should be. Was the substance of this framework to be the individual? Society? The nation?

In the next section we will attempt to see why the order followed in the modernization of Japan was so different from that followed in the West. We will see why in Japan the spiritual revolution, the revolution in man, came after the political revolution. This is another unique feature of the Meiji transformation; the revival of the arts and the return to Japanese literature followed the emergence of the modern State.

2. From Political Fanaticism to Expectations of the Future

The utopian mentality was not particularly a characteristic of Japanese traditional thought. To be sure, tales like the legend of Urashima indicated the existence of a tradition about an earthly paradise. In this story, as in many of the legends which originated in China, the locale was imaginary and did not exist in a temporal continuum. The concept of the earthly paradise as a possible development in the near or distant future, a utopia whose seeds existed in the present and whose future
form could be predicted by the process of logical projection was first born in the Meiji period. In the mid-1880’s political novels which manifested this type of utopian thinking became extremely popular.

The political novel at this time was really a forecast of the future. This was not great literature, nevertheless, it was avidly read. Another extremely popular form of literature was the travel diary or journal; records of world tours in fictional form were plentiful. The novels which portrayed future earthly paradises were closely related to the spiritual revolution of the Meiji 20’s.

In 1879 Kanagaki Robun published a novel called Takahashi Oden Yasha Hanashi (Tale of the She-Devil Takahashi) and for a while the she-devil or wicked woman became a popular type in literature. In the early 1880’s many of the novels published dealt with the theme of peasant rioting which was prevalent at that time. There were also novels which dealt with the last years of the Tokugawa regime, novels about the peasant hero Sakura Sōgorō who was horribly put to death after being forced to witness the murder of his wife and children. Many of the novels published at this time dealt with vendettas and were rather bloody tales. All this literature was a reflection of the savagery and insecurity of the times. And, we might add, this too was an aspect of the period of “civilization and enlightenment.” These novels paralleled the political fanaticism and reflected the general excitability which was current. This political fanaticism finally broke out in rioting; Fukushima, Gumma, Kabayama, Chichibu, Nagoya, Iida, all these were areas in which rioting took place. The peak was reached in 1884 and there followed a gradual subsiding or withering away of the zeal for political activism. In 1885 and 1886 the utopian novels we spoke of earlier began to appear. A glance at their titles makes their contents clear. These novels had titles like Forecast of the Future, Dream of the Future and we must now attempt to understand this transformation. Also, we must see what type of future forecasts these were.
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There were three novels which were most representative of this genre, these were; *Keikoku Bidan* (Laudable Tales of Statecraft) by Yano Ryūkei, *Kajin no Kigū* (Unexpected Encounter with Two Beautiful Women) by Shiba Shirō, and *Setchū-bai* (Plum Blossoms in the Snow) by Suehiro Tettchō. *Keikoku Bidan* was a novel about the heroes of Thebes—its central characters were people like Epaminondas—it was a tale of the sudden rise of Thebes. In *Kajin no Kigū* the setting is first in Independence Hall in Philadelphia. There the hero meets two revolutionary beauties, Colleen (Irish) and Yolande (Spanish). The contents, which dealt with the “rise of states” and “revolutions” were also sufficiently exotic to attract many readers. This novel, however, was not a forecast of the future, but rather a travel journal. In contrast to this, the novel *Setchū-bai*, which was about the movement for popular rights in Japan, had something of the forecast of the future about it.

*Setchū-bai* looked back on the political movement which had become stagnant by 1885, and the hero of the novel discusses this. The first reason, he says, the political movement declined, was that the arguments for popular rights became doctrinaire and academic and were divorced from reality. The average person became surfeited with this. He says, for example, concerning an advocate of popular rights:

All his arguments in defense of popular rights came down to the fact that the rights to freedom and equality were natural endowments. There was not one word, in all these thousands, leading away from this narrow compass, it was logical that this should produce feelings of dislike. I would definitely assert that the tendency towards dreaminess and obscurantism in political argument was a cause for the retrogression of political thought.

Another reason given for the stagnation in the political movement was the fear and abhorrence of most people for the bullies who participated in the political movement and committed acts of brutality and violence. The hero says:
Moreover... it must be stated that it was unavoidable that they suffer crushing defeat because they relied on strongarm tactics, and became, from a legal standpoint, criminals... They tarnished the entire popular rights cause. This too—their violence in word and deed—was one of the causes for the retrogression of political thought.

Another reason presented by the author for the depressed state of the political movement was the divisions and factionalism within the political parties and their constant squabbles. Of course, when we read the foregoing we should also take into account the author's political position. Yet the reasons as just pointed out by Suehiro really did exist as facts. And with the time drawing near for the inauguration of the National Diet, this was no longer an issue. Since the National Diet was finally being realized the future earthly paradises now became the center of aspirations. This may be considered a partial reason for the popularity of political novels with forecasts of the future as their contents.

The forecasts presented in these novels are of interest as projections of Meiji period aspirations. The novel Settshū-bai begins with a conversation between a host and his guest. This takes place 150 years after the opening of the first Diet in 1890, on the occasion of the Emperor Meiji's birthday (November 3) in 2040. The day is one "without one cloud in the autumn sky." The guest is a white-haired gentleman of quality, who confronts the host saying:

We have both been born into this prosperous state of affairs and it is true happiness to have spent our declining years in carefree fashion. The area of this city of Tōkyō now covers ten square miles; its tall buildings are all brick; telegraph wires spread over it like a spiderweb; trains come and go in all directions; street lamps turn the night into broad daylight and in the port of Tōkyō the merchant ships of all countries ride at anchor. Commerce and industry are so flourishing that London and Paris are put to shame. On land there is a strong army numbering some hundreds of thousands, and
on the seas hundreds of warships are afloat; there is no place in the world where the Rising Sun flag does not wave. Education is spread over the entire country . . .

After the guest spoke thus, the host said that 150 years earlier, at the time of the inauguration of the National Diet, there were all sorts of complications. The state of affairs of that time can be seen from a book that was found in the Ueno Library called Settchū-bai. And thus the reader is brought to the main part of the Settchū-bai.

As can be seen, this "future" was limited to the "rich country, strong soldiery culture and enlightenment" type of consciousness, and was not something special or unique. This kind of consciousness of the future was based mainly on the fact that the establishment of the National Diet was the result of a promise granted from above and could hardly be called a spontaneous development. Despite this, however, this consciousness of the future embodied concrete hopes and aspirations and was a form of idealism. With the subsequent deepening of this idealism it was linked with the spiritual revolution of the Meiji 20's. And its positive principles emerged in the slogan calling for a new Japan. To make this clear, we must touch on the translations of Disraeli's political novels which had influenced their Japanese counterparts, and which were avidly read by many.

That foreign political novels were eagerly translated in Japan at this time is due to the following circumstances. In 1882, when Itagaki was traveling abroad, he met the aged Victor Hugo in France. Hugo deeply impressed him by saying that, "In a country with unique characteristics, like Japan's, it would be well to have the people read political novels." Itagaki purchased many political novels and returned to Japan in 1883. These political novels which were in a sense Itagaki's homecoming gift, were translated and published in the newspapers, and aroused tremendous enthusiasm. We cannot go into these novels in detail, but we may note that the most popular were the novels of Disraeli. When Settchū-bai, which was modeled on Disraeli's works was published, Tsujiouchi Shōyō (1859-1934)
wrote a review in which he expressed great admiration for this work. He wrote, “Can we not say that our country has finally produced a Disraeli!” From this, and from the fact that his works were translated one after the other, we can see the great respect in which Disraeli was held.

Disraeli’s *Conningsby* was translated in 1884; *Endymion* in 1886. *Shin Nippon* (New Japan) which Ozaki Yukio (1858-1954) wrote in 1886, seems to have been modeled on *Vivian Grey*, and Ozaki’s *Keisei Ikun*, (Brilliant Deeds in Statecraft), published in 1886, is a biography of Disraeli. This adulation for Disraeli was extremely prevalent. We can even see it in Tōson’s *Sakura no mi no Juku-suru Toki*, (Cherry Ripening Time). He wrote:

It seemed that everything was really easy and could be achieved at will. If one thought to rise to heaven at a bound, this too seemed possible. Sutekichi’s (the hero of the novel) imagination was stimulated by the life of the once poor Disraeli, who had risen to high court rank, become well thought of by a beautiful widow, and at one leap had entered the political arena. Sutekichi planned, in passing, as it were, to write another *Endymion*.

We must see what it was in Disraeli’s works that attracted the youth of that period.

One reason for the attractiveness of Disraeli’s writings was that he was Lord Beaconsfield, the great English Prime Minister, and these were novels written by him. While a novelist was considered little more than a writer of frivolities, a great statesman held, at that time, a tremendous fascination for people. It was sufficient merely to say that a book was written by a statesman of Great Britain, and already people’s interest was aroused and the value of the novel was, perforce, acknowledged. Another reason that can be considered is the fact that hitherto the thought of people like Rousseau had been popular. Rousseau’s thought was very radical and in a sense went to destructive extremes. In contrast, Disraeli’s works touched on the real condition of parliamentary politics; his thought was sound, moderate, and
withal, progressive. It was suited to the popular taste of the period when the opening of the Diet was drawing near. There was however, a third reason for Disraeli’s popularity: he had placed his faith in the creative energy of Young England. In Japan there was at this time a similar emphasis on the role of youth which was basic to the New Japan consciousness. Disraeli’s emphasis on Young England held an extraordinary appeal for the youth of Japan.

Disraeli’s Young England was similar in nature to the various youth movements which had arisen in the West beginning with Mazzini’s Young Italy Movement. His position was essentially a response to three problems which he felt confronted England.

The subtitle to Sybil was The Two Nations, by which Disraeli meant to indicate the dichotomy which had appeared in the English nation as a result of the industrial revolution. English society was now divided into the “nation” of the rich and the “nation” of the poor. It was intolerable that such a division should exist within the same society and Disraeli, the one time Tory turned Conservative, attempted to heal this breach. Indirectly he was also concerned with making the Tories attractive once more.

The second problem he attempted to solve was how to preserve and if possible enhance England’s national independence in the face of the pan-European tendencies which had become prevalent since the French Revolution and the Age of Napoleon. And, finally, Disraeli, who had been influenced by Cardinal Newman, was interested in effecting the revival of religious and romanticist sentiments in the face of the materialist intellectualism which had been current since the Enlightenment.

The problem of the “two nations” Disraeli met by calling for a direct union between the English Royal Family and the masses, and by circumventing and rejecting the newly-arisen industrial bourgeoisie. The problem of how to maintain and enhance English national independence was to be solved by fostering a spirit of independence and national self-reliance.
Disraeli believed that "political organization is a type of mechanism; its motive force is the national character." The revival of the religious spirit and romanticism in the face of arrant intellectualism was to be accomplished by the emphasis on youth, by the glorification of youth.

Disraeli argued that the great events or changes of history were never the consequences of reason or cold intellection. Great events were the products of passion, imagination, creativity, the characteristics peculiar to youth. This glorification of youth was the basis of Disraeli's Young England.

The three points on which Disraeli's position rested were, in short, the coupling of the English Royal House and the masses against the bourgeoisie and the privileged classes, the strengthening of the national character by fostering the spirit of self-reliance, and the worship of youth. Clearly, these views were in exact agreement with the demands of Japanese youth at this time. This is not to say that the call for a New Japan during the Meiji 20's was completely based on Disraeli's position. It is sufficient to say that Young Japan was greatly stimulated by the Young England Movement. Tokutomi Sohō's magazine, the Kokumin no Tomo (The Nation's Friend) was the center of the Young Japan Movement and let in the advocacy of a New Japan.

3. The Self-Awareness of the New Generation

In the Meiji 20's expressions like "the old men of the Tempo period" or "the young men of Meiji," were frequently used. These two expressions show us the shift in the intellectual elite, in the culture-bearers, which was beginning to take place. The men who had participated in the Restoration had for the most part been born in the Tempō period (1830-1840). At the time of the Restoration in 1868, they were young men and relatively unknown. By the Meiji 20's, or the period from 1887-1897, they had achieved distinction both in and out of government, and were now old men past fifty. There was a new group of creative people who wanted to climb onto the stage of history.
These people were born just about the time of the Restoration, and had grown up in the fresh air of the Meiji period. These were the ten year olds who had been inspired by the tales of the Satsuma Rebellion (1877-78). These children, now young men, were pushing their way to the front.

The political revolution which had been made by the “old men of Tempō” was gradually perfecting its framework. There was now a demand for a separate and new revolution which could not be made by “the old men,” nor, indeed, could they be expected to even attempt this. This was something their still youthful blood made them sense, in some form or other. Now, indeed, a change of generations had to be effected. This was the origin of the expressions “old men of Tempō,” “young men of Meiji.” These expressions received concrete form in the revolution in man which began at this time.

In this sense, Meiji intellectual history—or, more appropriately, over-all Japanese spiritual history—took a great leap forward in the Meiji 20’s. In this period there was formed what can be considered the spirit which typified Meiji. This period stands in overwhelming contrast to the decades which preceded it—just as an earthquake fault breaks the continuity of a land form. When we reflect on the people of this new generation, we must conclude that a break between eras had taken place. It can be said that the new literature in Meiji began with the publication in 1885 of the Shōsetsu Shinzui (The Essence of the Novel), and the Tōsei Shōsei Katagi (The Character of the Modern Student) by Tsubouchi Shōyō.

Shōyō was born in 1859, and while somewhat older than the Meiji “Youth Group,” was one of their leading representatives. These two works of his which began the new era were published when he was 26 years old. Under Shōyō’s influence, Futabatei Shimei began publishing Ukigumo (The Drifting Clouds) in 1887 at the age of 23.

The beginning of the Meiji 20’s, from the standpoint of the history of literature, has been called the period of Kōro—the period in which the most representative figures were Ozaki Kōyo
and Kōda Rohan. The appellation Kōro was formed by combining the first syllables of the names Kōyo and Rohan. We might add here that while Kōyo and Rohan are usually associated with the "old men," when Kōyo published his famous Ninin Bikuni Iro Zange (Amatory Confessions of Two Nuns), and Rohan published his masterpiece Fūryūbutsu (The Elegant Buddha), in 1889, both authors were no more than 23 years old. When Tokutomi Sohō published his Shōrai no Nippon, (The Future Japan), in 1886, he was 23, and at 24, he became editor of the Kokumin no Tomo. It is in this way that the new generation emerged, and it clamored to replace the old generation.

We see this clearly in the harsh words of Nakae Chōmin:

There is nothing more difficult in times of change than for old people to know how to act. There is nothing unusual in this....But these oldsters, boasting of the two or three great deeds they accomplished, to this day continue to cling to their managerial posts and maintain their right to leadership. Holding aloft their superannuated ideas, these oldsters want to inspire the young...Unfortunately, I say to them, your ideas like yourselves have become old. They are nothing more than antiques, curios...As such, they are of no use to society whatsoever...You, sirs, are truly wise and are truly great commanders, except that today is a period of unprecedentedly great reform in all things in Japan, you are no longer fit for this. Your past is to be respected, your present is pitiable...What is called the country's well-being is something of which I probably understand little. However, I am a person who likes fresh, brisk, vernal-feeling air; I do not like stagnant, fetid swamp gases. Fresh air is produced by fresh, living things; superannuated things only produce stale gases. Therefore, in the interest of future statesmen, who are as yet beginners, I am performing the function of carabolic!

The foregoing was to be expected from someone like Nakae Chōmin who was called the "Oriental Rousseau" and was the teacher of Kōtoku Shūsui, the anarchist who was executed in 1912. Yet, interestingly enough, the identical rejection of the
oldsters and glorification of youth can be found in the *Nippon Shōnen Ka*, (Song of Japanese Youth), by the nationalist Shiga Jūkō. Shiga was two classes behind Uchimura Kanzō at the famous Sapporo Agricultural School. Even at that time he was stubbornly opposed to Uchimura, while, to be sure, respecting the latter's sincerity and earnestness. We see then that radicals like Nakae and extreme nationalists like Shiga joined in attacking the "old men" and glorified "youth."

In February 1887, with the birth of the *Kokumin no Tomo*, the slogan New Japan and Meiji Youth became dominant. From the publisher's preface to the first volume of the *Kokumin no Tomo*, we have the following representative statement:

We, the members of the Japanese Nation, believe the present time to be one deserving of our deep concern. The great reform of the Restoration which has been driving our society these 20 odd years, should be pushed still further. The old men of the past are gradually making way for the young men of the New Japan. Oriental phenomena are on their way out; Occidental phenomena are beginning. The period of destruction is at an end and the age of building is soon to start. Truly, our country's future welfare, its destiny, depends on the decisions we make in the present period.

The editor of the *Kokumin no Tomo*, Tokutomi Sohō, was at this time a "populist." He had almost a mystical reverence for the common, the ordinary people. His doctrine could be called "democratism" to distinguish it from what we today call democracy. The glorification of the common people by Tokutomi Sohō at this time was no less influential than the opposite view espoused by Takayama Chogyū in the Meiji 30's (1897-1907). Sohō's mystique of the common people was balanced by Chogyū's worship of the *uncommon* man, his belief in genius.

4. Sohō's Democratism

In attempting to trace some of the major trends of the Meiji 20's through Tokutomi Sohō's ideas we must clearly state
that it is the ideas he held before the Sino-Japanese War (1894-1895) which we will use. When the *Kokumin no Tomo* first appeared in the Meiji 20's it exercised tremendous influence on contemporary Japanese. In Sohō’s writings at this time we can sense his youthful approach to history, his romanticism, and his extremely advanced grasp of the problems of society. This was all embodied in his democratism.

We can also sense in Sohō an awareness of Japan in the world, and an acute realization of the dangerous situation in which the Orient found itself. Later, all this sensitivity was funneled into an ultra-nationalist chauvinism. In the Meiji 20's, however, an entire generation came under the influence of Tokutomi Sohō’s democratism.

In the *Shōrai no Nippon* Tokutomi wrote:

The present transformation is a progressive and not a retrogressive one. The field on which we now do battle is not the last, but the first; the present departure is not one of despair, but of hope...Today, if the rotted and withered old trees were to be blown down in a typhoon, there would still remain young shoots which with proper nurture would soon rise loftily to the heavens. This age is one of hope. For this reason we should speak of the resurrection of Japan rather than of the transformation of Japan. In any event, the old Japan has died. The Japan of today is a new Japan. The question remains: what of Japan’s future?

In answering this question Tokutomi said that Japan must quit the world of violence—feudalism—Japan must advance through democratism to the establishment of a peaceful world.

The use of the word *resurrection* in the foregoing was deliberate. We noted previously that the period coincided with the growing awareness on the part of the intellectuals of a cultural renaissance. In this sense, the feeling of revival—a new growth from sturdy old roots—was quite natural at this time.

What lend interest to his concept of this period as a “resurrection”, to his awareness of the New Japan, and to his view of history underlying these ideas were (a) what he con-
sidered to be the basic nature of the Meiji Restoration, (b) how he interpreted the role of Yoshida Shōin, who may be called the symbol of the revolutionary aspect of the Restoration which Tokutomi emphasized, and (c) where he located the general impetus for the changes and the revolution.

The Shōrai no Nippon was concerned with Japan's future and in the Shin Nippon no Seinen (Youth of New Japan) Tokutomi's emphasis was on a critique of Japan's past. And since a new spirit had not arisen to replace the old Confucian morality which was destroyed, "our Meiji society from a moral standpoint, must be said to be a naked society." Therefore, it was necessary to revive the morality of the mass society—"a task which must be accomplished by a second revolution of the Japanese intellectuals." He considered that what supported the Tokugawa feudal society—what might be called its sovereign—was tradition, in other words, mere custom. Tokutomi said:

Who is the ruler of this society? Is it the Shōgun who stands at the pinnacle of the society? There are those who would say of a certainty it is the Shōgun. Yet beginning with Imperial Loyalists like Takayama Hikokurō and Rai Sanyō there were all those others who burned with indignation against the Shōgun, finally forcing him to return his authority and powers to the Emperor. Truly, the view that the Shōgun ruled the feudal society is a shallow one. Who then was the actual authority or ruler at that time? Discerning and clear-minded individuals would certainly say the ruler of the society was not the Emperor, the nobles, the warriors, peasants, or merchants. Authority lay somewhere else. The ruler of society, the repository of authority, was custom, usage, and tradition. There is no society in which custom is so predominant as in a feudal society. Feudalism is established on the basis of custom; indeed, the feudal society exists jointly with custom. The moment custom is destroyed, the very fabric of the feudal society is subverted.

Sohō thus argued that the ruler in feudal society was not the Shōgun or the Emperor, but custom. The revolution of the Meiji
Restoration was accomplished by breaking with custom, and it was natural that this break was effected by young men. In the "second Meiji-Revolution," which should now take place, Sohō felt that here too youth was "the master of revolution."

In 1893 Tokutomi Sohō wrote a one-volume work called Yoshida Shōin. In this work, which can still be read with interest, he backed up his social-psychological interpretation with an historical and socio-economic analysis. In this work he wrote that there were internal or immanent reasons why the Bakufu was overthrown by revolution. Despite the fact that the Bakufu had originally been formed with the samurai class as its central support, it nevertheless collapsed. Two hundred years of peace, the growth of production, and the development of wealth, had led to a transfer of real power into the hands of the merchant class; the samurai during this period became "like bearded princesses"—they had become effete. These immanent contradictions were such that, had the West not come to Japan, there would still have been an adequate basis for revolution.

Peace was the servant of wealth; wealth progressed, indeed, made extraordinary progress. This wealth, however, was all outside the compass of the feudal warrior class. Peace not only contributed to the 'production of wealth,' it brought the 'joys of wealth.' And not these alone, but also the 'worship of wealth.' Therefore, the social structure, which was centered on the feudal samurai, could not but tend to focus on the attainment of wealth.

The samurai, the great daimyōs too, lowered their heads before the Ōsaka merchants and begged for loans. Tokutomi concluded that, because of conditions like theses, the buying and selling of shares and the adoption system possessed a semblance of bribery and corruption. In this connection he said:

Conditions of society being like this, even without the irruption of the problems of foreign affairs, revolution could not have been avoided. There was however, something even more extreme: this was the unnoticed, silent achievement of a spiritual revolution.
And, with this, Tokutomi Sohō moved on to the problem of the spiritual revolution. He presented a portrait of Yoshida Shōin as a revolutionary. "Shōin was not a military specialist, he was a revolutionary—what he taught breathes the spirit of revolution, what he preached was the manner of its accomplishment." More specifically, in the chapter in his book titled "Shōin, the Revolutionary," Tokutomi asserted there are three types of revolutionaries: the prophet who looks to the future and foretells; the destructive radical who "must immediately set his hand to what he sees with his eyes"; and, finally, the constructive type. Yoshida Shōin, in Tokutomi's interpretation, was the second type—"an extreme radical among radicals."

There are problems connected with this interpretation of Yoshida Shōin. In terms of the material already presented regarding Shōin in the first section of the book, it is difficult to agree with this interpretation. When we read the edition of Yoshida Shōin just quoted from, the correctness of the interpretation apart, we immediately feel a freshness, a sense of Tokutomi's passion. In this edition, at very least, we are caused to feel that the Tokutomi of the Meiji 20's has invested Yoshida Shōin with his own revolutionary passion. In 1908, however, he completely revised the book. The result of the revision: where, in the early edition, he had written "Shōin was not a military specialist...what he preached was the manner of its [the revolution's] accomplishment," now became, "Shōin was not a so-called specialist on military science, he was a reformer. What he taught breathes the spirit of reform, what he preached became the immense undertaking of reform." In this book, then, the word revolution was completely replaced by the word reform. And, surprisingly, the "accomplishment of revolution" became the "immense undertaking of reform." Shōin was transformed from a "destructive radical" into someone who had "rendered great service in the immense undertaking of Meiji"—no longer is passion in evidence. Also, the part in the first edition titled "Shōin, the Revolutionary" was entirely deleted. Tokutomi, plainly, had undergone a change of heart in the period
of the Meiji 30's. Nevertheless, in the Meiji 20's, as we noted above, Tokutomi was still a fervent advocate of a "second revolution."

At that time, Tokutomi thought the substance of historical great changes to comprise youth. The group which was active in historical changes was not only young in age, but in its class composition was of the common people. Now we can understand why Tokutomi wanted to fuse the youth and the common people. We see this clearly in the following lines:

Everybody knows passively the power of wealth; nobody reflects on the force of the desire for wealth. Everybody knows the force of power; nobody reflects on the force of the lust for power. To have experience is to have power, but in not having experience there is also power. Those without experience...can act impulsively, without reflecting. Rank is a source of power, to not have rank is also a source of power.

...At the same time we admit the importance of wealth, strength, learning, authority, in political affairs, we must also admit that there are other important resources. This is what is meant by the phrase 'to be inexhaustible though possessing nothing.' This quality of inexhaustible resources is limited to youth alone. Youth is naturally endowed with populist, reforming and progressive tendencies. It is always this class that is drawn upon when it becomes necessary to cleanse society of corruption.

To Tokutomi, the great changes of history resulted from the clash between the possessing and the have-not classes. The former tended to be conservative, the latter, progressive. Progress and change in history were the accomplishments of the youth within the class of have-nots. We see here a two-fold view of history: history as class-conflict, and history as generation-conflict. The latter, the conflict between youth and age, also suggested the belief that the vigor of youth, its reforming and spiritual zeal, was the motive power of revolution. Underlying Tokutomi's thought, however, was his populism, his mystique of the common people which we must now examine.
The term Tokutomi used to express his belief in the common people was *heimin-shugi*. To avoid confusion with what we mean today by the word "democracy," we have variously referred to Tokutomi’s *heimin-shugi* as *democratism*, *populism*,—possibly a neologism like *common people-ism* would most approximate his meaning. At any rate, *heimin-shugi* was Tokutomi’s translation for the word "democracy," as he understood it.

His position in the *Shōrai no Nippon* was as follows. Feudal society was one in which military power was dominant, it was a world of force. Today, however, military force itself has come under the dominance of wealth; the world of force has been replaced by a world of commerce, industry, and trade. Paralleling this transformation, the former world which was under the hegemony of the aristocratic idea has given way to a world in which increasingly the common people have become supreme, to a world dominated by the democratic idea.

These concepts were little more than Manchester liberalism of the Cobden and Bright variety. Also, Spencerian optimism was very much in evidence in these ideas. Tokutomi went further, however, and rejecting the hegemony of wealth, he espoused socialist thought which he felt was the basis for true democracy. The first victory for democracy had taken place when the rule of wealth replaced that of military force; the second victory for democracy would take place when the rule of production would replace that of wealth. In these writings we can see that Tokutomi was conscious of social and economic problems. He wrote:

The limiting of military power by wealth constitutes the first victory for democracy in the world. To limit wealth by labor would be the second victory for democracy in the world. The first victory has already been partially attained in the nineteenth century. Though there are not too many signs as yet of the second victory, it is certain that these will appear in the future.

What are the great societal changes that we can speak of for the period comprising the end of the nineteenth and the
beginning of the twentieth centuries?...The limiting of military power by wealth following the emergence of the middle-classes which developed commerce and industry.

I used the word limiting not destruction....When we think of a country like Russia, proud of her military power, yet, humbly floating loans from republican France, or a country like England, her ironclads all over the world, yet, having her power of taxation vested in the Lower House of Parliament, may we not conclude that wealth limits military power? ...Similarly, wealth will be limited by labor. The present power of wealth penetrates to the very marrow of society. Can this power be easily destroyed? To destroy this is never the way to foster the progress of society. Therefore, I speak of limiting, not of destroying. What does limiting mean in this regard? It means for the power of labor to transcend the power of wealth. And though wealth now has power, the power of labor will be triumphant. Where does the power of labor come from? From the lower classes, from those who earn their bread by the sweat of their brows.

A natural consequence of this type of thought was that Tokutomi even went as far as to glorify strikes. He defended the seamen's strike of 1889 in London, it was "a new phenomenon in the democratic movement." The two authors of the Nihon Shakaishugi-Shi (History of Japanese Socialism), Ishikawa Sanshirō and Kōtoku Shūsui, wrote in the section on Tokutomi Sohō and the Minyūsha (Society of Friends of the People) which he founded:

The Japanese Socialist Party is indebted to the Minyūsha. ...He [Sohō] became an instigator of strikes...The Minyūsha was a second Meirokusha, it became a well-spring for new thought. The currents of socialism in Japan can truly be said to have emerged from this source.

There is much that is plausible here. Sakai Yūsaburo, a disciple of Nakae Chōmin, was at that time writing reports for the Kokumin no Tomo from Paris. He reported on the Socialist Movement and covered such events as May Day for the journal.
These articles attracted a great deal of attention and we see in this period the gradual rise in Japan of concrete discussion of socialism, labor, and an awareness of the social problem. Tokutomi Sohō was one of the first to deal with these problems. There was however, another aspect to his thought at this time which was preparing the ground for his later ideological change. This was the aspect of Tokutomi’s thought which was concerned with Japan’s position in the world and the problem of the Orient in general.

In the *Shōrai no Nippon* Tokutomi had favored pacifism which he felt was a necessary result of the development of commerce and industry. The nineteenth century, he asserted, had, in essence, entered the age of peace and democracy, yet, the struggle between the idea of peace and the idea of force persisted. The attitude of the West towards the Orient was manifestly still based on naked force.

The present day world is one in which civilized people tyrannically destroy savage peoples....The European countries stand at the very pinnacle of violence and base themselves on the doctrine of force....India, alas, has been destroyed, Annam has been destroyed, Burma will be next. The remaining countries will be independent in name only....What is the outlook for Persia? For China? Korea? And even Japan? The future will be extremely critical. This, I feel, is unbearable.

Tokutomi’s attitude before the Sino-Japanese War was that Asia faced a crisis. He believed, as did many Japanese, that Japan’s mission was to serve as a “breakwater” which would prevent the “enslavement of the Orient.” The growth of nationalism (Japanism) and even ultra-nationalism can easily be understood in this context. It can also be seen why Tokutomi Sohō called his books *Japan’s Future, Youth of New Japan*, and his magazine, *The Nation’s Friend*.

In summary, Tokutomi’s “democracy” was a composite of a belief in the common people, an advocacy of some vague form of socialism and, latterly, a sense of the necessity for nationalism.
All these elements were joined by his concept of progress and reform which was to be led by youth.

5. The Nationalism of Kuga Katsunan and Miyake Setsurei

We saw that the beginning of the Meiji 20's was characterized by the demand for a human or spiritual revolution. This demand for a second revolution was something new in contrast with the political revolution which had unfolded since the Restoration. We attempted to trace one of the manifestations of this revolution through Tokutomi Sohō's writings in the early *Kokumin no Tomo*. What was of interest, or rather, what was surprising, was Sohō's marked concern with social problems. It was characteristic of the beginning of the Meiji 20's that society was considered a problem. It can be said that this was a period in which society was, in a sense, discovered. Another aspect we saw in Tokutomi's thought was that the nation had become a problem. In short, this was the period in which the problem of the *nation-state* clearly emerged. This period was both progressive and reactionary if we assume that social consciousness represents the former, and concern with the *nation* represents the latter. We can also say that this period was one in which there was manifested a mixture of reformism and conservatism. This mixture can be inferred from the popularity of the slogan New Japan. Extreme nationalism only appeared at the *end* of the Meiji 20's. In the next chapter we will see that Japanism could be recognized in its pure form at this time in the arts and literature. It signified a re-discovery of Japan's art and literature which had been forgotten or neglected since the period of the Meiji Restoration.

At this time many societies or associations were formed by the intellectuals. Examples of these were the aforementioned Minyūsha; their journal was the *Kokumin no Tomo*, and the Kenyūsha (Society of Friends of the Inkstone) which was organized by Ozaki Köyō. A similar organization was formed in 1888 led by Miyake Setsurei; their organ was the magazine *Nippon-jin* (The Japanese), which later was renamed *Nippon*
Oyobi Nippon-jin (Japan and the Japanese). In 1907 this organization became known as the Seikyōsha (Political Doctrines Society). The nature, structure, and activities of these societies are extremely interesting but we cannot deal with them here. Rather we will attempt to analyse the work of Miyake Setsurei on the magazine Nippon-jin of which he was editor. Also, we will examine the ideas of Kuga Katsunan who was editor-in-chief of the newspaper Nippon which was founded in 1889.

At first glance these intellectual currents appear to have been dominated by a narrow and intolerant chauvinism. And a development of this nature was a distinct possibility, given the epigones, the second-raters who came to the forefront in the Meiji 30's. At this time—the Meiji 20's—the thought of the intellectuals was not narrowly nationalistic.

There was in this group a significant tendency to think in historical terms, to see political ideas and movements within the broad scope of historical development since the Meiji Restoration. The Kinji Seiron-kō (Considerations of Recent Politics) which Kuga Katsunan (Minoru) wrote in 1890-91, was a concise and clear analysis of political theory and activity. In this work Kuga skillfully pointed out that the Restoration rested on a compromise which had been effected between two political concepts. These concepts had been mutually opposed in the last years of the Bakufu. One called for the expelling of the barbarians and the restoration of Imperial Rule, the other advocated opening the ports and the union of the Court and the military—the Bakufu. The Restoration became viable when these two extreme positions were brought into a working arrangement, and the new combined position became the advocacy of opening the ports and the restoration of Imperial Rule.

Again there arose a division of opinion over the question as to which path Japan should follow in the new era. This division was reflected in the Meirokusha where one group advocated an all out drive to increase national wealth and the other was bent on increasing national power before all else. The first position was represented by Fukuzawa Yukichi; Katō Hiroyuki,
Mitsukuri Rinshō, and Tsuda Shindō led in the advocacy of the second position.

This was the first phase of the political debate of Meiji and it lasted until 1874; in this period the statesmen sought knowledge from the scholars and intellectuals. The next period—the second phase in the political debate—saw the emergence of the demand for a popularly elected assembly. This was the period after 1874 when the Itagaki group which had earlier withdrawn from the government over the question of chastising Korea was now leading in the radical demand for popular rights. In Kuga’s conceptualization, the Itagaki group had while in the government, supported the assertion of national power, now, after 1874, it was advocating popular power—another way of looking at popular rights. This second phase lasted until 1881. We may note here that Kuga distinguished four types within the advocacy of popular power at this time:

1. The “melancholy” popular rights advocacy, which referred to those factions grieving over the state of national affairs—the groups led by Etō Shimpei, Maebara Issei and others—who did not hesitate to resort to force to oppose the government. This culminated in the great Satsuma Rebellion of 1877 when these groups were finally eliminated.

2. The “cheerful” popular rights advocacy held by the Tosa Risshisha (Society for Realizing One’s Ambitions), the Ōsaka Aikokusha (Patriotic Society), which later evolved into the Jiyūtō under the leadership of Itagaki.

3. The “translators’” popular rights advocacy of which those favoring Fukuzawa’s national wealth theory were adherents. Later this became Okuma’s Kaishintō (Reform Party).

4. The “ecclectic” popular rights advocacy which became the basis for Fukuchi’s Rikken Teiseitō (Constitutional Government Party).

These were the four divisions within the popular rights movement, according to Kuga Katsunan, during the third phase of the political debate. In 1881 the Kokkai Kisei Dōmei-kai (Association for the Promotion of a National Assembly) marked
the beginning of the fourth phase which lasted until 1884-5.

This new phase saw a growing concern with such concrete problems as the writing of the constitution, and there was a demand for the revision of the unequal treaties which the West had forced on Japan during the final years of the Bakufu. In this phase the Jiyūtō turned reactionary, it was now opposed to the government's Europeanization program which was proceeding apace. Contrariwise, the Rikken Teiseitō was now progressive since it supported Europeanization; the Kaishintō occupied a middle position—partly for Europeanization and partly for conservatism.

In this period reactionary nationalists and conservatives like Tani Kanjō and Torio Tokuan came to the fore. It must be said that Kuga Katsunan's nationalism was of a different order. We saw that Kuga was clearly aware of the vicissitudes, the many changes in the political debate since the Restoration. Above all, Kuga possessed a sense of historical perspective. He understood the shallowness of the Itagaki group's concept of freedom and was well aware of the origins of this position. Therefore, in his own nationalism he did not content himself merely with advocating freedom and equality as did the Itagaki group.

For his time Kuga had a remarkably sharp understanding of the origins of the modern national State in Europe. He perceived that the sentiment of nationalism was a product of a kind of rationalism. Kuga believed that the establishment of the national State was a process which in Europe included three historical moments of force. These were, the religious revolution which freed the State from the bonds of the Church, the French Revolution by which the State became an independent cohesive entity—no longer the private property of royalty, and the aggressions of Napoleon which forced the State to become militarily self-reliant and led to the strengthening of national unity.

Within the framework of such rational considerations the modern national State in Europe had been established. Kuga
felt that this rationalism was the trend of the modern world. His nationalism was therefore neither old-fashioned chauvinism, nor was it the individual-centered nationalism of eighteenth century liberalism. Kuga went beyond this and advocated instead the establishment of a national party.

Concerning this Katsunan later said:

At that time I advocated a national party and was not concerned over the laughter of shallow and frivolous people—rather I would have been upset had biased ultra-conservatives been happy over my ideas...the great purpose of a nationalist party is close to philanthropy and humanitarianism...and distant from the anti-foreign thought held by the ultra-conservatives.

Katsunan also said:

The Imperial House, the Government, taxes,...all of these belong to the entire corpus of the nation. In ancient times these were entrusted to members of the nation and were later arrogated as private property. This is something which is deleterious to national unity. The national party desires to rescue the country from divisiveness and favoritism and feels it is necessary on this score that the national political administration become political administration based on public opinion.

In the following Katsunan's conceptualization of a national party is made clear.

A national party has as its great objective the maintenance and development of its functions and powers which are historically derived. The maintenance and development of its national characteristics is another way of putting it. Therefore, despite the fact that it may appear conservative or progressive, depending on the position from which it is viewed, it can never really be designated as either.

In Gensei (Basic Politics—1893) he asserted, in connection with the fervor of many people for constitutional government, "In the national administrative structure, constitutional government is only a means not the goal." This was Katsunan's way of ad-
monishing those who only pursued one aspect of politics. However, it was precisely on this issue that Miyake Setsurei’s arguments in the Nippon-jin were inadequate.

Miyake Setsurei’s view of the State was that the State was an organism. The State was a “great organism” and not a company based upon some compact, “this was the historical Japanese State.” Kuga Katsunان stressed the duties and obligations of the nation more than the rights of the nation. Setsurei felt the same way and his belief was that the Japanese should “exert their special abilities” to fulfill these duties, because this was the way to contribute to world happiness. And in arguing whether the Japanese historically had such abilities, he stated that the Japanese were “sincere, good, and beautiful.” In a later article he also pointed out Japanese shortcomings, writing about the “mendacious, evil, and ugly Japanese.” Here he scathingly pointed out the various failings of the Japanese. He criticized the existence in Japanese academic circles of a hierarchic system and of feudal characteristics; especially, he made the Normal School the target for his attack. For it was there that the mendacity of Japan was apparent. Next, Japan’s evil, he felt, was the arrogance and dominance of the great merchant princes; these must be swept away, he said. He felt that therein lay the cause of the depression that Japan was undergoing at that time. And finally, in contrast to the enthusiastic boasting about Japanese art which was current, he felt that the larger part of Japanese art did not go beyond a facile skill in handicrafts and was deficient in a true concept of aesthetics—this was Japan’s ugliness. About the vulgarity surrounding the life of artists and novelists, he said: “An artist’s life ought itself be artistic.”

This was the nature of nationalism and Japanism in the first half of the Meiji 20’s. The following points should be noted about this Japanism. Nothing like Emperor worship could be seen at this time. Even a nationalist like Torio Tokuan who said: “He [the Emperor] also is a man, why should one set this man apart by the arbitrary division between ruler and
people or high and low!...If the ruler is not virtuous, he is not a ruler.” Torio also said, “The ruler cannot respect or value himself, the respect or value comes when the people love the ruler.” These people in the early half of the Meiji 20’s were nationalists but they were not adherents of “Emperorism.” Their attitude was different from conservative, extreme nationalism. Setsurei wrote of the “mendacious, evil, ugly Japanese,” and Katsunan was frightened by the ultra-conservatives rather than pleased by them.

Another characteristic of the nationalism and Japanism at this time was the rejection of capitalism which was tied to the government. This is clear from Setsurei’s attack on the merchant princes, and what was especially notable was his exposure of the “Takashima Coal Mining Problem” in the *Nippon-jin*, which he managed at that time. Setsurei wrote the following in an article called “What is to be done about 3,000 Slaves?”

It is odious to hear, but the evil custom of slavery exists in Takashima in the nearby province of Hizen. Under the cruelty of slavery, human beings are dealt with as cattle, and while this has been thought of as something occurring in the past, in other countries, it actually exists today in Japan under the name of coal mining in Takashima in Hizen. These slaves are without blame or crime, but are whipped on until their skins are inflamed. Their destiny is to toil diligently day and night and to perish miserably by the wayside. While there is much in the world to be deplored, there is nothing as painful as slavery, nothing as grievous as slavery, and nothing demanding such speedy assistance as slavery. Alas, in Takashima there are easily 3,000 of these people enslaved, who collapse suddenly with an anguished cry from toil, who descend while still alive into the veriest hell!

While the attitude of the people connected with the *Nippon-jin* was not socialistic, they nevertheless commented on, and discussed, labor problems. Their views as presented in the *Nippon-jin* were a national sensation, especially in Nos. 6-14 (1888).
We must also note that these people were never narrowly nationalistic. Their primary concerns were always within a background of "Orientalism." They were opposed to Western capitalism and imperialism and were concerned with how to protect Japan and the Orient. This was the embryo of the later tie-up with militarism. The national strength of Japan at this time (the early Meiji 20's) was not sufficient to make possible militarism and expansionism. Japanese policy at this time was defensivist; its main object was to seek the spiritual independence of the Orient and Japan. This last can be seen among the public-spirited men of that time and is especially notable in the Orientalism of Okakura Tenshin, who will be dealt with in the next chapter.

6. The Orientalism of Tenshin-Okakura Kakuzō

In the history of art in the Meiji period the two people who stand out prominently are Kanō Hōgai and Hashimoto Gahō. Very little, however, is known of the misery they endured from the end of the Tokugawa period to the beginning of Meiji, and how they had to persevere in order to realize their ambitions. Gahō's autobiographical reminiscences are extremely touching, and since these details in Gahō's life are relatively unknown, we will take these up briefly.

Gahō was born in 1834, and in 1856 he became senior or head student in Katsukawa Masanobu's art school. This position meant that he kept discipline and assisted in instruction. Fukuzawa Yukichi held the same post in Ogata Kōan's school in Ōsaka. The conditions of that time were extremely disturbed and as a consequence his wife became insane. People were excited over national affairs and were not interested in paintings. Gahō, to support himself, painted pictures on fans for export to China—a hundred for one yen! He also made samisen bridges which sold for one sen apiece. Then he obtained employment as a draftsman for the naval school and his life became somewhat stable and secure. He worked like this for fifteen years only to be confronted one day by the gruesome scene of
his lunatic wife who had escaped from her cell and set fire to
the house, attempting to drag their daughter into the flames.

Nevertheless, in an article for the magazine Taiyō years
later, he described his awareness at that time as follows:
The state of affairs became more and more turbulent; my
wife went mad; the household finances were badly off; and
I was wretchedly aware of the evanescence of life, the fleeting-
ness of this world. Yet I felt that worldly concerns and the
concerns of painting were completely unrelated. I felt I must
not weaken and deviate from my cherished ambition because
of a temporary physical misfortune. I also felt that my
desire to rise in the world by my painting would not be
fulfilled if it were not my sole resolve and concern. Thus I
usually visited with my especial friend, Hōgai; we discussed
painting; we consoled each other; we encouraged and stimu-
lated each other. He felt that always picking at the leavings
of the painter Tanyū or being a stickler in following the
rules of Tsunenobu was the worst possible fault. The progress
of painting, he argued, made it necessary to come out with
something that could be called one’s own, and from which,
incidentally, one could also derive pleasure. Hōgai was from
the Hagi territorial clan [Chōshu]. He had especially original
aspirations and was extremely bold in expressing his views
on painting—so much so people took him for a madman and
would not even venture to listen to him. Myself, however,
I always was amenable to his views, and agreed with them.

Later, Hashimoto Gahō was chosen by Okakura Kakuzō,
and together with his friend, Kanō Hōgai, he received employ-
ment in the Mombushō Painting Study Bureau which was estab-
lished in 1886. In 1888, with the founding of the Art School,
his became a central figure in this school. Unfortunately, Hōgai
died at the end of the year, leaving only a Hibo Kwannon (Tragic
Mother Kwannon) painting.

It was in 1888 that the Tōkyō Art School was established,
and this was part of the revival of the arts that we mentioned
previously. From Gahō’s words we can know about artists
who had an individual and original self-awareness even at the time of the Restoration. One can also understand their self-confidence and resolution, despite the unending and overpowering concern with politics and current affairs after the Restoration. It is this self-confidence, resoluteness, and awareness that became the basis for the revival of the arts in the Meiji 20's.

We can derive a feeling of the same kind of self-confidence on the part of Hōgai from anecdotes about him. There is this famous story about Hōgai. In 1884, at an art exhibition, Fenellosa was startled by two works of Hōgai's, the Ouca Shumme (Swift Horse Beneath Cherry Tree), and Sekkei Sansui (Snow Landscape), and together with Okakura Tenshin went to visit the artist at his wretched dwelling in Shibasannai in Tokyo. Thus Kanō was "discovered." At an art-judging exhibition in 1885 Hōgai's Niosokki-zu, a painting of Deva King with Oni under his Foot—a Buddhist theme, was exxxtremely well-received, and its reputation came to the attention of Prime Minister Itō Hirobumi and Home Minister Yamagata Aritomo, who both went to see the painting. Hōgai in turn went to visit Itō, this visit was described in Kinsei Meishō-dan (by Mori Daikyō), (Discourses on Modern Masters), as follows:

The appointed day came, and Hōgai set out in the early morning for Marquis Itō's residence. Marquis Itō, because of some unexpected business, was just leaving and made as if to climb into his carriage. Hōgai caught his sleeve and said. 'It was agreed that Hōgai would meet his excellency today, and I want to say that what the welfare of our people really needs is inexhaustible art and beauty, and the source of all the arts is related to painting. What Itō Hirobumi is to political circles, I, Kanō Hōgai, am to the art world. I therefore beg the attention of his excellency to discuss art.' Upon this, Itō did not leave his seat. Hōgai was a skillful speaker and he argued eloquently and could thus assure the encouragement of art in Japan—his discussion lasted four hours. When the talk ended Hōgai fumbled for something in the bosom of his kimono and drew out a written draft which contained
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essentially what he had just delivered orally. Hōgai said, 'Before coming, I outlined what I have just spoken about. I beg you to glance at these notes.' Presently he took up his fan, stood, and performing the dance from the Nō play Yamauba, which he always enjoyed singing, he made his exit. We see here the vividness and vitality of Kanō Hōgai, but the leader or mentor of men like Hōgai and Gahō was really Tenshin-Okakura Kakuzō.

Okakura returned from a tour of Europe and America in October 1887. On this tour he traveled with Fenellosa and observed the state of art education. In November 1887 he attempted some lectures in which he argued as follows on the proper way to advance Japanese art. The position of the intelligent public in connection with this question could be placed into four categories. First, there were those who argued for pure Westernism. To these people, the West was to serve as a standard or model for Japan. The question arises, what is understood by the word "West?"

Where is the essence of the West in the countries of Europe and America? All these countries have different systems; what is right in one country is wrong in the next; religion, customs, morals, there is no common agreement on any of these. Europe is discussed in a general way, and this sounds splendid; the question remains, where in reality does what is called Europe exist!

When we say, "in all countries of the West," not only is there no adequate way of supporting this statement, but the statement itself is inaccurate. As French scholars have lately said, it is Greece that should be taken as a model—and it is to Japanese art that the West should give heed.

In the second category, of course, were the pure Japanists. This group eagerly brandishes the view of Japan's "unique" and "characteristic" art, which also is inadequate. After all, where ought one to search for the uniqueness of Japanese art? Does not the character of Japanese art differ from age to age?

The art of the earliest period was taken from the three king-
doms into which Korea was then divided. The art of the Engi period was part of the culture received from T’ang China. The flourishing state of art in the Higashiyama period was based on Sung China, and the brilliance of Momoyama art was a product of the Korean expedition and Dutch importations. The art of the Genroku and Kyōhō periods was strongly imitative of China’s Ming Dynasty art, and Japanese art in the Tenmei and Kansei periods followed the style of Chinese art in the Ch’ing period.

The third category Okakura distinguished was that of the “eclectics.” These were opportunists who thought in terms of ‘yesterday—the Orient, today—the West.” The art of East and West was incomplete, to mix these was only to add injury and confusion, therefore, the position of the ecclectics was one which from the outset could not be recognized.

Tenshin’s position at that time was expressed in his “natural development” theory of art—which was the fourth category.

Natural development was something which would be determined by the unfolding of life.

We do not argue about differences in the art of East and West, we stand on the great principles of art, and adopt what is seemly, pursue what is beautiful. Art is a product of past history combined with present conditions. It develops from this fusion of past and present. What should be sought for among the great Italian masters we will seek; where the technique of oil painting is called for, it will be used, and even developed by experiment. In short, whatever is suitable for future life will be adopted...Japanese Artists! Art is common to all the world! There can be no distinction between East and West in this regard! Conformity is the domicile of bad habits! Show deep emotionality and this will of a necessity lead to magnificent art.

Tenshin’s perfected theory of art he presented in written form in the period of the Russo-Japanese War. This was embodied in his three books: The Ideals of the East, The Awakening of Japan, and The Book of Tea. The above discourse
already contained in embryonic form his theory of art. The problem we have dealt with, ramifications of spirit—thought—in the early Meiji 20's, can be divided, in terms of Okakura’s thought, into three categories which describe its characteristics.

First, he prized originality and individuality. The type of thought which unqualifiedly assumed the existence of special Japanese characteristics, or uniquenesses, he rejected, despite the Engi period and the earliest period in Japanese art. This is clear from his stressing the differences in each art period in Japanese art history. It is also clear that Tenshin vigorously opposed lumping together the various European countries and America. In 1893-94 Tenshin made a trip to China to study classical art. His first impression was that there was no one common characteristic in China which would link all the diversity of time and area. As Tenshin aphoristically expressed it, “In China there is no China.” This clarifies the meaning of his “conformity is the domicile of bad habits” by which he meant to stress individuality, the non-adherence to any formal school of art. This can be strongly felt in Tenshin and his followers.

The second characteristic of Okakura’s thought was his romanticist, and his introspective, spiritual way of looking at things. In an article he sent to the New York Times entitled “In Defense of Lafcadio Hearn,” he wrote as follows about Hearn, who came closest to the Japanese in his understanding and interpretation of Japanese life, ideals, and aspirations: “When the soul of one race of people is bared to outsiders, it is not erudition that is of prime importance here but insight. We need more than an historian, we need a poet!” Without wishing to detract from Hearn, it is really Tenshin himself who is described by the above statement. He, indeed, had the penetrative power, the insight, of a poet. It was Tenshin-Okakura Kakuzō who taught how to appreciate Japanese art in particular and Western art in general. Tenshin penetrated to the spirit of art.

The first lectures on Japanese art history were given by Okakura in 1891 at the Tokyo Art School, and it was from these
lectures that we have supported the view of Tenshin we have presented. We will also present two more citations from these lectures. The first of these represents an abridgement or summation of Okakura’s overall interpretation of Japanese art history:

The great divisions in Japanese art history are contained in the three periods: ancient, medieval, and modern. The ancient period is that of the Nara Imperial Court; the middle-ages are characterized by the dominance of the Fujiwara family and the Kamakura Bakufu; and the modern period is formed by the Ashikaga Bakufu. The Nara Court period excelled in sculpture; it was rich in extremely idealistic conceptualizations. The nature or essence of the Buddhism of the Nara Court was formed by the Hinayana. [Lesser Vehicle Buddhism which today still flourishes in most of Southeast Asia.] Here there could not be any close relationship between the human world and the world of the Buddha. Consequently, the sculptured representations of the Buddha were loftier by far than the conception of the Buddha as a mere mortal man, and these statues were objects of faith and worship. Buddhist figures like Yakushi [God of Medicine] and Amida existed in the remote heavens and were not close to human beings. Their statues had to be created by the imagination. In this, the Nara Court sculpture is close to Greece.

The medieval period in Japan was one of emotionalism; as such, the essence of its religiosity was primarily one of esoteric Buddhism. The doctrine that everybody could attain to Buddhahood, or enter Nirvana, was preached during this period. The Buddha had compassion for humanity and man had compassion for the Buddha—man and Buddha were not distant from one another. The Buddhist imagery of this period, as seen in the representations of Fudō and Jizō [Ksitigarbha, guardian deity of children], is familiar. The vigor and virility of this period is expressed in the school of Kose; its outstanding elegance is in Eshin and Motomitsu; and when
we come Takanobu and Takachika we arrive at its peak.

The foregoing essentially tended to elegance and refinement. And it was from the overflow from this period that the art of the Kamakura period was constituted. This too was an age of deeply emotional art. The conditions of this period are almost identical to those of the period of the emotional Renaissance art in Italy in the 15th century. When we come to the Ashikaga period, there is a complete turnabout from the emotionality of the Fujiwara age to self-consciousness: art is now personal, it is marked by an awareness of self. Japanese art, then, comprises in its essence idealism, emotionality, and self-awareness. When we come to the present, especially the period before the Restoration, we find art dominated by the ideal of self-consciousness... At the present time something different is attempted in the sketches turned out by Okyo. Art standards in the West and in Japan are different. Essentially, the difference rests on a difference in thought, and this is where the clash between the art of East and West emerges.

To Tenshin, the Nara Court was magnificent in its idealism; the Fujiwara period was elegant in its emotionality; the Ashikaga age was artistically extremely quiet and restful in its self-awareness. Tenshin saw the differences between East and West in art in these three points, and these differences were reflected in the religious-philosophical background as a product of Zen Buddhism and Sung Confucianism. Tenshin, feeling that a deeply spiritual life underlay art, was an idealist and not a believer in art for art's sake. This can be seen in the following:

In aesthetics the advocacy of what is called 'art for art's sake' has become extremely popular in the West. I cannot agree with this. Art which has only to please the human craving for beauty and is not required to have any other practical use, is nothing but a craft or skill. I feel that art must have both pure beauty and also, to be considered true art, must possess something of the highest level of the religio-
sity and culture of its period.

It was from this point of view that Tenshin’s Orientalism and Japanism emerged. It is obvious that since Tenshin believed that art was something common to all the world, that here, at least, there could be no distinction between East and West. From the very outset we see that Tenshin’s Japanism was not petty or narrow. In *The Book of Tea*, he wrote:

By mutually quitting the dispatching of epigrammatic criticism East and West will both profit. Though they do not come to understand each other in all particulars there will still be a softening of feeling between them. Though they follow different paths of development, there is no reason for them not to supplement each other’s shortcomings. We have gone through a gigantic and soul-shattering development. We have created in the face of aggression a delicate harmony. Can we not believe that the Orient is in some points superior to the Occident?

Okakura was indignant over the West’s contempt for, and aggression against, the East, but he did not have dreams of the East conquering the West. He only felt that for the Orient, significance lay in the Orient; for Japan, there was meaning in Japan. It was especially important for Japan, more important than religion, than literature, that art should not be deprecated. “It is only art that represents Japan to the world.” Okakura’s confidence grew when he passed through China on his travels and he realized that Japanese art was not necessarily dependent on China for everything. Therefore, he felt, “the independence of Japanese art” was possible. Furthermore, when he traveled in India in 1901, he felt that Japan indeed was a treasure house of the historical richness of Asian culture. It was thus that the experiences he acquired on these two journeys were still more clarified. For example, in commemoration of his Indian journey he was able to say in his book, *The Ideals of the East*, “Japan is the museum of Asian culture and civilization.... The history of Japanese art becomes the history of Asian ideals.” This was the origin of his famous statement, “Asia is one!” And it
can be said that this conviction already existed in germinal form in the early Meiji 20's.

In the foregoing we examined the nature of Tenshin-Okakura's Orientalism. His romantic idealism and reverence for individuality were grounded in Orientalism and Japanism. As such, he manifested one aspect of the spiritual revolution and the revival of the arts and literature in the Meiji 20's. Indeed, this romantic idealism and prizing of originality can even be considered to have been a preparation for the spiritual revolution and the revival of art and literature.

7. Tsubouchi Shōyo and Kōda Rohan

In 1884 the hidden Buddha of the Yumedono was discovered by Fenellosa and Tenshin. Tenshin described this as follows:

In 1884 Fenellosa, Kanō Tetsusai and myself appeared before the temple priests and asked them to open its gates. The priests said that opening the gates would certainly produce a clap of thunder. In the first year of Meiji, when there were disputes over the confusion of Shintoism and Buddhism, these gates were temporarily opened; suddenly the whole sky was overcast, there was a burst of thunder, and everyone was very much afraid. The whole matter was suspended at this point. The previous example was still so conspicuous that they did not easily comply with our request. And when we began to open the gates they were so afraid that they fled. When we opened the shrine gates, the stench of almost one thousand years assailed our nostrils. Brushing aside the cobwebs, we saw a low table of the Higashiyama period. When we cleared this aside, there, directly before us was the sacred statue which measured some eight or nine feet in height. The statue was wrapped in many layers of cloth. Surprised by the presence of human beings, snakes and mice suddenly scampered, frightening us. We approached the statue, and when we removed the cloth wrappings there was underneath a covering of white paper. This was the point which had
been reached in the first year of Meiji, when the clap of thunder had been heard and the uncovering of the statue was suspended. We saw behind the white paper the serene face of the statue. This was truly one of the greatest pleasures of a lifetime. Fortunately, there was no clap of thunder and the priests were greatly reassured.

This image had been publicly exhibited until the mid-Ashikaga period. In a record of a pilgrimage to Shichidaiji there is a detailed description of the life-sized image holding in its left hand a precious pearl, with its right hand covering the hand holding the pearl. Was that the reason it became a hidden image? The coloring was plainly visible and the nimbus itself was especially clear, being painted like a flame. The cheeks were high and jowled, the entire work executed in the manner of the Suiko period. The head, the limbs were large; the nostrils deeply grooved.

In the year following the discovery of the Yumedono, that is in 1885, two works by Tsubouchi Shōyo appeared. These were the *Shōsetsu Shinzui* (Essence of the Novel) and *Tōsei Shōsei Katagi*. Shōyo had been a student at Tokyo University and was two classes below Tenshin. With these two works the new literature in Meiji made rapid strides to maturity. In the first class to graduate from the Faculty of Literature at Tokyo University, in 1880, there were eight people, among whom were men like Wadagaki Kenzō, Inoue Tetsujirō, and Okakura Kakuzō. Shōyo, reminiscing about that period has said,

At that time—it was about 1880 or 1881—the students at Tōdai who had some critical interest in the belles-lettres of the West were surprisingly few. Of those known to me, the one who was most widely read, who liked novels, was the friend of Takada Sanae, the late Tan Itsuma. Takada himself was widely read, as were also Okakura Kakuzō and Tanaka Shōhei. While Wadagaki too liked belles-lettres, we were not friends at that time.

It was in the depth of winter, the students would occasionally gather in the caretaker’s room at the dormitory, this was
the warmest place. Takada, Okakura, and others from time to time would hold forth on the novel and various debates over theory of the novel would blossom. I still can hear echoes of these discussions now on Dumas, now on Bakin; the excellencies and failings of these, as well as writers like Scott and Lytton were argued over. I did not, at that time, rise beyond being a mere onlooker.

Tenshin wrote his graduation thesis in English on the “Theory of the State.” The story has it that his hysterical wife tore the essay into shreds and Tenshin hastily wrote another thesis in two weeks time. The second thesis which he presented was on art. This accidental bit of mischief was what probably decided Tenshin’s fate. Shōyō, the one who at that time was ‘a mere onlooker”, failed in his examinations and graduated in 1883. Shōyō’s Shōsetsu Shinzui, and other works of this nature, set off the literary revolution in Meiji.

The Shōsetsu Shinzui contained a criticism of Japanese literature from ancient times down to the present. Especially did Shōyō criticize the literature of the last phase of the Tokugawa period. Shōsetsu Shinzui also advanced a new concept of the novel.

In connection with the criticism of traditional Japanese literature, in 1925 in an essay called “Shinkyū Katoki no Kaisō” (Reminiscences of the Transition Period from the Old to the New Age), he argued as follows about the “Quadrilateral relationship” which made up the popular arts in the Tokugawa period: Kabuki, Ukiyoe, the novel, and the gay-quarters.

I have particularized the triangular relationship in the Tokugawa period popular arts as comprising Kabuki, Ukiyoe, and the novel. This relationship evolved basically from pre-existing circumstances which have no analogy in the West. In a certain sense this triangular relationship can be said to have been profitable in that each of the three elements of the triangle gained thereby. Yet the vulgarity and trifling nature of the Japanese arts also is a product of this relationship. The reason why this is so is that a fourth element can
be detected in the relationship which makes it quadrilateral; Kabuki, Ukiyoe, the novel, and the Yoshiwara [or gay-quarters]. From such beginnings the wild and uncultivated popular arts of the Tokugawa period perforce were fated as time went on to possess pornography, buffoonery, or, at very least, a gradually growing taint of this nature. In the final analysis, the subject matter, taste, sentiment, association of ideas, ideals, interests, all of these, came to be represented by the Gesaku, the cheap novels or 'literature' of the period and the Ukiyoe, the facile painting which was the 'art' of the period. These, of course, were intimately related to the theatre and the gay-quarters of that time and were the only means or forms in which the popular arts could be presented.

Shōyō pointed out that literature and art in the Tokugawa period, which were based on the only free elements in Tokugawa society—the theatre and the gay-quarters—naturally became vulgar and pornographic. Yet the root, the basic support, of the Tokugawa feudal society was the Confucianistic loyalty—filial piety-type of morality. Filial piety and loyalty were brandished on the surface; the reverse side, of course, was the fondness for the gay-quarters. The emergence of this bizarre mixture was to be expected. In the Shōsetsu Shinzūi Shōyō criticised and rejected precisely these aspects of traditional Japanese art and literature. He wrote in the introduction:

In the past it was customary to consider the novel a convenient method for education. The avowed purpose of the novel was to encourage virtue but in reality it was increasingly given over to brutality and cruelty. People only delighted in extremely pornographic stories, and rare indeed was the person who gave even formal attention in reading to other subjects. The authors, having no pride, had to become the slaves of popular opinion and the followers of fads. Vying for popularity, competing in flattering the public, their fictions interwoven with cruelty, their romances with pornography, they slavishly followed every fad. And despite the nominal encouragement given to virtue, they nevertheless
created plots which perverted human feelings and distorted the appearance of the world.

In this fashion, one by one, Tsubouchi Shōyō exposed the faults of the traditional Japanese literature in the Tokugawa period intending thereby the "reform and progress of the novel."

What did Shōyō feel the "new novel" should be? In answer to this question Shōyō said that the novel should propose neither the encouragement of virtue nor the chastisement of vice. Nor is the function of the novel directly to ennoble or to elevate the human temperament—although indirectly the novel may have this result. Wherein, then, does the essential nature or quality of the novel lie? Shōyō answered: "The novel reflects conditions, the state of affairs: this constitutes its essence." "The soul of the novel is human feelings; the state of society, morals, customs—these are secondary."

Because poetry and drama essentially appeal to the heart; their spirit is not in color or in sound but in what has no form, namely, the human emotions. The ancients, too, said poetry is painting in words. In the final analysis, poetry is to be lauded for enabling people to see vividly conditions which are difficult to portray and difficult to see. There is nothing in the world more difficult to portray than human passions.

The word passions just used by Shōyō is, of course, not to be taken narrowly as meaning carnality or mere sexual craving, but is rather to be conceived as the more-inclusive "seven passions: joy, sadness, anger, love, hate, fear, and desire." It was because the novel portrayed the very depths of human feelings that it had such appeal for the human heart. "Within the extremely numerous variations in the pleasures of life, there is nothing as interesting and entertaining as penetrating the mysteries of human nature and acquiring understanding and insight into the nature of cause and effect." It was thus that Shōyō showed his respect for the view advanced by Motoori Norinaga in his Genji Monogatari-tama no ogushi (Criticism of the Tales of Genji). It was Motoori Norinaga who developed
some of the aesthetic concepts used in Japanese literary and art criticism. Motoori’s discussion of the possession of fine sensibilities, became an aesthetic critical concept which Shōyō approximated in his own views on the novel.

What attitude should the artist or writer assume? The writer was to submerge his own subjective attitude and sincerely immerse himself in the characters in his creation. The writer must be objective in this sense.

The writer chiefly concentrates his attention on mental or psychological states. The characters created too, once these have appeared in the work, must be made to resemble people in the real world. The writer must not intrude his own feelings and endow these characters with good or bad, right or wrong, emotions and sentiments. He just sits by, charged with faithfully copying what exists.

Here Shōyō likened human beings to chess pieces; the Creator was the mover of these pieces; the only function of the novelist was, without disputing the good or bad of any dispensation, faithfully to portray things as they are. This view led in 1892 to the great controversy between Mori Ōgai and Tsubouchi Shōyō over what was called the “theory of purely objective delineation”. Shōyō argued for pure objectivity, whereas Ōgai defended the existence of ideals in literature. Shōyō, in the midst of this controversy with Ōgai, referred to Shakespeare as the “Second Creator.”

At the same time Shōyō developed his concepts in the Shōsetsu Shinzui, he also published his Tōsei Shosei Katagi by way of implementing these. The following comment by Rohan, concerning Shōyō’s Shōsetsu Shinzui will also make clear the extent of the influence Shōyō exerted. Rohan said:

The traditional novelists were utilitarian and didactic. Beginning with the one most revered and loved by the public, Bakin, writers all made the instruction and elevation of the reading public their objective. This was so ever since the time of Chikamatsu. To have this suddenly turn upside-down, was a great shock for me. My friends, too, were similarly
affected. When I think back on this, I feel nothing could compare with the shaking-up we received.

Since, before all else, Shōyō rejected the concept that the purpose of literature was to advance or encourage virtue and chastise vice, we cannot conclude that he detested someone like Bakin. The fact remains that Shōyō was deeply fond of Bakin. This is clear from an essay, *Kyokutei Bakin*, that he wrote in his later years.

In the main, the author the intellectuals avidly read in the period from the closing years of the Tokugawa regime until well into Meiji was Bakin. This included Rohan, who read Bakin with pleasure. Rohan stated in 1896 that the reason Bakin was hailed by the average person was because of the technique with which he constructed his novels. Bakin used names for the characters in his novels which were easily remembered by people. He considered, at the same time, that Bakin’s greatness lay in the fact that he was not content merely to go along with the times, but rather, like some tall tree rising up to the sky, he soared above the conventional at right angles to his time. His greatness was in being above, or superior to, the mediocrity and vulgarity about him. That he was not just parallel to his times was expressed by Rohan when he said about Bakin:

> Who will be able to say that Bakin’s tales of outstanding men were merely reflections of the everyday world of his period? It was his contemporaries, not Bakin, who were abreast of the period in their literature. Bakin himself was at cross-purposes with his period and was not the kind of person who merely drifts with the popular current.

Rohan was also eventually drawn to Saikaku, who came to have a deep appeal for him. If we look at his *Ihara Saikaku* (1890), the interpretation of Saikaku he presents therein makes this clear. In his description of Saikaku’s world, Rohan said:

> It is extremely difficult to inquire into Saikaku’s concepts. After we read a book by Saikaku we are always at a loss. And yet, in the midst of this bewilderment, I seem to hear
close to my ears something whispering very, very faintly, that
the world, when well considered, is an interesting place, that
those who appear to have everything may not necessarily
have all they need, that in the midst of grieving joy will well
forth, that such moments as when the withered leaf is about
to fall or the bud is about to burst into bloom contain the
essence of the vitality of the world. Perhaps that is how Sai-
kaku viewed the world.
Thus, "undoubtedly Saikaku's characters were felt by people
to have been interesting." And the nucleus of Saikaku's writing,
Rohan felt, was sincerity.

These two points—interesting characters and sincerity—
constituted for Rohan the primary characteristics of literature,
and it was this that made Saikaku so appealing to him. There-
fore, Rohan and Kōyō initiated a school of literature which
was deeply rooted in the literature of the Genroku period (1688-
1703). As shown above in the quotation from Tōson, the period
in which these writers were most active concided with the re-
vival of Genroku literature, Shōyō's concepts of literature in
the Shōsetsu Shinzui, as stated above, were therefore tremen-
dously disturbing to Rohan. And what was produced conse-
quently were works like Fūryū Butsu (The Elegant Buddha),
(1889), and Gojū no Tō (The Five-Storied Pagoda), (1887).

In the last section we touched on Tenshin and together with
what we have just seen of Rohan, the following from the Fūryū
Butsu is of extreme interest. Rohan wrote:

It is regrettable that here in Japan, which is naturally an
artistic country, there are no Hida artisans today. Someone
like Shuun, however, who exerted himself to the utmost, can
satisfy our feelings and ought to receive our goodwill on this
score. He can dispel some of our feeling of resentment over
being despised by the 'plaster-of-Paris like, high-nosed West-
erners.' This lovable youth of 21 who stood before the Saga
Buddha and swore to devote himself to his work is deserving
of our admiration.

We cannot go into this highly interesting and superb story
about Shuun, who sculpted a statue for which his beloved posed in the nude. It is the love story of a young artist born in the "land of art," Japan, his ambitions and aspirations. These were expressed as the desire not to be inferior in creative sculpting to the West. In this we can see Tenshin's "revival of art" reflected and joined to a "revival of literature."

In a short piece he wrote, Masaoka Shiki noted the extent to which he was deeply impressed with Shōyō's Shōsetsu Shinzui, Tōsei Shosei Katagi, and Rohan's Fūryū Butsu. In the summer of 1885 he spent his vacation in his native village of Matsuyama and returned to Tokyo at the beginning of September. At a friend's boarding house he "encountered something extraordinary." "This extraordinary thing was the Tōsei Shosei Katagi by Tsubouchi Shōyō." After reading the book, Shiki said:

Such an interesting book was of itself a delight to the public, and I waited impatiently for its sequels to be published. Even today, looking back on this period, this work must be considered as deserving a prominent place in any history of the Meiji novel.

Four years after he wrote this, Shiki bought a copy of Fūryū Butsu in a stall near Tokyo University. He had already heard about the book's reputation from a friend and at first found the book difficult to read and understand. However, re-reading the book several times, he grasped its elevated taste and was extremely delighted by the book, coming to feel that it was the most outstanding novel in Japan. "The Fūryū Butsu was the best book in Japan and I was forced to conclude that Rohan was the best novelist in Japan. Try as I might, however, I could not but feel that this book was a second sensation since the Shosei Katagi." The reform by Shiki of the Haiku and the Tanka poetical forms came somewhat later but can also be interpreted as a link in what was discussed above as the revival of the arts and literature.
CHAPTER II.

THE RISE AND COLLAPSE OF
THE SPIRITUAL REVOLUTION

1. The Two Inoues and Setsurei

In the Rikugō Zasshi for August, 1889, there appeared an article titled "Christianity and Youth." In the period from June 29 - July 10, a summer school had been initiated for young Christians at Dōshisha University in Kyoto and the article in the August issue dealt with this topic. It should be noted, incidentally, that this was the first attempt at a summer school in Japan. From Kyūshū in the south to Hokkaidō in the north came over 500 youths who participated in the session. What was also significant is that there were many female students who attended. Niijima's health at this time was already impaired. Despite his sickness, Niijima, on July 4, spoke of his "feelings concerning the summer school." He said that the fact that this summer school had been assembled, for the first time, and that it was possible to hear the experiences of various teachers, and especially that such a large number of youths were participating was certainly evidence of the divine purpose. And he gave thanks to God.

That night Yamamuro Gumpei, who at that time was a student of English at the New English School in Tsukiji in Tokyo, made his confession in a voice choked with tears. Yamamuro was the organizer of the Salvation Army in Japan; he decided on his vocation as a Christian after moving on to Dōshisha—in any event, his initial step was taken at this summer school. Also Kozaki Hiromichi rose and spoke about the Mt. Hanaoka Affair and the formation of the Christian student group in Kyūshū. This too made a very great impression on the audience. This, then, was the state of affairs at the convening of the first Christian summer school.
The second convening of the Christian summer school took place from July 5 to the 15th in 1890. This time the school was opened in Shirogane in Tokyo—at the Meiji Gakuin. Fortunately, the state of affairs at this time was described by Shimazaki Tōson in a work called *Sakura no Mi no Juku-suru toki*. Tōson wrote:

The highest strata of the Japanese Christian intellectuals, almost to a man, came to the greater part of these lectures at the summer school. In the morning and afternoon they came in contact with many teachers and listened to many lectures, and when they emerged from chapel it was time for a recess.

‘Suga, let’s stay here, shall we?’ Sutekichi said, inviting his friend. Sutekichi was in the second-floor corridor resting against the wall. Finally, the bell sounded again from the entrance of the first-floor lecture hall. The audience, which had gone outside during the recess, came climbing up the stairs. A speaker who was on his way to the chapel passed in front where Sutekichi was standing and observing. This person was a professor with a Chair in Psychology at the College of Literature. He happened to be related to Suga.

‘It’s M.’ [Motora Yūjiro], Suga said to Sutekichi in a low voice. That such a person was in the Christian group! Sutekichi’s eyes lit up as they followed the retreating figure of the sedate academician. Next, an American who was said to be translating the *Old Testament* into Japanese and who was extremely learned in Japanese, the white-haired scholar of theology, Verbeck, passed by. Then a theologian who was also working on the *Book of Psalms*, and was at the same time an editor engaged in literary criticism [Uemura Masahisa], passed by. Next came the head of the summer school for this session. He was the head of Tōhoku Gakuin, Oshikawa Masa-yoshi, and, just to look at him, he seemed to be flushed with a kind of righteous indignation. The head of the Christian Seminary in Aoyama, Azabu [Honda Yūichi] also passed by ...Tokutomi Sohō, a graduate of a Christian school and now
a critic on politics, economics, education, and literature—who earlier was known as a friend of youth and a democrat—passed by. Then there was also the scholar, Ōnishi Hajime, who was charged with the lecture for the day. Sutekichi and his friend were eagerly anticipating the lecture of the young philosopher. They recognized him by his extremely broad forehead, his soft swept-back hair, and the sensitive expression on his face. ‘Look! It’s Mr. Ōnishi!’ Sutekichi said, exchanging glances with Suga.

Inside the high-ceilinged chapel, seated on yellowish-painted benches, people had assembled almost to overflowing... Later, Sutekichi and his friend came in and sat down. Mr. Onishi’s lecture had been summarized in a pamphlet, which was being distributed to everyone. Here and there the sound of paper rustling as the pamphlets were opened sounded pleasantly to the ear. In the wide chapel, to the right and left, the many rectangular window frames were being adjusted and there were large windows ranged in a thick line. The glass which was frosted on one side was glowing in the afternoon sun—really, as if it could feel that there was a summer school on the hill.

Sutekichi and his friend too received some of the printed material being distributed. Suga looked at his and whispered, ‘The Change Leading from Greek Morality to Christian Morality’—‘now there’s an interesting topic!’

Rapture, admiration, smiles: these reactions passed among the audience as the lecturer began to explain the reasons for the decay of Greek morality and the rise of Christian morality from a history-of-civilization standpoint. As he spoke, the lecturer would reach into the back pocket of his frock coat for a white handkerchief and wipe the perspiration from his broad brow and continue the lecture. Every now and then Sutekichi would feel a thrill in his body. The sensations transmitted by the sensual voice of the teacher, which was refreshing and calm, albeit, vibrant with power, were very disturbing to Sutekichi. He could feel his cheeks one minute
flushed and feverish and the next cold....

The above was a scene from Shimazaki Töson's writings. Actually Töson—the Sutekichi of the above sketch—came to write this up some twenty years after he happened to be present at the summer school. Consequently there are some mistakes in these memoirs and also some literary embellishments. For example, the lectures by Ōnshi Hajime only covered a period of three days. One gets the impression from the names presented that these were the most important and influential people in Christian circles at that time, and that they were all at the lectures. What especially draws our attention now is the vivid portrayal of Ōnishi. Ōnishi's lectures were anticipated and heard with reverential attention by Sutekichi and his friend.

In a previous section, in discussing the first representative figure in philosophy in the Meiji period, we singled out Nishi Amane and presented some material on his theories. Following this, we presented almost nothing to continue this theme. This was not based on sheer arbitrariness. It was because in the period after 1876 Japan entered what was called the "decade of political fanaticism." Japanese intellectuals had a fanatical interest in politics—theory as well as practice. Outside of the theory of natural rights, or the theory of evolution as applied socio-politically, there was nothing especially significant to broach—speaking from an intellectual or thought-history standpoint. Now, however, when we come to Ōnishi, we begin to have portents of new philosophical trends.

Ōnishi sprang from the early Christian movement—he too was a member of the first graduating class from Dōshisha University in Kyōto. We do not mean to imply that there was in the period before Ōnishi and after Nishi Amane not one philosophical work written, or that there was no one at the time besides Ōnishi who could be regarded as a philosopher and respected as such. Witness that this was not so is borne by such names as Inoue Tetsujirō, Inoue Enryō, and Miyake Setsurei. However, their philosophical speculations were still widely removed from any formal, organized philosophical system.
To be sure, within their speculations there was something smacking of metaphysics. Also, the problem which later became the fundamental speculative problem—and is so to this day—the problem of how to join Western philosophy and Oriental thought was discussed and argued by them. Their statement of the problem was, however, descriptive and could not be called a logical analysis. Their writings on the subject contained flowery allegories, but in terms of a synthesis of East-West philosophy, their comprehension and interpretation of Western philosophy was indeed crude.

With Ōnishi Hajime there resulted an increase in the preciseness of the interpretation of Western philosophy. Ōnishi's enunciation of various philosophical problems was clearly logical and he expounded a philosophy of personalistic idealism. His significance—he died too soon to make any major philosophical contributions—was as a thinker rather than as a philosopher, and as a thinker who contributed to the introduction of logical thinking as a separate discipline in Japanese philosophical circles. Before commenting on Ōnishi's thought, we must take up in cursory fashion the thought of the two Inoues and Miyake Setsurei. This is partly to make Ōnishi's thought clear by way of contrast with that of these three figures and partly to impart some knowledge of the philosophical-intellectual trends of the period immediately preceding Ōnishi's, the period from 1883-1890.

As we stated previously, the class of 1880 was the first graduating class from Tokyo University. Among those graduating was Inoue Tetsujirō. In 1884 he went abroad to study and spent most of his time in Germany, returning to Japan in 1890. Inoue became the first professor of philosophy at Tokyo University. His inaugural speech was written up in the Tōyō Gakugei Zasshi, and from this it can be seen that he aroused high hopes.

When Inoue went to Germany Edward Erdmann was very old but still lecturing; Kuno Fischer too, hale and hearty, was also lecturing. Inoue attended the lectures of Zeller and Wundt
and visited Fechner and Hartmann. Later Dr. Koeber, upon
the recommendation of Hartmann, came to Tokyo University
to teach and had tremendous influence on Japanese academic
circles. The origins of this influence can probably be traced
back to the study and contacts made by Inoue in Germany.
Inoue also met Otto Lipmann, who with his call for a "return
to Kant," paved the way for the emergence of the Neo-Kantian
movement in Germany. Nevertheless, Inoue cannot be con-
sidered to have acquired any especial scholarly Western philo-
sophical spirit from these people. For one thing, when he returned
to Japan his major work lay in Oriental-type philosophical
studies like Nippon Shushi gaku-ha no tetsu-gaku (The Philo-
sophy of the Chu Hsiih School in Japan); Nippon Yōmei gaku-ha
no tetsu-gaku (The Philosophy of Ou Yang-ming); and Nippon
Kogaku-ha no tetsu-gaku (Philosophy of the Classical School in
Japan). Inoue’s lack of Western scholarly philosophical spirit
can be considered to have been manifested in his facile and
rather hasty eclecticism and in the synthesizing tendencies
manifest in his concepts. This will become clear when we
examine Inoue’s first work, the Rinri Shinsetsu (New Theory
of Ethics), which was published in 1883.

It may come as a surprise to many, but Inoue Tetsujirō
was rather expert at Chinese-style poetry. In 1882, Inoue
together with Yatabe Ryōkichi and Toyama Shōichi, published
an anthology called Shintai shi-shō (Extracts of New Style
Poetry). He was one of the first to attempt new style poems,
and to break with traditional Japanese poetic forms. It was
natural then that the Rinri Shinsetsu began with the following
flowery passage:

Last September the weather was especially beautiful. I
found it unbearable to continue sitting at home as I had been
doing the past few days. Tossing aside my book, I went out.
I took the road going down to Surugadai and I arrived at
Mansei bridge. I happened on samurai, peasants, artisans,
merchants, rickshaw-pullers, wagon drivers, all flowing
together pell-mell, in ceaseless movement. Some shouting,
some raising clouds of dust, others passionately pursuing their own gain, some preoccupied with luxury-seeking, others hungry for wealth, all dissipating themselves in evanescent desires and passions exactly like the struggles of birds and beasts for food. I alone stood by and sighed, thinking this is always the nature of life! How ugly and mean! I returned home. At my desk, I leisurely opened books I had selected from the shelves wanting to know the essence of ethics. The theories of East and West are not similar.

Well, then, wherein does the basis of life, the essence of ethics, lie? “Enquiring of men, I saw they knew not. I looked up, calling to Heaven, Heaven was silent; I cried out to the earth, it too answered not.” Examining the arguments of scholars—their mutual recriminations resembled the behavior of coolies and draymen. This was the lament of Inoue, and Inoue’s philosophic personality was reflected in such hyperbolic lamentations. A philosopher must however advance one step further and make clear the essence of ethics which runs through all different theories and interpretations. He must place himself in a position of utmost purity and utmost sincerity. Wherein lies the essence of ethics? Wherein lie the ideals and objectives of life? And wherein is the utmost sincerity and purity to be found?

Inoue’s demonstration does not go beyond a rather careless eclecticism. Where did Inoue find the essence of ethics? Western ethics from ancient times to the present comprised two great divisions; intuitionism and hedonism. Within this framework he made further subdivisions. Hedonism he subdivided into individual hedonism or epicureanism and universalistic hedonism or epicureanism and universalistic hedonism or altruism. In these divisions, Inoue was obviously following the classification system in Henry Sidgwick’s Methods of Ethics (1874). Inoue said that the differences in ethical theories were simply methodological: the goal of ethical systems was happiness. It was as clear as day that the objective of life lay in happiness. And even in Oriental ethics this is the one thread which can be traced from Confucius to Sung scholars.
In answer to the problem of why we ought to strive to realize this ideal of happiness, he enters into an inquiry on the nature of the universe itself. His answer is almost entirely based on Spencer’s work. That is to say, the essence of the universe, constituting an ultimately unknowable, albeit, really existing thing, was designated by Inoue as universalistic existence—space, time, and force—all are the symbolic expressions we use to describe this universalistic existence. The evolution of the universe too, is, in a sense, the development of the seeds contained in this universalistic existence. Inoue’s concept of the ideal was manifested in his interpretation of Spencer’s evolution. The manifestation of an evolutionary trend was what we designate as the ideal. By pursuing this ideal, we are caused to evolve, to perfect ourselves, to approach some absolute, and also are brought into accord with the principles of survival. We are thus led finally to happiness. Therefore, it behooves us to pursue the realization of this ideal. Inoue expressed this as follows:

When one attains the ideal for a day one becomes a sage for a day; when one attains the ideal for a year one is thereby a sage for a year; the attainment of a lifetime ideal makes one a sage for a lifetime. Those who would be sages for their lifetime must begin by being sages for a day. The sage for a day is superior to the fool for a lifetime. How then can one even waste one day by not pursuing the ideal!

It was in this form that Inoue joined Sidgwick’s theory of happiness and Spencer’s evolutionism to the Oriental-style ideal of the “sage.” This, then, is Inoue Tetsujirō’s conception and thought as expressed in the Rinri Shinsetsu. We now direct our attention to the second Inoue: Inoue Enryō.

What was it that drew people at that time to Western philosophy? What were they seeking? A typical example is afforded by Inoue Enryō. We can get some idea of this from the admission Inoue made in his Bukkyō Katsuron joron (1887). He was born into a Buddhist, priestly family and grew up in a temple. At the time of the great Restoration,
when the hostility to Buddhism was at its height, Inoue wanted to leave the temple and go out into the world. In his quest for truth he found that Confucianism and Buddhism were inadequate. Nevertheless he studied Confucianism for five years, and finally, since “Western learning was being taught in the vicinity of my home and some of my friends were already learning this,” Inoue began to study Western learning. “In the process of doing this,” he said, “I rejected Confucianism and turned toward Western learning. This was the year 1873.”

For some years Inoue devoted all his efforts to Western philosophy and it was here that he found real truth. The joy over his discovery he compared to that of Columbus when he discovered America. He said:

One day I was greatly enlightened. The truth for which I had been struggling and longing these many years did not exist in either Confucianism or Buddhism, neither did it exist in Christianity, but only in the philosophy expounded in the West. When I realized this my joy was unbounded. I felt entirely as Columbus did when he finally reached land. For the first time, the confusion and bewilderment of many years was swept away and I felt as though my soul had suddenly become cleansed.

Once Inoue’s eyes were opened by Western philosophy, he also came to feel that the germs of an extremely profound truth were already present in the Buddhism he had formerly looked down upon as the repository of untruth. He once again began to study the Buddhist scriptures, hoping that with the reform of Buddhism it could become a religion for the civilized and enlightened world. As Inoue stated, “This really took place in 1885, and I designate this year as the year which commemorates the beginning of the reform of Buddhism.”

The following points from Inoue’s *Bukkyō Katsuron joron* are of especial interest. Inoue, too, was someone who was in harmony with his period. The year he rejected Confucianism and turned to Western learning was 1873, the year the Meiroku-sha came into existence. The year he commemorated as his
"reform-of-Buddhism year" was 1885, precisely when Christianity was on the verge of becoming popular. Indeed, his reform of Buddhism was much stimulated by the burgeoning of Christianity.

The trend of Buddhism in Meiji cannot be adequately understood if Buddhism’s relationship to Christianity at that time is ignored. For the present we will take up Inoue’s dissatisfaction with Christianity. Inoue felt that Jesus himself was a person to be greatly respected. And he did not criticize Christianity entirely. That Christianity was the highest religion, he questioned. His reason? Inoue could not accept the view that Jesus was the son of God by an act of special creation, that Jesus died and was resurrected and ascended to Heaven. We see here the aspect of Christianity which was not easily accepted by Buddhists or by the people at large.

Inoue was close to Hegel’s position in his acceptance of Western philosophy. That he opposed Christianity was due to what he felt to be the irrationality or un-reason of the tenets noted above. Originally his position had tended towards the Tendai Buddhist interpretation of Ri, or Reason, as the basis of the universe. Inoue said concerning Tendai:

Tendai teaches the primacy of Reason as an underlying universal principle. This principle is neither material nor spiritual, we designate it here as an absolute. The fact that it is non-material, non-spiritual absolute, does not mean that it exists in complete separation from either spirit or matter. Matter and spirit themselves, are of the essence of the absolute. To speak of pure Reason as the underlying universal principle does not mean to end with a one-sided distorted principle, rather is it the absolute, the essence of the undistorted Mean.

When Inoue developed this concept of “pure Reason”—a concept which he derived from the two Mahayana Buddhist sects, Kegon and Tendai—he found himself naturally drawn to Hegel’s concept of a “pan-rationalism.” This was Hegel’s belief that the underlying reality of the universe was constituted by Reason. Inoue said, “The position of Buddhism as manifested in Kegon-
Tendai, does not differ in the slightest from that of Hegel."

Without question Inoue’s interpretation of Hegel was derived from English neo-Hegelianism which was then current. This interpretation transcended both materialism and idealism and came to rest with what could be called "pure Reason." The neo-Hegelians set up the Logos as the substantive basis of the universe. This is what is meant by pan-logism or by the term pan-rationalism which we used above. In this interpretation the dialectic which provided, through the conflict of opposites—the principle of negation—the motive force for Hegel’s system, was ignored. At any rate, we may note from the foregoing that Inoue attempted to join Kegon-Tendai to Western philosophy.

Miyake Setsurei made a similar attempt to join Lao Tze and Chuang-Tze [Taoism] to the philosophy of Schopenhauer. He started with a deep admiration for Taoism, and was ultimately drawn to Schopenhauer’s philosophy.

As early as 1889 Miyake Setsurei published a booklet called Tetsugaku Kenteki (Philosophical Trifles). His mature thought, systematized and assembled, can be seen in the Gakan Shōkei (Personal Views) which he published in 1892. This work, because of its limpidity, its proliferation of flowery words, the fact that it was rather nicely got-up, was a delight to the people who read it at that time. If we single out its essence and abridge the troublesome, flowery phraseology, the contents are as follows. Setsurei considered the phenomenon of consciousness as originating from a fantasy, moving on to wakefulness, and ending in death. Contrariwise, the phenomenon of physical existence he considered as beginning with what was closest to us, our bodies. From this physical existence extended to or reached to the entire corpus of the universe, and finally ended in disintegration or annihilation. What is called death or annihilation reaches absolute truth by its absolute emptiness or nothingness. This alone, however, makes it difficult to comprehend Setsurei’s poetical philosophy, which emerged from his use of poetry-like analogy. We shall attempt therefore to follow his account.

Illusion, wakefulness, death—our usual or normal conscious-
ness is produced and activated by outside stimuli. Our concept of consciousness is that it is produced from inside us. This is an illusion! Man, of course, can not visualize this and so rejects this concept. And yet this is the true form of human consciousness. Even in our waking state there is much that is illusory. When we attempt to think this way—the entirety of our conceptions of the waking state is in truth a gigantic dream. There is a contradiction here since man cannot conceive of dreaming, but the concept of waking also is always possessed of a contradiction. Well then, from the waking, which is nothing more than a gigantic dream, how does one come to true waking? We neither know our "pre-life" nor do we know our "after-death." The only way we can know this is to be in pre-life and after-death. This is to be in the area of death, which is another way of saying the area to which our consciousness does not extend, the area in which our consciousness is obliterated, the area where our consciousness cannot apply.

We cannot apply our consciousness before we are born nor can we apply it after death. And, where consciousness does not apply, this, conceptually, is death. Before life [where there is no consciousness], is death; after life [where again consciousness does not apply], too is death. In this sense life, or the waking state, exists as an insert between death and death. To expect death in the waking period is like expecting to awake in the period of dreaming.

To Setsurei liberty, equality, truth, beauty, virtue, all of these, can be acquired only in death which has no contradictions, oppositions, and distinctions.

Body, universe, annihilation—these exist as concrete realities and are quite different from our spontaneous or autonomic consciousness which is an illusion. We know our body's existence directly, from the inside, as it were.

Man's knowledge may be excessively vast and complex, at the core, however, there is only the knowledge of self. What is not tied to matter is an illusion. The body strives to know, from the inside, as it were, from its existence as a physical
entity.
The body, however, is an organism which possesses unified functions and movement. What of the universe? We are in the universe as a part of it. And the universe has order and activity—the universe therefore is a living thing, it is "the ultimate body." Just as the body has a mind and a will, so too, we can say that the universe is provided with "an immeasurable mind and will." We cannot know when the universe will be extinguished, will cease to exist. Matter in the form of atoms is difficult to visualize as matter, and is especially difficult to describe. However, what we are conscious of as death is, with respect to the universe, annihilation. And its true condition can only be grasped in death. Consciousness and physical existence can be thought to be in mutual contradiction. Yet, when we push this further in our minds, consciousness is related to the brain, and is therefore related to matter. Also, contrariwise, matter does not exist outside our conception of it. Despite these relations, however, mind and matter are in mutual opposition to the very end. Therefore, in death and annihilation this opposition between mind and matter too is extinguished and their true appearance emerges. Thus Setsurei said: "Since the ultimate end, the extinguishing of differences between matter and mind, is not to be sought in this world, it appears only after death. Freedom, equality, good, beauty, truth—the absolute unfetteredness of these—lie in the area of death."

This was the content of Miyake Setsurei's Gakan Shōkei, and it can readily be noted that he used Hartmann's and Schopenhauer's concepts almost without modification. And yet, despite this, there was still some slight difference in Miyake's views. His emphasis was different. Schopenhauer's concept of the philosophical agony of life in connection with blind will was almost entirely hidden. In place of this, Miyake spoke merely of consciousness as a transitory phenomenon which was like a dream. Still more, in speaking of the area of the after-death, though he did not say it in so many words, he was expounding his infatuation with, and philosophical awareness of, a type
of absolute non-existence.

In the foregoing we attempted to present some of the leading philosophical aspects of Japanese thought in the Meiji 20's by selecting the thought of the two Inoues and Miyake Setsurei. We were enabled to see that the conceptualizations and spiritual emphasis of this period were different from those of the period of the freedom and popular rights movement. Another aspect we were able to see was that Japanese thought in this rather brief period of time went from Inoue Tetsujirō's Spencerianism to the Hegelian thought of Inoue Enryō and, finally, to Miyake's thought which was close to Schopenhauer. We should note about this thought that, as stated previously, it was less strictly systematic than later philosophy in Japan; it tended to be purely descriptive. These views were deficient epistemologically. In contrast to these people, Ōnishi Hajime opened new areas, and was a systematic philosopher.

2. The Critical Idealism of Ōnishi Hajime

Ōnishi Hajime was the first to naturalize the neo-Kantian spirit of criticism in Japan. This is clear from the stand Ōnishi took in opposition to the positions of the three philosophers we have just described. In contrast to the unstructured, loose eclecticism of Inoue Enryō and Miyake Setsurei, whose fanciful metaphysics rested on the use of analogies, Ōnishi demanded that philosophy be a strict discipline based on epistemological criticism. In contrast to Katō Hiroyuki's positivism and his theory of evolution, Ōnishi argued strongly that there should be a distinction between the natural and the normative. He argued that the ought could not be deduced from the is. Fortunately, Ōnishi made his criticism of these theories and writings concrete, and we will proceed to examine his work.

Buddhists read Inoue Enryō's Bukkyō Katsuron Joron, most people, however, delighted in his Tetsugaku Isseki-wa, (Brief Discussion of Philosophy). The essence of this work was expressed in the second part, which dealt with the nature of God. This took the form of a discussion between Enryō and four
fictitious disciples, who are called Entō, Ryōsai, Ennan, and Ryōhoku. Entō took the materialist position—only physical substance exists, there is no God. To be sure, physical substance or matter in this case transcends the usual opposition between matter and mind and here refers to undifferentiated matter, or, in a sense, the undifferentiated essence of what is usually thought of as matter and mind.

Ryōsai took the idealist position and posited the existence of undifferentiated mind which equally incorporated mind and matter. To Ennan the existence of God could be known by transcending the differences described previously as between undifferentiated matter and undifferentiated mind. Finally, Ryōhoku, in distinction to the others, was close to pantheism. Essence separates mind and matter but mind and matter do not separate essence; essence is knowable within the limits of mind and matter. Outside these limits essence is unknowable. In summation, Enryō himself said:

The God I speak of is derived from those you four have described. His substance is God, and is not God, is matter, and is not matter, is consciousness, and is not consciousness. Depending on the direction He is regarded from, He may be undifferentiated matter, undifferentiated mind, a transcendent God, a knowable, immanent God. Depending on the different points from which He is viewed, His designation too will be different, and yet His substance is one and not many. When people assign the name matter to this substance, we speak of materialism; when they call it divine, we speak of theism. I call it ‘Enryō’s substance’!

Ōnishi severely criticised the foregoing. Inoue’s view represented a type of chemical compounding of materialism, idealism, theism, and agnosticism, but how these were made into one is not clear at all. Ōnishi wrote:

Are readers impressed with the skill with which Inoue combines theories? I personally question this; it seems to me that Inoue is trying to mix oil and water; his theory is extremely unclear. Of course, if Inoue claims that obscurity
is a characteristic of philosophy then I will not question this ...Inoue's theories can not be criticized because they are unclear. In fact, I question whether Inoue can speak in words that other people can understand!

Onishi's criticism was merciless, he showed no sympathy for Inoue's intentions. On the other hand, the philosopher Nishida Kitarō once said that in his youth he had read Inoue's *Tetsugaku Isseki-wa* and thought it interesting. To be sure, Inoue's argumentation combined various contradictory theories and smacked of "mixing water and oil." Inoue's statement—that "God...by being differentiated was contrariwise without differentiation, by being without differentiation was differentiated..."—was probably only comprehensible to his four fictitious disciples and himself. It was material of this nature that invited the criticism of Onishi as to Inoue's incomprehensibility. Basically, Onishi rejected over-simplified eclecticism and required a philosophy which was based on tight logical principles. We must now examine Onishi's criticism of Miyake Setsurei.

Setsurei's *Gakan Shōkei* was regarded highly by his contemporaries. As Onishi said: "There is at present no one who has not heard of the author of the *Gakan Shōkei*, this work has since its issuance received extremely good notices." Passing on to the book itself, Onishi said, "Miyake Setsurei has attempted to initiate an independent philosophy in Japan [and therefore] this book ought to be strictly and impartially reviewed." Onishi's criticism was therefore extremely painstaking. We cannot deal with his criticism in its entirety, instead, we will take up that part which is concerned with Setsurei's methodology.

As indicated above, Miyake's method was based on analogy. Onishi pointed out in a lecture that analogy, as defined in the following statement by Miyake, was unreliable. Miyake said: "The gradual spread of knowledge comes about by the extension of what is already known to what is as yet unknown. The progress of knowledge is thus consequent upon the method of analogy." This was precisely what Onishi held to be uncertain. Is a whale the same as a fish because it also lives and swims
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in the ocean! Analogy is a product of experience. The question is what is experience? Also, what makes experience possible? Philosophic inquiry requires first that these points be clarified. Ōnishi said:

The problem which can not be ignored since Kant, which I thought would be dealt with in Miyake's theories, I did not find in his book. In short, Miyake's book is deficient in epistemological theory and is also, therefore, extremely incomplete from the standpoint of methodology. The book can not be accepted in any of its particulars.

Ōnishi felt that Setsurei's analogy failed methodologically. In his critique of the content of Setsurei's work, Ōnishi also dealt with the incompleteness of the analogy or comparison used. Setsurei said that just as human beings die so too the universe disintegrates: "The universe loses its structure, it retains nothing material, it attains the emptiness of emptiness, the nothingness of nothingness." Questioning further, Ōnishi said:

When Setsurei says this, does he mean that the universe is annihilated in the same way that the body dies? Must it not be said that the end of the universe is nothing more than a scattering of molecules of matter rather than the disintegration of matter! Setsurei also believes that the universe has consciousness in the way we have consciousness, mind in the way we have mind. This kind of analogy is presumptuous and unwarranted. In line with Miyake's method of analogy we can conjecture many things about the universe. Since the universe has a mind, it must dream even as we mortals do. Indeed, it must dream rather frequently. What are some of these 'universe-dreams' like? Are they of much more gigantic scope than our own? If so, how gigantic? These are all things I would very much like to learn from Miyake.

Ōnishi concluded:

To summarize my criticism of Miyake's Gakan Shōkei, I would say that as an imaginative piece of literature it reads adequately; as a serious work of philosophy, however, it cannot command our respect in the slightest. I freely admit
that the book is imaginative and well-written; also, I do not
deny that philosophical speculation requires imagination. But
it is precisely philosophical speculation that must not be lack-
ing in logic. Miyake’s book, I feel, is deficient in this respect.

In short, Ōnishi was profoundly dissatisfied with Miyake
Setsurei’s thought. Setsurei’s formal thought was not charac-
terized by a concern for epistemology, his metaphysics was
deficient in logic and, all-in-all, his writing was scarcely more
than imaginative literature based on a poorly worked-out
methodology.

We now turn to Ōnishi’s criticism of Katō Hiroyuki. At
this time Katō was expounding a theory of morality based on
egotism or “enlightened self-interest.” This stemmed from
his position as a materialist and evolutionist. Katō Hiroyuki’s
autobiography, the Hiroyuki Jiden, from which the following
is drawn, sets forth in concise form the essence of his theories
in this regard. He wrote:

My new theory...is essentially derived from evolutionism.
Evolutionism is ultimately reducible to monism, the theory
of causality, and the theory of necessity. It regards this
universe as a pure natural development, it is a doctrine which
does not recognize anything as doubtful as a special grand
design or some special great principle by which the universe
is guided. Still, I must say something here about my theory
of egotism or self-interest. This theory of egotism is com-
pletely derived from the aforementioned monism, necessity,
and causality. The public at large assumes that this egotism
is the everyday-type of egotism. There are, thus, many who
attack this theory without knowing it clearly...Actually,
according to my theory, loyalty and filial piety, the principles
of justice and humanity comprise what I call egotism.

To Katō, the universe under the guidance of “the laws of
nature” follows evolutionary processes, and human beings too
come under the hegemony of these laws. Human society gives
rise to a morality in which good and evil is what benefits or
prevents the maintenance and progress of society. In this sense,
then loyalty, filial piety, righteousness, and justice are all ultimately to the benefit of oneself, which Katō calls egotism, or enlightened self-interest.

Ōnishi wrote four or five articles criticising this position. His articles started with "Questions to Katō Hiroyuki About Morality," (May, 1890), and concluded with "What Are the Laws of Nature?" (November, 1895). The criticism was, in its main points, typical of Ōnishi in that it was not a point-by-point criticism of Katō’s assertions but went directly to the core of his theory.

Ōnishi criticized Katō’s position as an evolutionist, and said in effect that Katō maintains that since the morality of an uncivilized society differs from that of a civilized society there is no one morality which is determined in nature. Just as society changes and progresses, so too does morality. Therefore, in the study of morality it behooves us to assemble our data and attempt to study this developmentally. Certainly, up to this point, nobody would argue differently. What follows, however, is a problem. Can we think that, “just by inquiring into the data of morality developmentally or comparatively, the task of ethical investigation has been completed?” By using the terms ‘development,’ ‘progress,’ do we not imply the existence of some ideal? And if this is so, ought there not be some prescriptive and unchangeable standard? “If there is no determinate unchangeable standard, we can neither speak of perfect nor imperfect morality. To attempt to determine the perfection or imperfection of things without a prescribed standard is like trying to measure size without a scale.” We can detect here Ōnishi’s idealistic tendencies. His position will become extremely clear in his criticism of Katō’s “Egotism-Naturalism.”

Ōnishi pointed out the lack of thoroughness, the contradictions in Katō’s discussion of the establishment of morality. Katō conceived of everything in terms of natural evolution but he was not able to go so far as to regard phenomena in nature and the phenomenon of morality in human society as exactly the same. Here it was not simply laws of nature but something
man made. Katō wrote: "Morality is never itself a law of nature. When human society was organized morality was an instrument for its maintenance and progress. It has thus indirectly been produced and developed by the laws of nature (with some human help)." This statement is patently in contradiction with Katō's position as a monist. From Katō's position of natural necessity, should he not say that everything follows the laws of nature and not speak of a distinction between good and evil? How can he speak of "some human help" in addition to the laws of nature, in his theory of the rise of morality? Ōnishi thus rejected Katō's attempt to derive his "egotistical" morality from nature.

Ōnishi showed himself to be an idealist when he attempted to see morality in the very heart of nature. Ōnishi said:
Kant separates the moral world and the natural world and regards the two as completely different. Katō takes morality and submerges it in nature. I do not regard nature and morality as completely different; in a certain sense the moral world stems from the natural world. The moral world may be regarded as a development of the true will of the natural world, it can be thought to be the result of the natural world. Both the world of nature and the moral world are manifestations of one fundamental process. The true visage of this process, for which the natural world is a stepping-stone or condition, appears with the development of the moral world. The mechanistic view turns morality too into mechanism. I, on the other hand, make morality the fundamental goal of the world of nature. My position is thus completely different from Katō Hiroyuki's mechanistic position.

Below we can see that Ōnishi's spiritual metaphysics strongly resembled the views of T. H. Green. Where Ōnishi criticized Katō Hiroyuki's naturalism, or his theory of the laws of nature, he strongly asserted the Kantian or Neo-Kantian distinction between is and ought, the distinction between a law of nature and a norm. In other words, what Katō called a "law of nature" was based on his materialistic and mechanistic view.
But there is a normative law which exists separate from and outside of this kind of law of nature. Of course, the natural world is governed by the law of nature; however, the moral world (the supra-natural world) is regulated by normative law. This moral world is not directly explainable by the natural world, Ōnishi said. Motora Yūjirō held a similar position. Just as Ōnishi criticised the attempt to derive morality from the laws of nature, Motora criticised the attempt to derive ethics from the positivistic science of mores or customs, or folkways. Motora wrote: “The study of mores and customs only tells us what these were or are; it does not tell us what they must be. To deduce the ought from the is is like attempting to obtain gold from dross.”

In the foregoing we saw that Ōnishi rejected Inoue Enryō’s and Miyake Setsurei’s vague eclecticism, their analogies, their fanciful metaphysics, and demanded a philosophy which was strictly logical and based on epistemological criticism. Then, too, Ōnishi rejected Katō Hiroyuki’s naturalism and positivism on the basis of the Kantian distinction between the is and the ought, and, further, he wanted to erect an idealistic metaphysics from the standpoint of Green’s teleological evolutionism. This was quite different from Katō’s mechanistic evolutionism. We now proceed to discussion of the positive content of Ōnishi’s thought.

Ōnishi died when he was 36 years old (1899) and left nothing in compiled, systematized form. His Ryōshin Kigen-ron (On the Origins of the Conscience), is justly famous. It was originally written as his thesis in graduate school (1890); and though he later added to it (it was eventually published post-humously), it cannot be said to do justice to his mature thought. We can, however, derive the gist of Ōnishi’s thought and intentions from his various articles and essays. We will present those views of Ōnishi’s which pertain to Kant since he was most attracted to the latter.

As early as 1889 Ōnishi wrote in an essay called “Hōkon Shisō-kai-no Yōmu,” (The Essential Duties of the Present-Day
that the condition of present-day Japan is that of an East-West market-place for civilization. All sorts of things have come pouring in from East and West, and, regarded from the standpoint of thought, the clash between novelty or innovation and conservatism, between Westernism and Japanism, is like the clash at the mouth of the Amazon between the river and ocean currents. In any event, this is unavoidable. This raises the question as to what attitude we ought to assume in the face of this. Ōnishi wrote: We speak of Westernism, Japanism, radicalism, conservatism, but all of these are just one-sided views. In the Intellectual world there should be a combined, a synthesized, doctrine, or body of belief, which stands above all these one-sided views. This is how I conceive of my doctrine of criticism. I feel that the first essential duty of the intellectual world is to compare, judge, criticize, all thought, Western and Eastern, to recognize its trends and values. I venture to suggest that it is not necessary to be radical or conservative. And also, “When I discussed the most essential duty of the Japanese intellectual world—I did not have radicalism or gradualism in mind, but criticism.”

Ōnishi’s position was that the Japanese intellectual world should not opt for any “one-sided” position but should exercise a critical awareness of all East-West positions. He argued in this essay, then, for a “return to Kant.” This Kantian critical theory of his is obvious from his discussion of epistemology and logic.

Ōnishi’s interests were not entirely absorbed by Kant. He was rather good at Japanese poetry. When he discussed “the pleasures of sorrow” he revealed numerous aesthetic and artistic elements in his character. He was not insensitive to the gradual rise of a misanthropic pessimism at this time. As to the hedonism which reduced all human concerns to pleasure and pain, Ōnishi pointed out that human feelings were of broader scope, on a higher order, than the pleasure and pain calculus would seem to indicate. From this coign of vantage, then, Ōnishi attacked the basic defects in Hedonism. Thus it is not
strange that Ōnishi was not satisfied with Kant's sharp distinction between Idea and Impulse. He asserted that there was something idealistic incorporated in Impulse. And this was the reason why he came close to T. H. Green's teleological evolutionism.

In the Ryōshin Kigen-ron, Ōnishi stated that everything exists within a totality and everything has a part to fill within the totality. "The object of the part is to fill its place in the total structure." And this is its ideal as well as its goal; the consciousness of this is what constitutes conscience. We have "a kind of impulsive tendency to be drawn to such an objective or ideal."

Ōnishi summarized his conclusion as follows:
When we become conscious of our relationship to our basic goal we develop a concept of the ideal in our life activity. Moreover, this gives rise to the functioning of what is called the conscience. This is what I have been discussing, and I feel there is no other way in which the origins of the conscience can be explained.

This, then, was Ōnishi's position, but because he stopped short with this his explanation of the relationship between the ideal and duty, between is and ought, is not clear. Also, the contents of the ideal are not made clear. Ōnishi, himself, said in his "Rinri shisō no nidai chō ryu," (Two Great Trends in Ethical Thought) in 1895:
The most important problem today in ethics, to my way of thinking, is for the idealists to make clear what they mean by the ideal and for the naturalists to explain the why of moral oughtness. The trouble with the idealists is that their ideal is not sufficiently clear; the naturalists do not explain or take into account our moral consciousness. These defects must be eliminated for the future progress of ethical theory. Probably he sensed the same deficiencies in his own idealism, and this may have been the reason why he did not publish the "Ryōshin Kigen" during his lifetime. Ōnishi's position can be said therefore to have been an incomplete or unworked-out
critical idealism. As far as it went, this idealism was a synthesis of Kant and T. H. Green. Ōnishi’s personality, attitude, and the characteristics of his scholarship, were clearly and concisely described in Tsubouchi Shōyō’s memoirs. Tsubouchi wrote:

Ōnishi was superbly qualified as an educator since his assertions were moderate, unbiased, not eccentric or radical. His research methods were careful, thorough, and undogmatic. Ōnishi Hajime excelled especially in the history of philosophy based on a constructively critical method. When he lectured, he often seemed to be moralizing from T. H. Green’s position. He always suggested that the goal of man was in action and that the basic duty of man was to exert himself unstintingly in the pursuit of the ideal.

Shōyō commenting on Ōnishi’s premature death compared his short life and the promise it held to a “tantalizingly brief glimpse of the scales of a large fish breaking water and then disappearing once more.” We can not but agree with this. Ōnishi’s “scales” were manifested in many of his critical articles and lectures. We will present only one more of these.

This concerns the theory of the clash between religion and education which came to the fore at this time in connection with the “disrespect incident” in which Uchimura Kanzō was involved. The involvement was the consequence of Inoue Tetsujirō’s denunciation. The rise of this problem, the process of its development, is of deep interest and constitutes an important research theme. To take up this question, however, is outside the scope of this work. Suffice it to say that Inoue’s criticism was a vulgar and a shallow one. He selected quotations from the Bible which he proceeded to label, here, “anti-traditional loyalty and filial piety,” there, “anti-Imperial Rescript on Education.” In the process, of course, he quoted out of context and ignored the true spirit of what he quoted. Also, we cannot go into Takahashi Gorō’s abusive criticism of Inoue, which appeared in the pages of the Kokumin no Tomo, beyond saying that the savageness of this criticism silenced Inoue. In place of this, we will merely point out Ōnishi’s views on (1) the Imperial Rescript on Educa-
tion, (2) the clash between religion and education, and (3) nationalism. These views will be discussed in relation to Ōnishi's attitude toward the debate on the clash between religion and education.

After the promulgation of the Imperial Rescript on Education in 1890, it became almost fashionable for a time to publish commentaries on the Rescript. Inoue Tetsujirō's commentary was called *Chokugo Engi* (Commentary on the Education Rescript). He was proud of this work which elaborated on the reasons *why* Japanese should "be loyal and be filial." The *Engi* went beyond the rather cryptic moral injunctions of the Rescript itself. In this regard, Miyake Setsurei and Sawayanagi Masatarō were critical of Inoue. Ōnishi, on the other hand, had the most reasonable position of all.

Ōnishi's interpretation of the Rescript held that its purpose was to itemize the moral behavior to be observed by the nation, and that it was not possible to single out an ethical theory from this bare listing of moral injunctions. Ōnishi felt that if the Imperial Rescript admitted only of a specially determined theory of ethics, then "ultimately we will arrive at the point where those with variant types of ethical theory can not but be interred." This was a reference to the purge of the Confucians under the Ch'in Dynasty.

Therefore, "I feel that the Imperial Rescript was not promulgated in order to spread a given or determinate ethical theory. I cannot view the Rescript as discussing ethics; I look upon it as only enjoining a series of moral actions to be observed by the nation."

Ōnishi's view of the clash between religion and education appeared in a long article, criticizing Motora Yūjirō. Motora Yūjirō had written an article on this question which Ōnishi felt had more scholarly significance than all the numerous articles which were then appearing. Ōnishi held that essentially the clash was not between religion and education but between old and new thought. He conceived it thus: Christianity, Buddhism, and all *world religions* in general were not limited to any one
state but required worldwide validity. Christianity was a special case, it preached a ‘Kingdom of God’ which was not of this world. Christianity had no statist tendencies; it was non-statist—not anti-State—its concerns were not with, or of, the State. As Ōnishi expressed it, “To say that Christianity has no especial tendencies towards the State is different from saying it is completely opposed to the State. Not is quite different from against.” And therefore one could not make the assumption that in this case there was a clash between religion and the State. Ōnishi first set forth the essential relationship between religion and the State; then, the fact that in Japan a clash had arisen between the two despite the previous stipulation that religion was not anti-State, Ōnishi felt, was due to the clash between the old and new thought. In other words, in Japan the clash between old and new thought assumed the form of a conflict between religion and the State. Ōnishi stated:

With the entrance of Christianity into modern Japan, the conflict which arose could be felt to be one between conservatism and progress! The new concepts advocated by Christianity which have permeated the Japanese mind, are manifestations of a progressive trend! And, contrariwise, the rejection of Christianity as something leading to the destruction of Japanese tradition and custom is conservative! For this reason, I say: The clash in the matter of religion (and all other matters which have been dragged in its wake) is the clash between progress and conservatism. And rather than speak of Christianity as conflicting with the Japanese State, or the educational system of that State, it would be more appropriate to speak of the conflict between Christianity and one trend within the State; the advocacy of conservatism in education, among other things.

Therefore, Ōnishi concluded, Christianity did not manifest an anti-State or anti-Japan attitude and could be “Japanized.” Also, the Japanese State would gain new spirit and would be reinvigorated by taking in Christianity.

The next question is what was Ōnishi’s view of the nation-
alism which was gradually beginning to flourish at this time? Ōnishi was not one of those nationalists who saw the world only from the position of their own country, who thought only about the State and could conceive of nothing above the State. This type of thought, he felt, no matter what the goals and values of the State were, led to evils and abuses. The objective, the goal of the State, Ōnishi said, was "to give benefits and blessings to all mankind." We can note in passing that this ideal stands in marked contrast to the initial slogan of the Meiji Restoration, "Rich Country, Strong Soldiery."

Ōnishi was probably the first person to translate the German word Aufklärung (enlightenment) into Japanese. His concept of enlightenment was a Kantian one and was quite different from the dogmatic concept of enlightenment which prevailed during the age of freedom and popular rights. To be for enlightenment in a Kantian sense meant, as in Ōnishi's case, to be for a critically epistemological enlightenment. We feel, and we are not alone in this, that, had Ōnishi's ideas (which were discussed in terms of his view of the Imperial Rescript on Education, his view of the State) become dominant in Japan, they would have been able to exercise some restrain on the distorted and prejudiced ultranationalism and statism which developed after the Meiji 30's. At this critical time when he could have become a guiding light for the intellectual world, Ōnishi died.


At the beginning of the Meiji 20's there arose, especially among those who had been drawn to Christianity, a fresh spiritual demand which had about it something of romanticism. This trend can readily be visualized when we remember Tōson's description of the Meiji Gakuin summer session. Young women followed the same line of development, albeit, more simply and more passionately. This could be especially marked among the young women students and their young instructors at the Meiji Jogakkō (Meiji Womens School).

Iwamoto Zenji, the husband of Wakamatsu Shizuko, was
originally a disciple of Nakamura Masanao. He later became the leading personality at this school. His wife, Wakamatsu Shizuko, was a famous and brilliant authoress in her own right. She won fame at this time for her translation of Frances Hodgson Burnett’s *Little Lord Fauntleroy* (1886), a book which was avidly read. This emergence of a woman author is symbolic of the period, but we will not deal with this aspect. Suffice it to say that there were gathered around Iwamoto Zenji at the Meiji Jogakkō a group of young teachers, still in their 20’s, who had graduated from the Meiji Gakuin. Some like Togawa Shūkotsu, Baba Kochō, and Shimazaki Tōson later became famous. A vivid description of this was given in a work by the authoress, Sōma Kokkō called *Mokui* (Silence).

She described Iwamoto, saying:

My impression of my teacher is that he was a tall man with a nice complexion. He had large, moist, bright eyes, which somehow were illuminated as though he were staring fixedly at something. His splendid beard and rather thick red lips were strongly suggestive of manly beauty. When he lectured, the eyes of his audience were constantly fixed on his own strong eyes and his voice took on a sad booming tone. . . . We had other lectures too, as was usual, there was first a moral or ethical-training type of lecture by the school headmaster. This lecture was, for the most part, insipid and boring. With our teacher the case was different. We eagerly awaited the time for him to speak, and when he finished and it came time to leave the lecture hall our eyes shone with emotion, we felt deeply the joy of life, we completely admired the genius of our teacher. . .

In 1885 Iwamoto Zenji began publishing the magazine *Jogaku Zasshi* (Women’s Education). He wrote the following regarding the aims of the journal.

Western scholars have said that when we examine the status of women within a country we can determine the level of civilization that country has attained. In present-day Japan the condition of women is such that Japan cannot be con-
sidered a civilized or cultured country. There is no reason to complain over what has been said. It is not to be extremely deplored that we are made light of by the world because of our mothers, sisters, and wives!... We should exert ourselves in the improvement of the condition of women; by combining Western women's rights with the traditional virtues of our women, we will produce models of perfection.

Iwamoto preached such ideas as the "value of love" and "eternal womanhood". The following description by the authoress of the work quoted above is no distortion. "I must object to the popular characterization of Iwamoto as a person who was interested or over-interested in women... I think it should be said that, because of this interest, it became possible to educate women at that time, and that because of their fascination with him it was possible to convert them."

Sōma Kokkō also wrote about people like Shimazaki Tōson: Though they were called teachers, there was not much age difference between them and the students in the higher forms. This held true for people like Togawa, Baba, and Tōson, who had come from Meiji Gakuin. When they entered our classroom they were in the habit of first placing their books on the desk, then praying reverently before beginning the lecture...they were all truly people of proper manners and deportment.

Sōma also wrote of the deep impression she received from the Meiji Jogakkō and from the magazine Bungakkai (Literary World), published by the people just mentioned. These impressions are a manifestation of the condition of that period when there was mounting fervor for women's education. She wrote: When we read the spirited writings of these people, we came to know Dante, we learned Raphael and Michelangelo. And what we had deep inside us—inadvertently, as it were—a concept of women indefinably colored by the pessimism of the late Tokugawa period novels, was evoked in all its simplicity. We were made to understand the brilliance and colorfulness of life. When we read Bungakkai, we women were
able to rectify and improve our position. The views of the Bungakkai were diametrically opposed to Strindberg’s view of women. At any rate, I discovered in Bungakkai a largely idealized view of women, and it was also something I saw in Meiji Jogakkō.

We have here in rather modest form an early suggestion of what was to become the new type woman.

We said that in the beginning of the Meiji 20’s a spiritual revolution took place; this was also when the feminist awakening began. We quoted at some length from the writings of Sōma the proprietor of the famous Nakamura-ya in Shinjuku, not because she was especially noted as a thinker or a writer, but to describe the atmosphere around the Bungakkai, and because we wanted to present one of the first of the awakened women.

The Jogaku Zasshi was guided by the ideals of Iwamoto Zenji and as such it was partly based on Christianity and it was partly an art and literary magazine. Its readers were not solely women; many men also read the magazine. It was a composite type of magazine. Its pages showed a rather naive union of Christianity and the new literature and arts. This union was soon destined to fall apart. In 1892 the Jogaku Zasshi was published alternately with red covers and white ones. The red meant the issue was devoted to women’s culture, the white, to literature and arts. After 1893, the white-covered Jogaku Zasshi, that is, the one devoted to literature, changed its name to Bungakkai and became a separate magazine devoted exclusively to literature. Its staff consisted of people like Hoshino Tenchi, Hirata Tokuboku, Shimazaki Tōson, Togawa Shūkotsu, Baba Kochō, Ueda Bin, Kitamura Tōkoku, Miyake Kaho, and Higuchi Ichiyō.

The magazine was published for five years from 1893-98. We can divide these 5 years into three phases. The first phase from January 1893 to June 1894 is characterized by Tōkoku’s outstanding activities, which drew the attention of literary circles. With the suicide of Tōkoku in May 1894, however, this first phase of the Bungakkai drew to a close. The second
phase was the period from July 1894 to January 1896. The outstanding event of this period was the serialized publication of Higuchi Ichiyō's *Takekurabe* (Comparing Heights), (January 1895-January 1896). Ichiyō died at the early age of 24. The third phase went from 1896 to 1898. In this phase the *Bungakkai* published many of Shimazaki Tōson's poems, which appeared later in various anthologies. Also, many of the short stories of Tayama Katai, including the lovely Wasure-numa, (Forgotten Swamp), a beautiful descriptive piece on nature.

The above periodization of the *Bungakkai* was taken from Masuda Gorō's *Bungakkai Kiden*, (Story of the Bungakkai). While this periodization was based on such surface things as the death of Tōkoku and Ichiyō's *Takekurabe*, it also had an internal or deeper basis. Even a casual examination of the types of work published during the five years the *Bungakkai* was extant would support this periodization. In the first phase criticism was foremost; this was followed by the primacy of novels; and in the final period poetry was supreme. The following quotation from Tōson, one of the most important members of the *Bungakkai* staff, reveals the trend in spiritual activities. This, in a sense, carries our analysis of the *Bungakkai* a step further. Tōson wrote:

Our magazine lasted about five years; these years could be divided into three periods. In the first phase some of us were already on our way as litterateurs; others were still preparing. It was a period which began for us with the quest for the classics—from the middle ages down to the beginning of modern times. We young people constantly thought about the works of Carlyle, Emerson, Matthew Arnold, Byron, and Goethe. This first period was also the one in which Kitamura Tōkoku was very active and debated vigorously against the thought represented by Yamaji Aizan's practcalism. The topics which Tōkoku took up with delight were concerned with the inner life and spiritual freedom. At that time, too, we were disturbed by various problems in the relation between religion and art. Hoshino meditated at the Zazendō
in Kamakura, and a poetical type like Tōkoku went to preach in the northeastern areas of Japan. In this way we moved on to the second phase. Tōkoku, unfortunately, died at this time. We began to recover from our 'Christian agony' and it was only natural that we turned to the quest for the Western Renaissance. Our discovery of the Renaissance was rather important. Unfortunately, Tōkoku did not live to see this transformation of our interests... The third phase was one in which we reached the point where each of us set out on his own...

The Bungakkai began to appear the year before the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese War, and throughout the war the magazine was extremely lively and brisk. Three years after the war, the Bungakkai ceased publication. While there is much that can be said about the magazine, we will confine ourselves to three essential points which are of special interest for us.

First of all the Sino-Japanese War found almost no echo in the pages of the Bungakkai. As a matter of fact war literature was almost wholly absent—even during the second phase (1894-96), when it was most likely that literature connected with the war would be in evidence. Even in the section devoted to biographical studies the topics were concerned with historical Japanese figures like Hōnen, Buson, Saigyō, or with Western historical figures like Michelangelo, or with Dante criticism. Nor was this all. Hirata Tokuboku, in an article called "Ni-jūshichi Nen o Okuru," (Seeing Off the Year 1894), came out with the following lofty statement:

At the present time, to mention war literature is the very quintessence of foolishness... What the litterateurs now call war literature or new-style military poetry is, as Rohan has said, nothing but the uninteresting husk of poetry, the abortive work of poets with rather dubious goals. Though they may, thanks to mass hysteria, be popular for a time, there is not one particle of the eternal poetic values in their work. For writers to divert their writing to war is the same as for the masses to excitedly drop all enterprise for war. This
time is especially one demanding elevated thought. Though lofty concepts like justice, benevolence, the country, and freedom ought never be lacking in literature, and though the heart-warming national activities of the present day necessarily exert influence on literature, still the splendid state of mind of the people, the disturbances and trials facing Japan, all these storms are not seen in the inner life; and unless they especially blend with the deep and splendid concepts of literature—however splendid the national concepts are, however heartwarming the national activities are—can never possess the eternal poetical life.

Tokuboku concluded, “To speak of a war literature at the present time is the height of shallowness. These are the words with which I send off the year 1894.” Here there is apparent the romanticism and detachment of the Bungakkai people and also their advocacy of looking inward at the wellspring of emotion: an almost mystical belief in the existence of “eternal poetic and literary values.” And we must acknowledge that, faced by the Sino-Japanese War, they strongly played on the theme of self-expression.

It is extremely interesting that many of these people of the Bungakkai either came from “downtown” merchant families or lived in the Nihonbashi-Kyōbashi districts. Both districts comprise the downtown shopping area of Tokyo. Specifically, the people on Bungakkai could be grouped as follows: Hoshino Tenchi and Hirata Takuboku were “pure Edokko” or Born Tōkyoites, Kitamura Tōkoku lived in Kyobashi from the age of 13; Tōson lived at his brother-in-law’s house in Kyōbashi from the age of 10; Higuchi Ichiyō—as is well known—lived in the vicinity of the Yoshiwara, in Asakusa, Tokyo. As we can see in a poem by Tōson, the atmosphere of old Edo must still have lingered on in the district with its white warehouses. Interestingly enough, these people living in the downtown area, a traditional area, were permeated with Christianity. This Christianity combined with the downtown “Edo-ish” atmosphere in a way that became characteristic of the Bungakkai. It is not strange
therefore that the romanticism of the Bungakkai permitted the acceptance of Genroku-type literature.

The third aspect to be noted, however, is that the spiritual revolution, which began in the Meiji 20’s, had, by the time it reached the Bungakkai, become a full-blown spiritualism and was concerned with what Tōkoku called the “inner life.” It became further refined and emerged as a thoroughgoing romanticism. These romantic blossoms were like natural blossoms, doomed to fall and be scattered. Tōson wrote the farewell note in connection with the Bungakkai’s demise, saying:

Parting brings reminiscences—since we first began writing, we and our readers have witnessed the eddying of literary currents and the rise and wane of poetic stars. During this period we saw the rise of interest in Shakespeare’s plays, the attempt at detailed criticism of Tokugawa period literature, and the minute study of the Japanese language, its poetry and songs. At this time, too, we saw the remnants of the struggle between simple Japanese thought and complex Western culture; we read the tragic histories of the many brilliant and talented people who died in the storms of this struggle. The realist school of literature, people like Flaubert, Zola, Daudet, was markedly influencing the trend of the novel in Japanese literary circles during this time. It was at this time that the seeds of ‘romantic’ awareness and compassion were first really planted in Japan.

We see here in concise form, the literary-artistic-intellectual transition which took place in the five years of the Bungakkai’s existence. And we cannot but feel sad that the “seeds of romantic compassion and awareness”—nay, the blossoms, fell, were scattered, and disappeared. Why? Was it because the realism of Zola and Flaubert was gradually replacing romanticism? There may be some such reason, but there was also another reason. The limitations of the Bungakkai lay in its romanticism. These limitations came from the rather facile way in which it combined things Western and things Japanese; in a sense, it resembled a table set with Western and Japanese
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dishes. Probably the most important reason was that the spiritual revolution of the Meiji 20's had conceptions which were one-sided and abstract and were not rooted deeply either in history or social reality. Therefore, this spiritual revolution was fated to collapse of itself. In connection with this collapse we must now proceed to examine Kitamura Tōkoku at closer range.

4. Kitamura Tōkoku

When we look at the history of an outstanding personality, we often see evidence of the history of an age. The growth, development, and collapse of an outstanding personality often symbolizes those hidden aspects of the nature and significance of an age which tend to be overlooked or ignored by us. Tōkoku's short life, his development, and ultimate collapse can be thought significant in the above sense.

An outstanding personality cannot be thought of as simply a "common denominator" of an age, there is always some remainder, something which does not fit into the age. For this reason there is something tragic in the fact that these personalities transcend and are superior to their period. Tōkoku's suicide certainly had this as its motive; he was driven because he stood in conflict with his age. Kitamura Tōkoku was in direct conflict with the traditionalist thinking of the family into which he was born. The question, however, remains, is something like this sufficient cause to explain the tragic destiny of an outstanding personality? We would rather argue that the characteristics and tendencies of some periods are such that they end in a cul de sac and cannot but collapse. People, for the most part, have no premonition of this; indeed, even when they are in the very midst of an age of collapse they often do not sense it. In the case of the outstanding or exceptional person, who is representative of the special characteristics and trends of the age and participates himself in their formation, circumstances are different. This kind of person has premonitions of forthcoming collapse, he is conscious of an age having reached a dead-end, and often anticipates the end of an age by his own
personal collapse.

There is much here that explains Tōkoku's collapse and suicide. Tōkoku, himself, probably would not have been able to give adequate reasons for his suicide. Suicide, too, in a certain sense is a free act based on a personal decision, and therefore it is difficult to find sufficient objective reasons for this act. To an outsider, it often occurs that the entire act of suicide is an unnecessary one. Yet it is possible that the extraordinary individual, who anticipates and has premonitions of the breakdown of an age, is himself caused to breakdown; and his breakdown, in turn, comes to symbolize the breakdown of the age.

This was the case with Kitamura Tōkoku. There was an aspect of his suicide which symbolized the "suicide" of the spiritual revolution of the Meiji 20's. It was not only with his suicide that Tōkoku symbolized the age, but in his youth too his thought and behavior seemed to have symbolic significance.

Among Tōkoku's literary remains there is a long letter which he sent to his fiancée—later his wife—Ishizaka Minako. The substance of this letter almost constitutes an autobiography in its style of writing. It tells of how he acquired unlovely traits from his arrogant petty-minded father and his overly-nervous mother, and how he spent his childhood and youth in the unfeeling custody of his grandparents in Odawara. The letter goes on to say that, despite the fact that he worshipped heroes and avidly read historical fictions, despite the fact that he delighted in playing war and being a general in these childish games, despite the ambition which was obvious in these activities, he came to doubt life itself. This was because he received not one drop of real affection from either his parents or grandparents. This probably formed the basic elements of his melancholia. Indeed, he stated in his letter, had he been plunged into or preoccupied with reading novels at that time he would even then have attempted suicide.

When we think about Tōkoku's later fate we cannot help
being horrified, but a detailed account of this has to be omitted. Instead we will give a few citations covering 1884-85, when after a period of instability he matured and resolved on his hopes, goals, and plans in life.

It was in 1884, I cast off my cowardliness and the fires of my youthful ambition flared anew. My ambition was now a quite different thing from what it had once been. I had completely overcome my desire for personal fame. I now aspired to become a great statesman, to make possible the revival of the Orient which was in a pitiable state of decline. I fervently contemplated sacrificing myself for the good of the people. I hoped to dedicate myself politically as Jesus had dedicated himself religiously. To accomplish this goal I wanted to become a great philosopher, I wanted to demolish the new philosophical school whose doctrine was the 'Survival of the Fittest'—which was popular in Europe. In any event, I thought this way for almost a year, a year in which this idea was not out of my mind for even a moment. Oh, what madness it was to hold such thoughts for such a long time... In 1885 I lost hope and was plunged into such despair that finally I became mentally ill. When I once again recovered to some extent, I realized the wrongness of the thoughts I had hitherto maintained. At this point I aspired to become a novelist. But I did not think of becoming a creative artist, rather I wanted to be like Victor Hugo. Like Hugo I wanted to dominate a political movement with the brilliant power of my writing. It was at that time that I traveled and came to appreciate a change of scene and as a result of my association with all kinds of people I became a student of human sentiments. At the end of 1885 I fell from the ladder of ambition and now a happy life became possible. All this eventually gave me sufficient confidence to become a novelist. Still, this very self-confidence is the villain responsible for my present suffering.

When we read this letter, we can see the trends of the period we spoke of earlier reflected in Tōkoku. We can also
sense his resistance to these trends. The years 1884 and 1885 were years in which young people had to be discussing the world, the State, the condition of society;—it was a period in which political fervor was at its peak, but it was also a period in which this fervor was about to turn into its opposite, political calm, and even apathy. This was a time in which Japan was no longer the sole concern; the Orient itself, the problem of its decline, was now of utmost concern.

Tōkoku, in a sense, participated in the political madness of the period, but he was concerned with the problem of the decline of the Orient. To oppose the West he tried to demolish the survival of the fittest, the evolutionist social Darwinism which was gradually becoming popular at this time. Tōkoku intended first to become a statesman so that he could imitate Christian martyrdom. Then he wanted to contribute to the nation and the country by wielding his pen à la Hugo; finally, he, for a time, made up his mind to be a student of human beings in his capacity as a novelist. What we recognize here is the transition already mentioned; the transition from the age of political fervor to the human or spiritual revolution. We can see it taking place, in shorter compass, in the young Tōkoku. We must still analyze with greater precision why this transition, this change, took place in Tōkoku as well as in society at large.

Why did Tōkoku, who originally dreamt of being a statesman, change and become a novelist? Probably those who think usually in socio-economic terms would find a simple reason for Tōkoku’s behavior. Tōkoku was disappointed in politics therefore he turned to literature. To speak of Tōkoku’s disappointment in politics—depending on how we understand the meaning of the word disappointment—is both correct and incorrect. That is to say, Tōkoku failed in real political activities; at the very least, because he could not effectuate his will in politics, Tōkoku turned to literature. His unrealized hopes were thus intellectualized, idealized, and he escaped into romanticism and spiritualism. Romanticism, spiritualism, are nothng but an
escape from reality. This, then, would represent a narrow approach to understanding Tōkoku’s motives.

We cannot agree completely with this interpretation. First, rather than speak of his disappointment in politics, it would be more accurate to speak of his disappointment in politicians or in political circles. For, Tōhoku was on friendly terms with Ōya Sōkai, who was later (1885) involved in the Ōsaka Affair when an attempt was made to smuggle arms to Korean progressives. In recalling his old friendship with Ōya Sōkai Tōkoku wrote:

Three times when I visited Sōkai, I found him leading many young bravos and intending to involve himself in Korean affairs. My eccentric friend, whose reputation as an excellent poet was widespread, had now ceased composing. I found him, instead, greatly preoccupied with the petty affairs of his village. It was about this time that I began to loathe political affairs. Instead of grasping a sword and joining my patriotic friend in his activities, I desired instead to plunge into discourse about climbing to mountain tops, to pursue quietly the fleecy clouds. Though my heart was overflowing with sadness over losing my friend, I decided inwardly to put myself beyond the confusion of politics.

Tōkoku continued to maintain his friendship with Ōya Sōkai while at the same time rejecting the confusion and turmoil of the political arena. Had Tōkoku been a person who liked politics for itself he could not have come to the point of rejecting politics as loathsome so quickly. In order to say that he was disappointed in politics, we would have to know that he arrived at this after his failure in various political activities. This was not the case, after one or two years of some political fervor he quickly found the “rotten condition” of politics to be unbearable. He almost instinctively—sensing the unbearable “foulness” of politics—recoiled from participation. Tōkoku did not look at men through politics, he tended instead to look at politics through people. Therefore, he was temporarily drawn to Hugo. And his disappointment in politics was preceded by
his disappointment in "dirty politicians" and political activities. Actually, disappointment is rather weak, it is more appropriate to speak of hatred.

We might digress at this point—what is called disappointment with politics can be divided into positive and negative types. A negative disappointment is typified by someone who flees politics who would not do so were he able to actualize his political hopes and ambitions. A positive disappointment with politics means that even though one succeeds in politics one is not satisfied. One who exposes himself to the political world and from the start, because of premonitions of dissatisfaction withdraws, he too experiences a positive disappointment with politics. This takes place, we submit, because the person is somehow aware that his ideals are above or beyond attainment in ordinary politics.

There is indeed a tendency for people to think that the basis of romanticism is to be found simply in the desire to escape reality. This type of romanticism is nothing but a kind of betrayed or perverted realism. There are, however, people who are disappointed with politics or the "real world" because, from the very start, they admired and longed for something beyond mere reality. Tōkoku belongs in the latter category. His romanticism, spiritualism, his emphasis on the inner life, all these represented his quest for something more than mere reality. To be sure, this kind of "positive" romanticism was not free from the limitations of romanticism in general. These limitations meant that one tended to overlook the brutal side of real life and with almost excessive sincerity to grasp only at the purer aspects of life. The collapse of Tōkoku's romanticist assertions were symbolic of the fate of the Bungakkai both as a magazine and as an intellectual-literary trend. Indeed, the entire spiritual revolution of the Meiji 20's had its origin and end in this ignoring of the brutal side of real life. We shall present some of the more interesting aspects of Tōkoku's thought to make this more clear.

The people of the first decade of Meiji who were preoccupied
with Rousseau, Comte, Mill, and Spencer for reasons already set forth, now began to be drawn to Western literature. This was represented for them by Byron, Heine, Wordsworth, Tennyson, Shelley, Browning, and even Shakespeare and Goethe. It was in this period when, symbolically, it was Gladstone rather than Disraeli who drew attention. There were also those who found Emerson praiseworthy and many who avidly read historical biographies by Carlyle and Macaulay. In the Meiji 20’s the attention once accorded the socio-political theories of freedom and popular rights was transferred to historical criticism and theories of history. These now became extraordinarily popular. This tendency was not necessarily, as may be rather hastily concluded, a going-back or a restorationist-conservative one. There were indeed many thinkers and writers like Tokutomi. Sohō who in his Yoshida Shōin interpreted Yoshida as a revolutionary. While there were people like Fujita Mokichi who wrote the Bunmei Tōzenshi (1884), (Eastward Spread of Civilization), there were also people like Fukuchi-Ōchi, who wrote the Bakufu Suibō-ron (1891), (On the Decline and Fall of the Bakufu). The latter was an attempt to leave some record in writing of the history of the closing years of the Bakufu from the point of view of the Tokugawas. One of the most active and vigorous among the historical critics of this period was Yamaji Aizan, who was also a Christian. Yamaji, in January 1893, wrote an article in the Kokumin Shinbun entitled “Rai-Jō O Ronzu,” (On Rai Sanyo). He wrote:

Writing is a form of accomplishment. The writer wielding his pen is not unlike the hero wielding his sword. Both engage in their respective activities for a purpose. If swords and bullets do not contribute to the good of the world they are nothing but vanities. Similarly, beautiful literature, flowery words, be there ever so many in hundreds of volumes, are naught but empty and vain if they do not fall within the compass of human life. Therefore, because literature is an accomplishment it ought to be worshipped. To discuss Rai Sanyō is thus to discuss his accomplishment.
This quotation manifests Yamaji’s theories of practicalism. Literature had to have a practical purport, had to be an “accomplishment,” or it was nothing but vanity and emptiness.

Tōkoku, however, could not agree with Yamaji’s practical or utilitarian approach to art and literature. To be sure, Tōkoku did not reject pleasure and utility as important elements in literature. He felt, and this is clear from his theory of literature as expressed in the *Meiji Bungaku Kanken* (General View of Meiji Literature) that an important function of literature was “solace.” Literature should bring comfort and give solace to the pain and suffering of life. It should therefore have pleasure as one of its aspects. Also, there should be the function of maintaining and advancing life, which too was a “practical” aspect in literature. Yet, all of this did not, to Tōkoku, exhaust the overall significance of literature, nor did this approach the essence of the aesthetic.

Tōkoku found the significance of *science* in its “utility” for the acquisition of exact knowledge; he found the significance of *ethics* in its advancing correct moral concepts; and “solace,” “pleasure,” he acknowledged made contributions to the latter. If, however, this were all, then utility and pleasure, the two aspects existing in science and morality respectively, would, in literature, be nothing but substitutes. This is not all. Simple science and simple morality, did not deal with the true condition of life and the universe, did not show the correct position of human life in the universe. Thus, Tōkoku did not place the significance of literature in simple pleasure and utility. He stipulated that true aesthetics in the universe, “the aesthetics which advances the proper position of human beings [in the universe] should be sought.” Therefore “the enterprise of literature was the study of the unbounded, the study of humanity.”

Tōkoku intended to study and review the literature from the Tokugawa period through the Meiji period—a literature which did not go very far from the unsophisticated pleasure-utility principle. This was probably what he intended his *Meiji Bungaku Kanken* to correct. His work was left uncompleted.
Nevertheless, it is of interest to note that Tōkoku made a distinction in literature in the Tokugawa period between what he called "commoner's literature" and the "literature of the nobility." Especially in the literature of the commoners of the Tokugawa period did he feel that there were types of nihilistic ideas. This is all brought out in his *Tokugawa Shi Jidai no Heimin- teki Risō* (Commoner Ideals of the Tokugawa Age), (1892). Unfortunately we cannot go into a detailed presentation here.

In any event, since Tōkoku cherished views like these concerning literature, it was natural for him to feel repelled by Yamaji Aizan's practical-utilitarian views as expressed in the latter's "Rai-Jō O Ronzu." The result of this was his savagely critical essay entitled "What is Meant by 'Within the Compass of Human Life'!" We might add, parenthetically, that the *Meiji Bungaku Kankan* was published two months before the attack on Yamaji Aizan. Thus, Tōkoku's views of literature as having more than a utility-pleasure function antedated his dispute with Aizan, which was actually a consequence of the views he expressed in the *Meiji Bungaku Kankan*.

It is said that the day Aizan read Tōkoku's criticism he was so disturbed he did not sleep all night. The criticism was essentially as follows: Men are born to fight. Fighting is not something engaged in for its own sake; when men fight it is because there is something to fight for. Whether we use a sword or a pen, when we fight we must know the enemy we are fighting. Voting is always the same, whether we use a sword or a pen. Our fight differs only as our enemy differs. Victory itself differs in accord with the spoils we fight for. When the warrior returns home victorious, his comrades and friends congratulate him and speak of his victory while the critic speaks of his accomplishment. While accomplishment is to be respected and victory is to be respected, there are great warriors who nevertheless do not return home with victories, who do not fight all their lives with victory as a goal. There are those who struggle with "empty things" and make an accomplishment out of the "vain and useless," and there are those who may quit the fight midway.
In the final analysis, this is what Tōkoku wanted to say. There is alongside the enemy we see with our eyes, an enemy we cannot see. It is “nature as force” which sometimes takes form as sensuality, sometimes as temptation or idle fantasy, and in these forms commands our submission as to a kind of destiny. While we can partially dominate and utilize it, in the end we have to submit to the invisible force of infinite nature. In what way, then, can we struggle against this “force of nature” and find an “escape” from this all-enveloping nature? Can we find an “escape” other than “utility” or “practicality”? The true man of letters “leaves off striking ‘reality’ and begins the death-struggle against ‘emptiness’ or ‘uselessness.’” The true man of letters “aims at the immediate foe and does not fight in a restricted or limited arena; he aims and strikes at the unlimited mystery of the world as a whole.” He tries to “achieve the absolute or the idea of the absolute,” and in this way “he can leave this “nature as force” behind him and, at a bound, advance into the exquisiteness and aesthetic splendor of nature.”

Regarding the mission of the man of letters Tōkoku said: The sword of flesh (sensuality), no matter how sharp, only cuts at the flesh and is not the ultimate battleground of the man of letters. Lift your eyes, look up into the infinite void! Climb up there and seize purity, freshness, return with these, make the creatures of the mundane world quaff a drop of this purity and let them live! Oh, how earnestly they desire to live!

Here we can plainly see Tōkoku’s romanticism. We now must examine, in connection with the outlook on literature just presented, his “outlook on life.”

Secondly, Tōkoku wrote in his Ganshu Mohai no Hei (The Evils of Foolish Acceptance and Indiscriminate Rejection) :
There are two ways of looking at the universe. We can view it as lifeless, or we can view it as something vital. There are two ways of looking at human life. We can view human life as bounded by the present world, or we can consider it as extending to the future.
Moreover, in Naibu Seimei-ron (The Theory of Inner Life), he stated:

I believe that there is life in human beings. What is found in the present intellectual world is not so much a competition between Buddhist thought and Christian thought but a war between a living thought that believes in life and one that does not [between a thought of life and a thought of non-life]. Life and non-life, that is the issue between Eastern and Western thought... Why should things that are beneficial for external civilization have to be the concern of the experts in the intellectual world? External civilization is but the reflection of internal civilization. Moreover, the essential difference between the two great civilizations of East and West is that one has a religion that expounds life while the other does not have a religion that teaches life.

In other words, Tōkoku maintained that the difference between Western and Eastern civilization lay in the fact that one had at its core a religion that expounds life, while the other has as its basis a religion that does not expound life. Life thus confronts non-life, and Tōkoku sided with that thought which believed in life. It is obvious that Kitamura Tōkoku's view on life was greatly influenced by the Christian view of life. It cannot be denied that what he called the "inner life," or the "secret palace in the deepest recesses of the heart," had its origin in the Christian view. "There is a palace in the heart, and there is yet another palace in the depths of the palace. The heart exists in the world, yet the world is encompassed by the heart. The heart is in the man, yet man is enveloped by the heart." This heart in the depths of the heart, or the second secret palace in the heart, is what he calls "the secret palace within the palace in the heart of each individual." It is also what he calls the "inner life," the "fundamental life" of human beings. For this reason he said: "Gentle reader, do not take me to task for questing 'the fundament of the life of man' instead of attaching importance to the so-called 'fifty years of life' of a human being." This also is why he opposed the utilitarianism
which tried to place the significance of literature merely on pleasure and utility. For, it seems that he believed the essential qualities of the poet were to be found in the instantaneous covenant between such inner life and the spirit of the universe—God—which was inspiration. He considered that the mission of the poet was to touch the fundamental life and to transmit it through the eyes of the life recreated by such an instantaneous covenant. The following makes this clear:

What does an instantaneous covenant mean? It means inspiration; the person who makes such an instantaneous covenant is called an inspired poet...Inspiration is nothing but a kind of inducement from the spirit of the universe, or God, to the spirit of man, or inner life...This inducement recreates the inner life of man. It recreates the inner experience and inner awareness of man. By this inducement, human sight temporarily detaches itself from the sensual world. This is exactly what I meant when I said 'quit the flesh, forget reality'. I did not mean we should wander about forgetting the 'I,' like a somnambulist. I meant to look at the things which transcend nature with the eyes of [inner] life, the eyes of the recreated life.

We must admit that Tōkoku's advocacy of the inner life, as shown above, was his important contribution to the thought of the Meiji 20's. The characteristics and limitations of his romanticism and spiritualism, however, can best be noted in his view of love.

Thirdly, Tōkoku's view on love may be found in crystal form in the following quotation from the opening of his Ensei Shika to Josei (Pessimistic Poets and Women). "Love is the key to life. Life comes only after love. What is there to embellish life if love is taken away?" He expatiated on this theme, saying: He who has not love is like a tree before spring; he stands somehow in a position of loneliness. It is after going through love that each individual may learn something of the art of life. For love has a pellucidness which pierces to the very truth of beauty. After one experiences love the feeling for
the elemental pathos of nature, for scenic beauty, is no longer superficial, but real. It is like moving into one’s own house from that of a neighbor.

He went on to say:

Emerson wisely said that marriage and death are subjects constantly spoken of by human beings from earliest childhood, from the time the infant barely lisps his language, to the time the grave yawns before him. The boy, clutching his grade-school reader, blushes when he sees a girl entering the school building. In his childish mind, which is still struggling to read the kana syllabary, he tries to imagine what love is like. All this comes as the [natural] order of things in life. To love properly must be as fundamental a law as to leave this world properly.

Tōkoku held the view that love gives meaning to life and is also the key with which to solve the riddle of life. He considered it as important to love in the right way as to die in the right way. Needless to say, this theory of the supremacy and all-importance of love was shocking to his contemporaries and extremely welcome to the younger people.

We must also note that he boldly insisted on platonic love. This is made clear in the following quotation from Shojo no Junketsu o Ronzu, (Discussing the Chastity of Virgins). He wrote:

There are many things in the world to be cherished. But the chastity of virgins is to be most highly prized! If gold, emeralds, and pearls are precious, then chastity of virgins is the gold, the emeralds, the pearls of the human world.

What a great difference there is between this and Yosano Akiko of the same romanticist school, but of the Meiji 30’s! She wrote: “Art thou not lonely in thy ethical preachments? Thou hast not even penetrated to the warm stream of flowing blood ‘neath the tender skin!” Yet even Tōkoku himself had a premonition that such platonic love had to break down. This may be noted in his Ensei Shika to Josei, in which the pessimistic poet, who most cherishes women and love, betrays both, and brings about
tragedy. We can interpret this as an early warning of the collapse of the spiritualism of the Meiji 20's.

Tōkoku severely criticized the eroticism of the Tokugawa period from his position as an advocate of pure love. He stated: "Just think what a great distance there is in literature between eroticism and love. Eroticism is something that lets the lowest animal instinct in mankind go wild while love is something that develops the spiritual splendor in mankind." He, of course, did not conclude simply that Tokugawa period literature was nothing but erotic literature. He acknowledged that chic stylishness was valued and that it was idealized, often replacing love. Tōkoku, however, accurately pointed out the difference between stylishness and love.

The issue between stylishness and true love is that stylishness has not the mutuality of love. Stylishness means to play at love without being infatuated in the first place. Therefore it seems that its principle is to captivate somebody without being captivated oneself. If one permits oneself to become infatuated, then stylishness seems to be taken down a peg in its value. To be infatuated one must probably be a fool. How can a fool then excel in stylishness?

In love one forgets oneself, one becomes quite blind, and probably cherishes love because of this rather than despite this. But stylishness laughs at such love that lacks in intelligence, calls it infatuation, and rejects infatuation. Not to be infatuated is the true aim of stylishness. In other words, "stylishness is close to intelligence" in the sense that it does not involve emotions.

That in the Tokugawa period such a distorted ideal, or value, as stylishness, which in a certain sense bears a resemblance to resignation, could appear, was just as much a consequence of restricted feudal social setting of Tokugawa society as that society's exaggerated male heroics. Be this as it may, the idea of pure love, however abstract it may be, was gradually clarified in the logical sense through Tōkoku. We should note that Kōda Rohan and Mori Ōgai had already portrayed the idealized versions of such love in their works.
Tōkoku’s views on love also had a metaphysical background. He saw in love, moreover, the archetypical differences and links between the thought of East and West. Drawing on Plato, he said love is not something of this world, it is rather like an angel who has descended to the earth from heaven. It is as a natural feeling flowing from metaphysical demands we come to quest beauty and love. Tōkoku puts it thus:

This feeling is akin to a bottomless lake and may be described in no other way than as an element in nature. It cannot be destroyed even if it is attacked; it cannot be shaped by casting; it cannot be easily extracted. What else can it be but a spiritual element which exists even as the universe itself exists?

The metaphysical nature of Tōkoku’s view on love is thus made clear.

In his *Takai ni taisuru Kannen*, (The Idea Concerning the Other World), he said the reason for the absence of true tragedy in Japanese literature was that “we have no other-worldly idea and are concerned only about the tangible things in our immediate surroundings.” Also; “It is largely due to this that love, with us, gives precedence to fleshly desire rather than to true feelings of love.” He blamed Confucianism and Buddhism for the lack of true love. Also, Tōkoku suspected that true love could never be appreciated in the Orient as long as people cleave to pantheism. What did Tōkoku, who thought thus about the characteristics of both Eastern and Western civilizations, think about the Japanese *revolution* since Meiji?

It is worth noting in this respect that Tōkoku considered the revolution since Meiji as merely material and not spiritual and as more of a *transition* than a *revolution*. When one stands on a street corner and looks about, one sees Western-style buildings and Japanese-style buildings, some people are in Western clothes and others are in Japanese clothes. This mixed and confused state is the picture of present-day Japan. He wrote:

At present spiritual values are being lost in the face of a material revolution. This revolution did not result from an
inner clash of opposing elements, but rather came as a result of stimuli from outside. It is not a revolution but a transition. People could not control their minds and were drawn into the waves of transition without knowing it. Thus many ended by destroying themselves... There is nothing in the enterprise, social life, conversation, language of this time that does not prove it to be a period of transition.

Tōkoku, however, took a different stand in his *Meiji Bungaku Kanzen*; he probably adopted this interpretation from Tokutomi Sohō’s concept of democracy which we discussed earlier. He said, in effect, that the Meiji Restoration was a victory for democracy in that it destroyed the class distinction between the nobility and the commoners. It was “the first victory based on the nation’s public opinion.” It rejected the ideology of a patriarchal system in which only those at the top of the hierarchy were given freedom, while the personal freedom of the common people was ignored. “The commoners had matured so much in their thinking that they could not be passively obedient under the old system any longer. The revolution of Meiji looks as though it was achieved by the arms of the warriors, but actually it was largely due to the natural or spontaneous trend of thought.” And also, “The greatest misfortune for the Orient is that spiritual freedom has been unknown from the very beginning down to the present.” Tōkoku went on to say that the significance of the Meiji revolution lay in the awareness and the achievement of such spiritual freedom. Judging, however, from his title, Manba, or “Miscellaneous Abuses,” it seems that retrospectively he considered the Meiji Restoration as a “transition” and not a revolution. And, thus, he thought that a spiritual revolution was necessary to elevate this mere “transition” to the level of revolution.

Today many people call attention to Tōkoku’s efforts in the peace movement. His pacifism, in the main, resembled Tolstoi’s. It was a spiritualism that insisted on loving one’s enemy as Tolstoi’s Ivan did, Tōkoku’s “Heiwa Hakko no Ji,” (Address in Publishing ‘Heiwa’); “So Dandan,” (Fragments of Thoughts);
"Heiwa no Kimi no Ōkoku," (The Kingdom of the Lord of Peace); "Saigo no Shōrisha wa Tare zo," (Who is the Ultimate Victor); "Torusutoi Haku," (Count Tolstoi); "Isshu no Jōi Shisō," (A Kind of Anti-Foreign or Exclusionist Thought); all bear this out. Like Tolstoi, he hated the crimes of society and sympathized with the poor. Tōkoku considered thought concerning society, country, and the people as "horizontal thought," and emphasized the significance of "higher order thought." He said:

In the world of thought there is something that may be called horizontal thought. This type of thought always concentrates on our earthly environment, is concerned with the improvement of the society, the welfare of the nation, and the guidance of people's opinion... But, remember, people should not be satisfied with thinkers who only think thus. In order to give true culture to the people, something more than horizontal thought is required. I call this necessary thought a higher order thought... Indeed, I believe that this so-called higher order thought is absolutely essential for the people, even though I recognize the importance of horizontal thought too.

Tōkoku's spiritualism, his loftiness, are apparent in the above quotations. He hoped to complete the Meiji Restoration by achieving a new spiritual revolution. Why did Tōkoku fail?

First, in defining a misanthrope, he said: "A misanthrope is one who is unable to observe the rules of society, nor can he be at home in society." This also fits Tōkoku himself. He repeatedly stated that the rules and regulations of the society should be rejected. He probably tried to climb up into the world of pure spirit and pure life after destroying and smashing the secular world. But with what result? Shimazaki Tōson, in his Haru, (Spring), makes Aoki, who was based on Tōkoku, say, "Destruction! Destruction! After destruction, something new may be born. My struggle till now was nothing but the efforts stemming from this spirit [to make room for new things]." "There is a limit to a man's power, isn't there? I tried to beat the world, and I ended up breaking my own heart!" This may
have been inevitable after all. Perhaps Tōkoku was right in trying to break old cusoms and institutions, especially the Japanese family system, with his concept of the supremacy of love. He could not, however, establish a new system to replace the old, nor could he rebuild reality on the basis of spirit. He merely tried to liberate the spirit from reality. The mere act of destruction does not yet by itself assure us that construction will follow. Freedom from material things in itself does not enable the spirit to take control over the material. A spirit that loses its content (raw material) becomes powerless and has to die in the end. Here is one of the reasons that made the spiritualism of the Meiji 20's, represented in Tōkoku, collapse. Here was also the inner cause that brought a new era in the Meiji 30's when, to some degree, affairs of the state and society came to be dealt with as concrete problems.

The fact that Tōkoku's spirit did not have any external—material or institutional—support, however, was not the only reason for his collapse. The cause did not reside only in the fact that Tōkoku was unable to achieve a purified, transformed, and ideal kind of family or society. He desired to be an architect of the soul, "an engineer who aspires to build the spirits of human beings," he wanted to be "an engineer of the inner life." For this reason he fought against Nature, his great enemy, and Fate, his invisible enemy. In busying himself with the construction of the inner life, Tōkoku eventually came to detach himself from vital, vigorous life in direct contact with instinct, and somehow seemed to be indefinably aged. There was something about him that smacked of Bashō and of Saigyō. Here, too, the cause just presented for Tōkoku's collapse—his emphasis on spirit at the expense of instinct, his attempt at abstracting human spirit from nature—was responsible for the rise in the Meiji 30's of what can be called "instinctivism." One aspect of the latter was constituted by Takayama Chogyū's Biteki Seikatsu-Ron (On the Aesthetic Life).

More important for intellectual history, however, than the above reason is Tōkoku's inconsistency in his position in relation
to pantheism and monotheism, or, more specifically, Eastern thought and Western thought. As mentioned, Tökoku’s spiritualism and revolution may be said to have been based on Christian thought. He did not, however, maintain that everything Oriental, or Japanese, had to be Westernized. In fact, he was opposed to the machine civilization of the West. He went even further and in an article entitled *Ane to Imōto*, (Elder Sister and Young Sister), he wrote that “along with the beautiful elder sister who wears a silver comb called democracy and a flowery pin named individualism, the depressed younger sister left at home should also be taken to wife.” He also said: “Who is it that can harmonize Western thought that is like a pearl with strong and firm Oriental taste?” As mentioned earlier, Tökoku expressed his doubt concerning the pan-spiritualism of the East by saying “that love which possessed life, hope, was eternal” and never could be found in a country which adhered to a multiplicity of religions and doctrines.

On the other hand, he admitted in his *Naibu Seimei-ron*, (On the Inner Life), that his position could be considered as both mono-spiritualism and pan-spiritualism. Thus he said: “Dear readers, do not criticize me for my tendency to be mono-spiritual at some points and pan-spiritual at others.”

In this respect, it may be said that Tökoku’s spiritualism swayed between the idea of the Christian personal god and Oriental pan-spiritualism. There was in him a conflict between a monotheistic religion and an art that considered nature as beauty. With his Oriental mind that admired nature, Tökoku found the very origins of the universe to stem from *mystery*, *silence*, something that for us human beings is an inanimate remnant. While he believed that God is love (in the Christian way), he sensed at the same time the presence of *silence* in the depth of nature (in the Oriental fashion). The contradiction between Western religion that stresses life and Oriental religion that does not stress life is unresolved and at the base of his personality.

This inconsistency and dissociation must have been another
of the major causes of Tōkoku’s collapse—and also the failure of the romanticists to unite East and West in the Meiji 20’s. We feel this very strongly in Tōkoku’s *Isseki Kan*, (One Evening’s Thought), written just before he committed suicide. There he wrote:

It is evening. I am lying at the window. The place is the seashore; the time, the midst of autumn. The sky is clear and all things in my surroundings face me serenely. It is as if Nature were laughing at me for my lack of sincerity, as if she were sneering at me for my timidity, calling me names for my lack of power, ability, and enthusiasm. She can pierce me in this manner! Yet what about me? I am nothing but a small particle on earth, and I comprehend her only with extreme difficulty...The moon is late in rising and has not appeared yet. When I look up at the sky the stars are scattered in profusion far above my head. Turning to myself, I see my body and when I look deeper, inwardly, I am amazed at the great distance between Nature and myself. Immortality and imperishability are her’s, senility, disease and death are mine. How ashamed I am of my vulnerableness in face of fresh, beautiful, and serene Nature!...If I perceive her as being sad, then I myself become sad. If I sense her to be singing, I find myself singing too...When I look at it differently—she doesn’t exist, nor do I, but only the vast remote heavens with their innumerable lanterns.

The same problem will be met within Kinoshita Naoe, who was a believer in Christianity and an extremely fervent socialist. Concerning Tōkoku’s suicide, Baba Kochō opined that it was a consequence of that mental illness which was an important aspect of his character. We had no intention of ignoring this aspect of Tōkoku, but we feel that the above points had more importance from the point of view of intellectual history.
PART V

CHAPTER I

THE DEVELOPMENT OF INDIVIDUALISM

1. The Thought of the Meiji 30's

When people discuss Mori Ōgai, they frequently quote from his Ōgai Gyoshi to wa Tare Zo (Who is This Fisherman Ōgai?). This was a critique of the Japanese literary world which Ōgai wrote in January 1900. At this time he was living in Kokura, in Kyushu, having, in a sense, been demoted and transferred there from Tokyo. Ōgai wrote this work at the instance of the editor of the Fukuoka Nichi Nichi Shinbun. In it he said that to look at the literary arena of the capital from this remote village was “like looking at a beauty through a rattan blind.” Making a play on words—the name of the leading literary magazine at this time was Taiyō (The Sun)—Ōgai wrote:

I learn from the newspapers that the ‘sun’ of the Hakubun-kan is at its zenith and Takayama Chogyu stands without peer in literature. The men of letters praise him saying that he raises new problems. Chogyū himself speaks of his originality in his aesthetic theories. I cannot see from this distance the brilliant stars ranged about him, but I can discern writers like Gotō Chūgai, who writes new-style novels, and Shimamura Högetsu, of the Yomiuri Shinbun. These men appear to be waiting in readiness. They seem to be showing the pluck of those who would make ready to take over the publishing empire of the Hakubun-kan. In the face of this, Chogyū cannot afford to rest. Besides, there seem to be thousands of vigorous young men with the lustre and glory of Tokyo Imperial University behind them who are taking turns in playing parts on the literary stage of the Teikoku Bungaku, (Imperial Literature), magazine. This, then, is
what the literary scene looks like from out here.

After describing the new literary atmosphere of this period Ōgai compared it to the period when he, himself, and Rohan and his group were active, saying:

Posterity will not question the fact that there emerged with Meiji a literature which did not follow in the footsteps of predecessors. Posterity will also acknowledge Rohan to have been one of those who created the new literature. I am happy to say that I was present at this time and that I was able to be friends with someone like Rohan...In today's literary world writers like Chūgai, Högetsu, and Kyōka [Idumi Kyōka] rise to positive brilliance in passages of their work, but I feel that I have not yet encountered one instance of perfection...I would venture to say that the Greek word Epigone is supremely applicable. The word in the sense of secondary or derivative, applies to the new men of letters who stand alongside Chūgai and his group in the literary world. When the present literary scene is compared with that of Rohan and his group, it, of a certainty, is secondary or derivative.

With regard to his own position in the literary arena, Ōgai said:

Ōgai both died and was killed, but I myself don't feel I died. ...When you check any number of issues of Teikoku Bungaku and the various newspapers and magazines published during this time—starting with Taiyō—there seem to be some arrows which pierced the name Ōgai. The name Ōgai has ceased to be heard among this militant group, and in this sense Ōgai has died....In the present literary arena there is one name—that of Shiki—which is left over from the period before my death. Shiki is active in the present literary world and was active before as well....Fortunately I have proof that one of my interests remains as before. Because of my old habit of reading I continue to read the latest European works and criticism. Recently I read Gerhart Hauptmann's The Sunken Bell, and I was moved by this work. This experience did not
differ from the time when I read good books by the people from earlier periods. Thus, though Ōgai has been killed, I never died.

These words of Ōgai’s suggest all kinds of interesting possibilities; we will confine ourselves to the following two points. First, the Sino-Japanese War of 1894-95 marks the beginning of a new literary period. The magazines just mentioned by Ōgai, the Taiyō, the Teikoku Bungaku, were first published in 1895, immediately after the Sino-Japanese War. Taiyō, especially, took over from the old Kokumin no Tomo as the sounding board for the literary-intellectual world. Through Taiyō, Chogyū dominated the criticism and thought of the literary world, and the new people like Hōgetsu began to emerge. The age was clearly one of transition. Nor was this all. We should note that while the creative men of letters of the older period, Ōgai, Shōyō, Rohan, and Kōyō were still alive, they were, in a sense, buried. This is plainly the purport of the statement, “Ōgai died here.”

In the period from 1892 to 1901, Ōgai devoted himself to a painstakingly meticulous translation of Hans Christian Andersen’s Improvisators, indeed, he did almost nothing else. This work exerted and continues to exert tremendous influence on young Japanese, the original is almost forgotten in the West. We see, then, Ōgai was preoccupied with his monumental translation work; Shōyō escaped into a concern with the problems of ethics; and Rohan ceased writing in 1895. In a sense, all these people departed by “dying.” The actual generation which was in charge was clearly a different one. What is of importance, however, is the fact that, as Ōgai ventured to say, parts extraneous to him may have died, but he himself remained alive. The same can be said for many of the group. They were inactive for a period of ten years, starting after the Sino-Japanese War in 1895, and they once again resumed their activities as creative men of letters after the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-05. It is in this strange and interesting phenomenon that we can perhaps find the key to the puzzle of the Meiji 30’s. Also, we can arrive
at a clue to understanding the Meiji 40's and the early years of the Taishō period. Indeed, the proper explanation of this phenomenon may be crucial towards clarifying the entire Meiji period. We must start with an attempt to explain the Meiji 30's.

In the passage we cited above, Ōgai criticized the new people who appeared in print for the first time in the Meiji 30's. Ōgai said that there was almost no sign of perfection to be found in their works. And he concluded that they were essentially "epigones" who, in comparison with the earlier group represented by Rohan and, needless to say, Ōgai, were distinctly inferior and second-rate. This criticism was certainly apt. It is impossible to find any outstanding work in the literary-intellectual field for this time. One can say the period was characterized by imperfect, immature attempts at creating. Nor is this all. In July of 1900, Ōgai criticized the trend to naturalism, that was already beginning to make its appearance, as destructive of style.

I feel the last half of the 19th century was a period of destruction in the arts and literature....It is this which produced the desire to destroy the forms of those who went before.... Therefore, I consider that the history of the arts and literature of the latter half of the 19th century was that of the destroyers. And, dear readers, in order to understand this destruction it is necessary to know the true nature of the structure that was being destroyed. At the same time that I was being advised that I was behind the times, I was informed that society was progressing....But, dear readers, whence did the form at which the naturalists aimed their destructive efforts originally arise? It too must have emerged from nature....People in the past were positive in their ways of thinking and they continually strove for perfection in their art. It was from this desire that style or form was born. Present-day people are really negative in their thinking; they are constantly searching for holes which people in the past may have overlooked.

It is doubtful that we can conclude that the art of the
past was positive and that the new arts and literature of this period were negative. We may agree, however, that the arts and literature of the relatively recent past, of Rohan’s period, for example, possessed a perfection of form, and that in contrast the new art of the Meiji 30’s was destructive and had lost stylistic beauty and elegance of form. Ōgai explained this by pointing to a similar change in the arts and literature in late 19th century Europe. There was, of course, something to this, yet, we must state that conditions in Japan were more complex than Ōgai’s explanation would seem to indicate. The breakdown of the destructive naturalist movement of the Meiji 30’s was a consequence of the same conditions which had caused the collapse of the spiritual revolution of the 20’s.

This is an interpretation we can extract from the following words of Shimazaki Tōson. He spoke as follows about the vital temper of the Meiji 20’s.

The Meiji 20’s were a youthful, vital period when it appeared that everyone who took pen in hand was able to make progress. There were various reasons for this: one of the reasons we can list was that writing satisfied a social demand. This was a period when the new Japan was being conceived by many and there was a strong need for new writers.

The question, of course, is why did this vital trend come to an end? Tōson said: “Had Meiji literature been able to continue at that pace, its development would have been something worth noting. There must be various reasons for the loss of its early purity and freshness.” Tōson then gave as one of the most important reasons the incompleteness of the change to the “unity of language and speech” which was to serve as the foundation of the new literature. These words from a man who as a writer struggled with the problem of expression are quite important. Moreover, the problem of expression was not just limited to the problem of form; it was deeply related to the problem of content. The problem of expression and of technique in naturalism was also related to the question of form and content. In an other article by Tōson, in connection with
his reminiscences of his fellow members of the Bungakkai, Tōkoku and others, the following short sentence appeared: “I unexpectedly found that even I had become a frightfully aged youth.” This, properly understood, is the key to the question as to why the vital trend in literature collapsed.

As stated earlier, under the influence of Christianity, Tōkoku strongly stressed the inner or spiritual life. At the same time, however, Tōkoku adored such writers as Bashō and Saigyō, indeed, Tōkoku was called “Mr Saigyō.” While this worship of traditional Japanese writers may have been natural for someone like Tōkoku, still, objectively, there was something strange in this joining of a Christianity-derived spirituality with an emotional attachment to the Japanese literary past. In the case of Ichiyō, too, there was something inexplicable. There is in her writing an over-all indefinable something which smacks of the Tokugawa period or of “old-Edo.” Why did the young people of her group on the Bungakkai venerate her so much? Also, why was it that someone so young had so mature a taste and a style so polished? Tōson’s statement about finding himself to be a “frightfully aged youth” gives us a clue to the answer.

As we have mentioned time and again, the beginning of the Meiji 20’s coincided with what we designated as the “age of spiritual revolution.” This was the age of the “second revolution of Meiji,” the age of “new Japan.” It was an age where, in contrast to the earlier period of political fervor and destructiveness, constructiveness was emphasized; the building of “new Japan” and especially the spiritual aspect of this “new Japan” was demanded.

If there was to be building without destruction, then it was not permissible to ignore the old Japanese traditions which constitute the building materials, the point of departure, as it were, on which this “new Japan” was to base itself. It was in this age that the significance of things Japanese, especially of traditional aesthetics and morality, was rediscovered, fostered, and stressed. What aided this process was a more or less
restorationist-conservative revival. And not only was there an attempt at a thorough and pure spiritual revolution by the Bungakkai people, but they found themselves close to Saigyō and the Genroku (1688-1703) period. It was in this sense that these people unwittingly or inadvertently became "aged youths," youths who somehow suggested agedness, youths whose style had about it the polish which comes with maturity in years. Stated simply, they attempted an over-hasty joining of things Oriental and Western. Therein, as could be seen in the early works of Rohan and Ōgai, was manifest a classical beauty and perfection which became archetypes for the period. And yet, this kind of hasty synthesis of East and West ultimately was fated to break down.

The foregoing is nothing but a hypothesis. Still, if this hypothesis is valid, we can make some stipulations about the character of the Meiji 30's. In the Meiji 20's a leap forward was attempted. In a sense, the "new Japan" was born, a new spiritual and cultural synthesis took place in terms of which the meaning of the Meiji Restoration became clear and was translated into actuality. This was what we called the second Restoration in Meiji. Yet, despite the fact of this emergence to the level of consciousness of the meaning of Meiji, the "Second Revolution" was limited by the fact that it was merely an extension of the first revolution, the Meiji Restoration. It was natural that the first revolution was heavily shaded with materials from the Japanese past, and despite the progressive aspect of Meiji, there was a flavor of antiquity about it. Fortunately, in literature, this led to the classical perfection of the work of Rohan and Kōyō. And yet, for reasons just presented, this combining of old and new had to break down, this unity had to split asunder. For this reason the Meiji 30's can be characterized as a period of breakdown and dismemberment. It was in this age that the spiritual-cultural synthesis, the synthesis of old and new, of East and West, broke down and it was not until the Meiji 40's, and especially in the last years, that the attempt at cultural synthesis was again made. At any
rate, the period at the conclusion of Meiji, in which this new attempt was made, was prepared and developed by the "transition period" of the Meiji 30's. The Meiji 30's have meaning in the sense of being a new point of departure, a preparing of the way for the new spiritual-cultural synthesis of the late 40's.

For the purpose of analysis, we can divide the Meiji 30's into three phases. As noted previously, the collapse of the Meiji 20's, which we symbolized by the personal collapse and suicide of Tōkoku, was a spiritual collapse. What at first arose in continuation of the 20's was also colored by romanticism. But it was natural that this period's romanticism was far removed from the earlier type, in the sense that it demanded freshness, life, instincts and could even be designated as instinctivism.

The first phase of the Meiji 30's was represented by Chogyū and lasted until 1900-1901. It is also not strange that this period in which life, existence, constituted a problem was a period of agonizing skepticism and doubt. This was reinforced by a residual religiosity from the Meiji 20's, which in the first phase of the 30's lent a religious coloration to the skepticism.

The second phase was the one in which Tsunajima Ryōsen succeeded Chogyū as the dominant literary figure. Ryōsen, however, was utterly unable to help resolve the skepticism of the period; the pressure for vitality and life became ever fiercer. Thus, it becomes clear, there was a gradual changeover to naturalism which accompanied the fin de siècle trend of this complex period.

The third phase, at the end of the Meiji 30's, foreshadowed the naturalism which emerged fullblown in Japan after the Russo-Japanese War.

The character of the Meiji 30's when compared to the Meiji 20's is essentially as stipulated in the foregoing. This is especially so when one thinks in terms of the connection between the two periods, and of the problem which faced them; the problem of synthesizing the Western and Oriental traditions. The survey of spiritual-intellectual history from this aspect is extremely important. From the standpoint of the history of
thought, the various problems which confront an age are never just the problems of that age. They are not the problems which are visible from any given present alone; they are formed by the necessity for synthesis with a tradition which comes from the remote past. Moreover, it is not a case of simply fusing with the inheritance from the past—the formation of a synthesis with the feudal family or household—for example. That tradition was represented by the longing for a return to, and re-absorption by, Nature, a characteristic Oriental sentiment, is what made this confrontation between tradition and the West necessary. In the problem of the confrontation of East and West we must never ignore this observation. In his sociology of religion, Max Weber recognized religious factors as underlying given social structures—the development of modern capitalism, for example, was supported by the Protestant ethic. All the problems of the history of thought cannot be explained from socio-economic or political standpoints alone. Therefore, we especially went into the character of the Meiji 30's from the standpoint of the history of thought rather than socio-economic history or political history.

Meiji Japan moved onto the stage of world history as a result of the Sino-Japanese War. Prior to the Sino-Japanese War, Japan, while part of the world, confined itself to its own problems. It could now no longer function within a narrow Japanese frame. The "Yellow Peril," the Triple Intervention, and the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, all pointed to the fact that Japan was a power to be watched, or that Japan had become a country worth being used. At the same time, Japan had to liberate herself in terms of the outside world; she had to harden her framework still more. Thus the state, the nation, repeatedly became important and serious problems, and it was in this period that nationalism and imperialism clearly emerged. Tokutomi Sohō’s change of heart, which we discussed earlier, dates from this period, as do the theories expounded by Hozumi Yatsuka. His statement, "The emergence of civil law is destructive of loyalty and filial piety," was made in 1891; and in 1892
he said, "Public law has its roots in the veneration of ancestors." Both of these ideas found expression in a work called *Ie no Hōriteki Kannen*, (The Juridical Concept of the Family), which appeared in 1898. One of the ways in which traditionalism was manifested in the Meiji 30's is evident in what Hozumi said:

The national polity of Japan, which has a venerable antiquity, is governed by the family system. The Japanese State is an enlargement of the family and, conversely, the State in reduced form constitutes the family. For this reason, to explain the family system is at the same time to make clear the meaning of the Japanese national polity.

The foregoing represents a characteristic current of thought in Japan after the Sino-Japanese War of 1895. It is one of the earliest appearances of the concept of the familial-state in Japan, but it should be noted that this concept and this style of thought was not satisfying to the intellectuals at that time. In this form, it was lacking in sufficient logical content to satisfy them. It was an urgent necessity, however, for the Japanese state to be strong. Therefore, many of the intellectuals of the time gave tacit recognition to the authority of the state, but at the same time attempted to disassociate themselves from the state. That is to say, the intellectuals did not deal directly with the question of the state—they attempted to avoid direct confrontation. And the state was thus deficient in a theoretical-intellectual framework, and, conversely, theory was widely removed from the state. It was here that the disassociation between the state and thought arose, which was one of the characteristics of thought in the Meiji 30's.

A positive manifestation of this disassociation between thought and the state could be seen in the prevalence in the thought of the Meiji 30's of individualism. Japan, now on the world stage, found that to the degree that she hardened and strengthened her framework there was asserted an egotistical or self-centered type of individualism which was destroying this framework. The rise of self-consciousness, which is a characteristic of modern man, was something which could not
be avoided. In Chogyū, in Ryōsen, and, in general, with all those people who were suffering from agonizing doubt, the problem of the individual was a vexatious one. This, then, was another characteristic of the Meiji 30's.

An additional problem which it is not permissible to ignore was the social problem. This problem was apparent as early as the Meiji 20's, and it was raised by the people associated with the Kokumin no Tomo. Yet, at that time, it was still presented in theoretical form as a phenomenon which could be observed in the advanced countries in Europe. After the Sino-Japanese War, with the acquisition of colonies and reparations, with the establishment of capitalism which paralleled the tremendous expansion of military preparations, the social problem gradually came to have reality for Japan, and it was now dealt with not as a theoretical and distantly-removed problem but as one directly facing Japan. The problems of class and society now had to be met. What should be noted is that the method of coping with the social problem at that time represented a flowing together of Christian humanism, romanticism, and a type of socialism: all of these were combined in a vague amalgam. The peace movement at the time of the Russo-Japanese War also had similar characteristics. It too was a fusion of many elements which eventually fell apart. Be that as it may, it should not be forgotten that the socialism of the Meiji 30's, the awareness of the social problem, was heavily charged with religion and emotionalism and was not of a logical or theoretical social scientific bent. Here, then, is still another characteristic of the Meiji 30's.

2. Takayama Chogyū and His Agony

The ending of one period contains the beginning of the next period. Often within the ending of a period there is a momentum for continuance; negation, in this sense, contains a drive for development. The movement of the Bungakkai may be considered a phenomenon of the last part of the Meiji 20's, and was, as such, best represented by Tōkoku. However, the
third period of the *Bungakkai*, which was represented by the poetry of Shimazaki Töson, was also the starting point of the Meiji 30's. This poetry appeared in the *Bungakkai* and later was compiled in such works as *Wakana-shū*, (Young Greens Anthology), (1897) and *Hitoha Bune*, (One Leaf Boat), (1898). This eventually gave rise to new trends summarized by comments like, "At last, the time of new poetry was coming and was just like a beautiful dawn." Actually, Töson soon retired to Komoro, and it was not until 1904 that he resumed his career. He wrote *Suisai Gaka*, (Water Color Painter), followed by *Hakai*, (The Broken Commandment), in 1906.

Töson's period of inactivity resembled that of Ōgai and Rohan. The influence of Töson's poems on other people, like Yosano Akiko, is apparent from the following words by her.

In 1897, when I was 20, I started composing after Shimazaki Töson's new style poetry came out in the magazine *Bungakkai* and my poems were published in several volumes. It was also after Susukida Kyūkin published many of his fresh new poems. I owe very much to these two people. What turned out to be the most important magazine of poetry in Japan, the *Myōjō*, (The Morning Star), made its first appearance in 1901, with Akiko and others as the central figures. Its first issue carried Töson's well-known poem "Komoro naru kojō no hotori," (At the Ruins of Komoro Castle).

One should not forget that it was in 1899, that Tsuchii Bansui's poem "Tenchi Ujō," (The Sentient World), came out. Many will still remember "Hoshi Otsu Shūfū Gojōgen," (The Stars Fall and the Autumn Wind Blows on the Field of Gojō), which is in the same collection.

Takayama Chogyū, comparing Shimazaki Töson and Tsuchii Bansui, praised the former for rhythm and the latter for imagination. He said: "His [Bansui's] poems are his philosophy, his ideals, his religion." But, at the same time, he appropriately criticized Bansui as follows: "He has not yet composed any epic poetry. Some people look at "Gojōgen" as an epic poem but actually it is merely a type of lyric poetry."
We intend to discuss Chogyū but we must also direct the reader's attention to the *Bungakkai*. The magazine was instrumental in both opening the new era of the Meiji 30's and in the phenomenon of the collapse of the spiritualism of the Meiji 20's. Through Tōson and Bansui the lyrical feeling of the early Meiji 30's could be seen. Returning to Chogyū, what characterized the whole of Chogyū's work was this lyrical quality. This was accompanied by skepticism and a degree of rebelliousness.

It is accepted opinion that Chogyū's career can be divided into three periods. The first period started with *Takiguchi Nyūdō*, (The Lay Priest Takiguchi), (1894), the work that bought him fame, and ended with *Waga sode no ki*, (Notes in My Sleeves), June 1897. The second period lasted from May 1897, when his Japanism emerged, to the end of 1900; and the third period covered the last two years of his life. This was the two-year period from January 1901, when he published his *Bunmei kihyōka to shite no bungakusha*, (The Literary Man as a Critic of Civilization), until his death. These three periods were dominated by romanticism, Japanism, and individualism, in that order. The last period could also be called instinctivistic, or genius-centered. At the base of all these periods, however, one could sense a lyrical quality. If it were asked what kind of a person Chogyū was, we could answer by giving the following quotation from Chogyū's "Anezaki Chōfū ni atauru sho." (Letter to Anezaki Chōfū):

As you may know, I am a person of contradiction and of agony. My short life has so far been spent indeed, just in contradiction and agony. I have resorted to all measures within my power in order to relieve myself from this agony. There was nothing, however, that had any effect at all. The little knowledge I acquired did not bring me light, but darkness. I made efforts to overcome my skepticism by strengthening my will power, but my emotions were too strong to let me reach this objective. Many a time I thought 'Should I not rather free all my desires and let them have what they want?
I should then enjoy my aloneness and that would not be too bad.’ Yet I could not help but feel guilty. In short, my emotions are too strong for me to reach enlightenment, while my intelligence is too high to let me go astray. I was going in circles between these two and could never find a suitable point of compromise.

This contradiction and agony with a lyrical trend at its base, his Japanism and the reverse—individualism, all this instability, was characteristic of Chogyū. But it also symbolized the Meiji 30’s.

Chogyū’s first period, his romanticist period, reveals aspects of his life and also shows his relation to the time in which he lived. Aside from these two points, there is not much in this period that is worthy of attention. The introductory phrase of his *Takiguchi Nyūdō*, in itself, sufficiently expressed Chogyū’s feeling. He himself admitted that this piece was a lyric, rather than a historic, novel.

Rather than go over this first phase of Chogyū’s in detail, we will examine the growth of Chogyū’s thought during the second and third phases. Why did the lyric poet Chogyū, who wrote *Takiguchi Nyūdō*, and translated Goethe’s *The Sorrows of Young Werther* which he published under the title *Weiteiro no hiai*, (The Sorrow of Weiteiro), three years before writing *Takiguchi Nyūdō*, postulate Japanism in the Meiji 30’s and then suddenly change to individualism? The reasons and the basic content of his thought are all to be found in the latter two phases of his career.

In reading Chogyū’s articles and critiques, and in trying to follow him in his development, we are often puzzled by the suddenness of the transition in his thought. We often have great difficulty in locating the cause for this sudden transition. Many people have pointed to the strangeness of Chogyū’s change from Japanism in his second phase to individualism in his third phase. While this is true, what is even more difficult to understand, is his shift from the romanticism in his first phase to the Japanism of his second phase. On re-examination, however,
one realizes that it is possible to detect a clue in his first phase. This clue at the same time accounts for the difference between Chogyū's Japanism and the many other more crude forms of Japanism, and also contains the reason which eventually compelled Chogyū to become an individualist.

Immediately after the Sino-Japanese War, from June to September of 1895, the year following the publication of Taki-guchi Nyūdō, Chogyū wrote a long article entitled "Dōtoku no risō ronzu," (On the Ethical Ideal), for the Tetsugaku Zasshi, (Philosophy Journal). In this article Chogyū criticized current, ethical theories which were based on hedonism, intuition, and evolution, and advocated a theory of self-activism. This theory was based on T. H. Green's theory of self-realization as set forth in his Prolegomena to Ethics. In this sense, Chogyū's position did not differ greatly from that of Ōnishi Hajime and demonstrates the strong influence Green exerted on Japanese intellectual circles of that time. We shall confine ourselves to noting those parts of Chogyū's article which reveal his thought at that time and suggest the transition he later underwent.

When Chogyū said, "Impulse precedes pain, therefore it also precedes pleasure," he rejected hedonism and, instead, expounded a so-called "pleasure of sorrow" principle. On the basis of his theory of self-activism, he maintained that the ideal of morality was to be found in self-actualization and that human beings basically had the impulse to overcome all obstacles and pressures in order to attain the free development of the self. This impulse preceded pleasure and pain. In experiencing a miserable or sorrowful fate, "one finds the deepest pleasure here because one has the opportunity to fully express one's real ability." Therefore, the "pleasure of sorrow" is found in misery and distress. Not only can we see here the basis of Chogyū's romanticism, but also the emergence of the individualism and instinctivism of his third phase.

We may also note that following Green's thought Chogyū did not consider the individual to be the chief subject of morality. Society, the State, and mankind too have a life and personality
of their own and it was through the awareness of the interdependence of the individual parts and the whole that one fulfilled one's self. In other words, "Society does not progress by destroying the personality of the individual, nor does the individual actualize himself by denying the personality of society." The metaphysical theory Chogyū set up asserted that the universe itself was based on a moral plan. This was more advanced than either the evolutionist's theory of State, or the contract theory of the State which were asserted in the second and third decades of Meiji. Chogyū's theory saw the State as having a metaphysical existence. When it came to realizing such a metaphysical concept of State it was obvious that it was difficult to recognize concrete personality in abstractions like mankind, or world. Herein lay the danger that this theory would eventually lead to nationalism.

The relation of ideal and reality in Chogyū's thought should also be noted. His theory of self-actualization presupposed the presence of disharmony in life, the origin of activity. "All acts of the will are promised on disharmony and dissatisfaction," he wrote. If this were true disharmony or dissatisfaction must be present so long as efforts are being made for self-actualization, and, conversely, when the ideal of self-actualization is realized, disharmony and dissatisfaction must disappear with a resultant cessation of the activity of the self. There is an inconsistency in Chogyū's theory of self-activism as here expressed. This theory pushed to its logical conclusion, leads to the adoption of a position which places supreme emphasis on means or the process of actualization rather than on the ultimate ideal, on what it is that is to be actualized. There is here more concern with process than with the ultimate ideal. As Chogyū put it: "The ideal...after all is nothing but a figment of the imagination. If the actuality in which logical activity exists cannot coexist with the ideal, then I am obliged to reject the latter." He admitted that he favored practical actualization, the process, the means, over the ultimate ideal to be actualized. Chogyū's third phase, wherein he developed his theory of the
aesthetic life, was a consequence of the more thorough working out of his position.

Chogyū's second phase began with the Taiyō. The state of the literary world at that time was in marked contrast to the former romanticism and idealism. The "social novel," the novel dealing with the problems of social reality now began to be popular. Chūgai's Funiku-dan, (The Rotten Gang), which dealt with political corruption, and Oguri Fūyō's Seido, (Political Stupidity) were examples of this type of literature. The influence of Zola on the Japanese "social novel" could be seen in Köyō's Konjiki Yasha, (The Golden Demon), (1897). To be sure, these novels neither contained Zola's objective analysis of modern society nor Ibsen's harsh criticism of contemporary civilization. As Chogyū said about these Japanese "social novels": "There are few among them which contain a real grasp of the life of society. They are superficial and read like the third page of a newspaper which has been transformed into the novel form." He argued for the necessity of a theory of Zeitgeist; he tried to analyze the temper of the times and to give a critique of civilization.

At this period too, cosmopolitanism appeared. This was the time when Uchimura Kanzō said: "The accident by which I was born in this country is not sufficient to make this my native place:" Saionji Kimmochi said: Japanese culture must be Westernized." These were typical examples of the current cosmopolitanism. The other side of the coin, however, was that at this time Japanism came to be preached. Chogyū said:

As a result of the victory gained in the Sino-Japanese War, a segment of the nation had its self-confidence raised. Indeed, there has come about that pathological thought which is characterized by anti-foreignism and self-worship. This is to be deplored. And yet at the same time it was through this that the Japanese came to know the geography of the Liaotung Peninsula, the state of affairs in the Far East, and world conditions in general. They realized that the nation that won a war was the nation in the most critical position in the world.
After sobering up from the victory celebration, the people became frightened and seriously reflected on their position. In this way the nation felt acute doubts over Japan’s position in the world. Japanism emerged as an answer to these doubts. Chogyū attempted a critique of civilization from the position of Zeitgeist, and he sought the underlying principles of the Zeitgeist in Japanism rather than in cosmopolitanism. This can be surmised from the fact that he advocated “national literature.” The consciousness of Japan’s critical position in the world after the Sino-Japanese War encouraged his advocacy of this nationalist position.

There were old-fashioned or foggyish aspects in Chogyū’s Japanism—his adoration of the Imperial Rescript on Education, his statement that “the special and unique Japanese polity originates in the nation’s consciousness that the Emperor and his subjects constitute one family.” Yet, when we examine Chogyū’s Japanism more carefully, we see a breadth of concept that sets him apart from the run-of-the-mill nationalist. Chogyū felt that the interests of national independence, the happiness and welfare of the people, dictated that good things should be adopted from abroad. And with respect to Japanese things which no longer fulfilled the foregoing criteria, “even if these have existed in Japan for thousands of years, there should be no hesitation in destroying and discarding these.” Nor was this all, Chogyū, following Hartmann, distinguished between means and ends. “The supremacy of the State is not an end—it is a means, and only as such is it advocated.” He thus set limits on his theory of the supremacy of the State. There was in Chogyū’s nationalism a metaphysical background deriving from the thought of his first phase. His dependance on the Japanese state, his advocacy of the supremacy of the State, and his Japanism, were all directed towards solving the problems of life. These were all directed towards finding the ideal in reality and towards finding the way to live in accord with this ideal.

Chogyū’s nationalism was based on the sense of crisis which
was prevalent after the military victory of 1895. Close analysis reveals that his Japanism had limits, his conception of the supremacy of the State as a means rather than as an end bears this out.

In his third-phase Chogyū’s thought exerted its greatest influence. It was in this phase that he stressed the individualism and instinctivism which later was to become the germinating force of the naturalist movement.

On January 1, 1901, while convalescing at Ōiso, Chogyū sent the following letter to Anezaki Chōfü, in Kiel: “Last May at the Chiba residence I spoke on the topic of ‘Existence and Romanticism.’ When I expressed my hope that a pure romanticist movement would arise in place of the formalistic instrumentalism which is now prevalent, many of those present were startled.” We stated previously that it is commonly accepted that the year 1900 was still the year when Chogyū’s thought was dominated by Japanism. It is apparent from this letter (concerning a talk given in 1900) that the trend of his thought was beginning to change. Indeed, tracing his critical articles, we see that in 1898 Japanism is most frequently advocated, but starting in 1899 the advocacy is not quite as fierce. And in a piece written in January 1901, called “Bummei Hihyō to Bun-gakusha,” (Cultural Criticism and Men of Letters), he stands clearly as an admirer of Nietzsche, which, in a sense, symbolizes the change in his views. Before, however, going into the contents of his new position, let us trace his spiritual development through his letters to Anezaki Chōfü. In this way we will gain a better understanding of his Japanism.

In a letter to Anezaki in Berlin, dated June 6, 1901, he discussed his sickness and also mentioned his Japanism. He wrote that in the past Japanism was not something inherent for him.

To travel, to go abroad, affords a good opportunity for improving one’s character. I feel that sickness has the same effect. When a person stands on the threshold of death he comes to appreciate life to some degree. At this time my
thoughts often turn to religion (my own), and at the same time my concept of individualism too has taken on clearer form. It seems to me that my Japanistic thought was a manifestation of some inborn superficiality.

Continuing in a letter of June 24, he described in detail the state of affairs during this period.

I have come to feel that for the past two years a change has been fermenting in my spirit. People may think it pathological, and I myself sometimes wonder whether it may not be due to my circumstances, my sickness. Yet, I cannot but believe that this change is a natural development of my spirit. I believe that very soon now I will be able to let you know more clearly about this change. At any rate, I will not deny that it is basically a type of individualism tinged with romanticism. The Japanism that I once advocated was something which supported and extolled the supremacy of the State. While I have no reason now for destroying this position, I nevertheless have become dissatisfied with it and this is become for me a spiritual fact! I have reached the point of not being satisfied with any of the current theories of morality, education, and social improvement...and I have done much thinking about religion. At one time I looked at religion with antipathy, now I am at the point where I have some sympathy for any religion.

A month later, in a letter dated July 24, he wrote: "Lately I have become strangely sentimental and, try as I may, I can't seem to shake this off. I have never experienced a life so fraught with the spiritual as this past year...neither science nor morality suffice any longer to interpret life." In a letter dated November 15, we can see his anguished confession.

Dear friend, I am defeated! I am truly defeated! I am mortified, humiliated. My thoughts bear fruit inside me; from the outside I seem a madman...failure, loss of heart, and then quitting—all that's left are scars. I feel myself getting older and declining day by day. Those of my friends and acquaintances who are aware of my suffering are indeed
rare....Though I've always known of my transitoriness, what can I do with my insuppressible determination. Oh, dear friend, if a human being is not born for himself, for what purpose then is he born....Have you no pity for me? How is it that I sense in myself an inherent agreement with Nietzsche's thought. People say to me, 'Didn't you even try to criticize literature and art from the point of view of Japanese national history? What is your position now?' Sad to say, I don't know the words to answer them with beyond the fact that I am happy in the knowledge that I always try to be true to myself.

In a letter dated July 1902, his view of Nichiren was noted in concise form. "I found Nichiren to be a supreme egotist who would even sacrifice the State for his own beliefs."

Through such letters we may well imagine why Chogyū was preoccupied with death. He had to give up an opportunity to study abroad in order to convalesce from a severe illness and accordingly he thought about "death and eternal life," and later wrote: "Death is like a cool night, life like a hot day. When I was about to die of illness, I remember how comforting this thought was."

In 1897 the inaugural meeting of the Teiyū Rinri Koen-kai, (Teiyū Ethical Lecture Society), took place. Takayama Chogyū and Anezaki Chōfū wrote the prospectus for the organization. Chogyū, seeing that most people were satisfied to immerse themselves in superficial educational and ethical problems, said:

Briefly, the intellectual world in Japan is too indifferent. In a world replete with what should be questioned, doubted, wondered at, feared, deplored, the Japanese intellectuals are nonchalant, sanguine, and idle. This is truly most amazing! ...even when one observes the young developing scholars and intellectuals, they are like young old and worn out people. Not one of them holds a fresh ideal or troubles himself over the renovation or reform of the times.

Nietzsche's death in 1900 was all the more cause for Chogyū to read him. Chogyū, who was already familiar with Whitman
and Ibsen, could not help being deeply moved by Nietzsche. Thus, when he wrote the previously mentioned article on scholars as cultural critics, he was critical of democracy, socialism, nationalism, and came to advocate a Nietzschean type of individualism and "supermanism." One of the results of this was his *Biteki Seikatsu o Ronzu*, (On the Aesthetic Life), (1901). This work was the most beautiful expression of his third-phase thought. We must now turn to his theory of the aesthetic life.

Chogyū's theory of aesthetics has usually been interpreted as individualistic and instinctivistic. In some respects he has been considered as one of the forerunners of naturalism. This is correct. He defined the aesthetic life as follows:

We do not know to what purpose we have been born in this world. And yet, having been born, our goal is to become happy. What, then, is happiness? To me, it means the satisfaction of instinct and nothing else. What is instinct? It is an innate need of the human personality. What satisfies the innate need of the human personality is what I call the aesthetic life.

Chogyū also said, "It will, perforce, be acknowledged that the utmost pleasure in life lies ultimately in the satisfaction of sexual desires." "What is of absolute value constitutes the aesthetic. The satisfaction of the instinct constitutes the purest of aesthetic values." "Is not love one of the most beautiful elements of the aesthetic life?"

In modern terms, Chogyū was arguing for a "life philosophy"—in the sense of Bergson's vitalism. This is clearly evident when he says: "When instinct rules, knowledge and virtue are only vassals; when instinct is the goal, knowledge and virtue are only the means." This meant that knowledge and morality were not absolutes, instinct was the ultimate. The attainment of truth—the goal of morality and knowledge—was a never-ending task in which means and ends are completely separate. What of the aesthetic life?

When Lord Kusunoki was killed in battle at the Minato River, what concept of supreme good could he have? How could
he have distinguished between means and ends in his mind? He threw away his life merely because he received the favor of his sovereign and was deeply moved. To die in this manner was for Kusunoki the supreme satisfaction... How could he have ends or means?

In other words, the value of morality and knowledge is extrinsic, that of the aesthetic life is intrinsic. Chogyū maintained that knowledge and morality distort the innate need of human beings—the true meaning of instinct—and should be destroyed since they lead to a false life. And, indeed, the aesthetic life is the thing that gives supremacy, the highest position, to life itself. "If asked what is the aesthetic life, I would say it is something more than food and clothing: it serves body and life."

We have no intention of deciding whether or not Chogyū derived his theory of the aesthetic life from Nietzsche's *Birth of Tragedy*, in which Nietzsche spoke of life and the world as having meaning only as aesthetic phenomena. However, one must recognize that Chogyū's assertions are very much like Nietzsche's. And, in this sense, Chogyū's theory of the aesthetic life, though inadequate, was nevertheless, the first attempt at a "philosophy of life" in Japan.

The following is one of the last conversations held by Chogyū.

There are only two ways to be great. One is to realize one's smallness and the other is to have confidence in one's greatness. The former represents emotion, the latter, will. The former stresses receiving, the latter, taking; one is a smooth path, the other a hard road. One is the doctrine of Christ and Buddha, the other of Napoleon and Nietzsche... to cast off one's humanness and become a god is how one becomes aware of one's smallness; to remain human and yet be a god one must believe in one's greatness.

Here we see why his individualism resembled Nietzsche's doctrine of the Superman. Immediately preceding this, he said: "Nowadays people have forgotten how to pray, and this indeed may be said to be one of the greatest disasters of the present
world.” Here one may detect his attitude towards Nichiren—and yet he was supposed to be advocating individualism or, even more importantly, the doctrine of the Superman! There is an inconsistency in his trying to find a resting place, as it were, in Nichiren and at the same time rejecting tradition. He stated his reasons for reverencing Nichiren: “Nichiren recognized the State in the service of truth and not truth in the service of the State. To Nichiren, truth was always greater than the State.” Chogyū was attempting, in this way, to make a compromise between his early Japanism and his later individualism. It cannot be denied that it was a premature compromise and included contradictory elements too great to be harmonized. It was in such contacts between Japanese and Western thought that tragedies took place. The essence of these tragedies was the attempt to overcome the contradictions between the two types of thought.

We said earlier, the essence of Chogyū was contained in his phrase, “I am a person of contradictions, a person of agony.” We noted this in the contradictions in Chogyū’s three periods or phases—his romanticism, Japanism, and instinctivism. His early rejection of religion and later adoration of Nichiren was also a contradiction. These agonizing contradictions were not confined to Chogyū alone; indeed, they characterized the epoch. The Meiji 30’s could also be called the age of agonizing contradictions, and Chogyū was as symbolic of this age as Tōkoku was of the 20’s—the age of the spiritual revolution and its collapse. The person who tried to resolve the agonizing contradictions in the field of religion was Tsunajima Ryōsen, who was strongly appealing to the younger people towards the close of the Meiji 30’s.

3. Tsunajima Ryōsen

Shimamura Hōgetsu wrote an essay in 1907 in which he compared Ryōsen and Chogyū, saying:

Some time ago Takayama Chogyū died at an early age. And now Tsunajima Ryōsen too has died prematurely. Both men
died before reaching the age of 40, both men created in their later life an enthusiasm amounting to a popular craze. I wonder how Ryōsen would have changed had he but ten years more to live. Needless to say, his sensibilities were extremely sound. He was not like a blazing flame, flickering, shooting arrows of light about. His brilliance was like a hot iron that sparks as it is struck. There was something about him.... As compared to Ryōsen, my memory of Chogyū is quite different. It goes without saying that Chogyū’s literary art was similarly dazzling, colorful, and high-flown. He was constantly flaring up like a flame. So, too, it was his fate to be extinguished early.... He tried to dominate the real world, the everyday world, with his literary ideals. This caused conflict and then breakdown.... Everything traditional was injured when exposed to this flame of Chogyū’s. What remains in the midst of the ruins, is the so-called originality that wants to build up everything from within the self, the genius.... There is, however, no precognition of the self, nor is there an awareness of how the self will develop. The literary horizons for our intellectuals lie in naturalism, in religion, in Ryōsen’s theory of the immanence of God, in philosophy, in a humanistic pragmatism. All of these represent the development of the new self.

The popular enthusiasm for Ryōsen lasted from the close of the Meiji 30’s to the early Meiji 40’s and corresponded to the craze for Chogyū in the 30’s. We learn from Högetsu that religious needs once more made themselves felt at this time. Christianity which had declined considerably since the latter part of the Meiji 20’s, now became active following on the large-scale missionary work in 1901. Ebina Danjō expounded his new theology in an article called “Sanmi ittai no kyōgi to yo no shūkyōteki ishiki,” (The Dogma of the Trinity and My Religious Consciousness), which appeared in Shinjin, (The New Man), in January 1902. This topic provoked lively discussion by Uemura Masahisa and others. Ebina maintained that there was a difference between the religion of Christ and
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the religion *based on* Christ as the Lord, and he sided with the former. The essence of his position can be found in the following statement:

There is the religion of Christ and there is the religion which sets up Christ as the Lord. The religion of Christ is based on His own religious consciousness. He is conscious of Himself as a child of God, worships God as His father, and a father-child relationship is thus established between God and man. The religion which sets up Christ as the Lord is one in which Christ stands between God and man. Through Christ one is forgiven his sins and relates to God...."

Ebina was affiliated with the Hongō Church in Tokyo and had great influence on young people. At this time Shinshū [the Shin sect of Buddhism] also revived aided by people like Kiyozawa Manshi. A magazine called *Seishinkai*, (The Spiritual World), began appearing in 1901, and its first issue carried an article called "Seishin Shugi," (Spiritualism), by Kiyozawa. His Sunday lectures which were held in the Hongō district in Tokyo also attracted many serious youths. The religious upsurge in the late Meiji 30's was truly remarkable and was evidence of the spiritual uncertainty of the period. Ryōsen was the person who most attracted and influenced the general public.

In an essay "Chinto no Ki," (Bedside Note), Tsunajima Ryōsen wrote about how he came to have a vision of God. Since Ryōsen's character, as well as the trend of the time, is reflected in this writing, we shall first follow the evidence of his spiritual development. Ryōsen was born in Okayama prefecture in 1873. He asserted that he became a member of a Congregational Church when he was about 15 years old. According to records, it was in 1887 that he was baptized, and the following six years represented the first stage (on his road to the vision of Christ). This stage was characterized by an indiscriminate and blind faith. He reminisced about his state of mind saying:

In those days, I was like one hypnotized. It looked as though I was completely engulfed by a magical power called Chris-
tinity. Under the sway of this magical power, I prayed, I sang hymns, I observed the Lord’s Supper, I believed in the miracles, in the sacred meaning of atonement, in the deep meaning of transubstantiation and the resurrection, swallowed whole everything that was listed in the church catechism without any criticism, and thinking, or checking.

In the summer of 1894, however, he left the orthodox faith and entered his second phase, dualistic skepticism, and this lasted for three years. As he came more or less to understand philosophical speculation, he maintained that Christ could only be recognized as a great moral genius and the Bible was only a book of moral instruction.

The blind faith of my past suddenly turned to my skepticism of today.... My reason went beyond its jurisdiction and was freely destructive, was haughty and rough. My reason rejected the miracles in the Bible... further, it did away with the real existence of God Himself and the holy awareness of the father-child relationship between God and man. How could I have properly understood the difference between mysticism and superstition in those days? I came to understand that mysticism was the same as superstition.

After denying God, Ryōsen found the world and life to be meaningless; he realized that these were nothing but desecrated tombs and again started looking for God. The God who once died thus became alive again; He became after 1896 “the active, the fresh, the green God.” This was the beginning of his faith, which eventually led to Ryōsen’s experiencing the “immanence of God.” We must examine in what sense Ryōsen came to see God, and what his religious awareness was like.

Ryōsen, it has been said, enveloped religion with poetry and poetry with religion. The following passage is a typical example of this. He wrote:

When I read poetry, there is evoked in me a sense of beauty. My feelings, however, inadvertently go deeper and are unwittingly brought into contact with reality. I then find myself crying out to God. The moment I dedicate myself with
utmost sincerity to God, my feeling are inadvertently drawn into the adoration of beauty. Oh, how feelings for nature and beauty stealthily creep into my bosom! I approach God through poetry and I approach poetry through God. This is the true experience of a deep-searching person; God and poetry have a common origin!

At the same time that Chogyū was advocating Japanism, Ryōsen was pointing out that Chogyū's position was practicalism in the bad sense of the word. Ryōsen concluded, "Alas, I sense the spirit of praticalism running through the entirety of this essay." This was a reference to Chogyū's essay on "the evils and advantages" as the "twin aspects of the poetic." In his critique of this essay Ryōsen took a moralistic-idealistic position. He wrote, "Buddha is not a poet, Christ is not a visionary." "The Ideal can in reality be actualized. This is decidedly not imagination or dreaming... This Ideal transcends society, it transcends the State, it is the ideal of humanism, the ideal of all men." To Ryōsen, the Ideal was not a figment of the imagination, religion was not simply poetry. And in 1901, he began to see a unity between religion and poetry. He said:

There is here a truth to be learned. There are poets who are able to create just for poetry's sake and there are poets who are able to create for the sake of poetry and truth. The sphere of truth and the sphere of poetry are from the outset different. Truth and the 'truth' of poetry are not the same. To the extent that we approximate truth, that is, to the extent that we penetrate to the innermost part of human life and existence, truth and poetry draw close. What at first was in complete oppositions is now in harmonious union.

Concerning Jesus he wrote: "Poetry was not his principal consideration and yet He interwove poetry with his faith. Christ's poetry embraced truth and forged a unity between them. In Christ there was no room for the insertion of a dualistic gap, truth had become poetry."

The people of the Bungakkai who had preceded Ryōsen,
especially Tōkoku and Tōson, were plagued by the problem of the dichotomy between religion and art: Ryōsen, however, was able to interpret the “poetry of Christ” in the fashion just presented; the gap between art and religion became, for him, non-existant. Therefore, at a later point in his development he wrote, “God is my beloved!”

From what has been presented we can conclude that Ryōsen’s religious conception was grounded in emotion, was based on a poetico-religious outlook. In 1902, in his work *Hiai no Kochō*, (The Stress of Sorrow), he said that at the bottom of all human grief are elements stemming from the “religious impulse.”

Sorrow is truly the keynote of existence. This sorrow is not necessarily the negative sorrow felt at the prospect of non-existence, or in the face of death, but rather the sorrow of yearning for the Infinite One, of questing and not attaining God; it is grief crying out at unexampled longing, it is the prayer of inexpressible emotion.

During the same period, Ryōsen wrote on the “Essence of Religious Truth,” and in this work he spoke of God as the “sum-total of our emotions and feelings.”

We say we know God, yet, strictly speaking, should we not rather say that we *feel* God or *savor* God? What is God but the ultimate summation of our feelings and emotions! A God outside of the emotions remains only as the concept or the notion of a first principle. The God of reason is not the God of religions. God, religiously speaking, makes reason a secondary principle and makes intelligence a servant. God is only sensed with the emotions, is only comprehended with the feelings. To someone who senses God the problem of the existence of God is one which has been resolved. Someone who does not sense God finds the problem of His existence an eternal riddle.

At any rate, in the years 1901-1902 Ryōsen’s emotional concept of God was expressed in terms of his physical senses: the God one *feels*, the God one savors. And after July 1904
Ryōsen actually "saw" God. Ryōsen summed up his feelings, saying, "Happy are they who see not, yet believe; blessed are they who both see and believe!" Here then we are faced with the beginning of Ryōsen's visionary, apocalyptic period—the period he himself designated as the one in which he "saw God."

In connection with his vision Ryōsen said:

The first experience of this nature occurred last year sometime in July. It was at midnight, I remember, that it happened. I was ill and it was my habit to sit up in bed every night for about an hour. This particular night too I was sitting up. My room was absolutely still and my mind was as untroubled and tranquil as a clear starry night and not even the faintest suggestion of a thought seemed to cloud it. At that moment my feelings overflowed with a gentle, dream-like, joyfulness—akin to the ecstasy one senses when undergoing a religious conversion. And gradually this feeling spread from the innermost recesses of my being and dominated my entire consciousness. This feeling of clarity which filled my being, was an incomparable sense of joy; it transcended the joys and good of this transitory world. It was a sense of peaceful loneliness but not isolation, and it endured for about 15 minutes.

Ryōsen analyzed this first experience of "seeing God" in some detail in an article called "Religious Illumination." The experience he described was something like a temporal earthly reflection of the heavenly life. The second experience of this nature took place on the road under an autumn sky. Ryōsen was looking off to the wooded hills in the distance which were bathed in the setting sun, and "at that moment suddenly I felt that God and I were both gazing on the same awe-inspiring scene." Here, then, was a strong sense of "God and I," and of seeing together. In 1905 he had a marked experience of seeing God, and he wrote:

Indeed, that night was an extremely quiet night. It happened while I was writing something or other under the light of a solitary lamp. By what chance it may have been, I suddenly
felt myself joined to a self I never was—the movement of my pen, the words I was writing, all shone before my purview as a series of transcendental wonders. It seemed that this feeling lasted for only a few moments, yet in this short period from the depths of a boundless, deep, lonesomeness, I was suddenly confronted by a splendid, emerging, ghostly movement, by the consciousness of a shocking sense of joy and indescribable exuberance.

Here, clearly, as the son of God he faces God his father and speaks of "being with God, rejoicing with God, working with God." He also stressed the fact that his "consciousness of seeing God was simultaneously pantheistic and transcendental." It is not necessary for us to go into this any deeper, for it is clear what his "seeing" comprised.

In the foregoing we went into some detail over Ryōsen's mystical experiences because he symbolized the religious needs of the Japanese at the time of the Russo-Japanese War. We should not forget, however, that while there were strong religious needs, there were also at this time tendencies towards socialism which will be dealt with later. In Ryōsen's case we note that the religious needs were joined to an ever-deepening awareness of self. The usual self is nothing but the knowable and seeable self. The true self, that is, the self that knows the knowable self, the self that sees the seeable self, transcends the usual sense of knowledge and consciousness. Ryōsen thus taught the existence of a "transcendental self."

The phenomenon of the 'self' transcending consciousness is unperceivable as an object of consciousness. Though unperceivable, its existence as a kind of 'force' cannot be denied. Do we not meet with the existence of this mystic power through the individual content of our consciousness in our daily experience? Do we not feel its authority and are we not subject to its influence? ...Our so-called 'self', while present in the entirety of our consciousness, also exists in the further recesses of consciousness, and beyond, as something which unifies, organizes, and protects our usual in-
dependence and the usual elements which characterize us. Consciousness is not mine alone, it is as widespread as the stars of heaven. It exists and flourishes among all men; just as the stars each separately illuminate parts of the heavens, so consciousness too is scattered here and there over the earth. The stars are the clearest spiritual things in the heavens and consciousness is the clearest spiritual thing on earth. The stars then are the 'consciousness' of heaven and consciousness is the 'star' of earth.

Ryōsen tried in this fashion to see God at the basis of the cosmic or universal consciousness he described.

We saw in Chogyū the strengthening and deepening of the consciousness of self in terms of 'life' and instinctivistic trend. Eventually, Chogyū stressed individualism as the concluding phase of these tendencies. The thought concerning the 'self' in Ryōsen has been broadened into a tendency toward a transcendental self, a cosmic consciousness. We can recognize in this type of thought suggestions of the influence of James' *Varieties of Religious Experience*. A characteristic of the Meiji 30's and 40's was the deepening of the self-awareness of the individual and the search for that self. This was given theoretical formulation from the point of view of neo-idealism in Tomonaga Sanjūrō's *Kinsei ni Okeru Ga no jikaku-shi*, (History of Self-Consciousness in Modern Times.) (1916). The following is noted in *Ryōsen Zuihitsu*, (Random Essays of Ryōsen).

There is an interesting phrase in Dr. Koeber's lectures on general philosophy at Tokyo Imperial University. I will quote from Uozumi, who reported it as follows: 'Religion and Philosophy are always the champions set by Mysticism in order to defend his interests, for Mysticism itself has no arms.'

It is roughly from this period that Dr. Koeber, who came to lecture in philosophy at Tokyo University upon Hartmann's recommendation (in 1893), began to exert influence. He stimulated the study of the Greek classics. And it was in this
atmosphere that an outstanding work like Hatano Seiichi’s, *Kirisuto-kyō no Kigen*, (Origins of Christianity), was written.

We began our account of Ryōsen’s significance in the history of Japanese thought with a phrase from Högetsu. Högetsu noted that in the Meiji 40’s there emerged, together with Ryōsen’s religious thought, naturalist and pragmatist trends. These will be discussed later. We must now turn our attention to the intellectual content of socialist and imperialist thought. We may note that the period from 1897-1907, the Meiji 30’s, was marked not only by the development of individualism, but also by the birth of socialism and imperialism.
CHAPTER II
SOCIALISM, PACIFISM, IMPERIALISM

1. The Rise of Socialism

In tracing the changes in socialism and socialist thought in Japan, there is no one who does not but feel that the period of Meiji 30's was extremely important and noteworthy. This period was the period in which socialism became a real question in Japan, the period in which it appeared to have won the sympathy of many people. This phase lasted until well after the Russo-Japanese War. After the 1910 "Great Treason Affair," which involved Kōtoku Shūsui, the socialist tide suddenly receded. Socialism did not again become the focus of public attention until after World War I with the appearance in 1918 of Shakai Mondai Kenkyū, (Study of Social Problems), by Kawakami Hajime.

To be sure, there were earlier indications that socialism constituted a problem of sorts. In 1870 Kato Hiroyuki made reference to "communism" and "socialism" in his Shinsei Tai-i. And the people of the Meirokusha were to some extent informed on questions of this nature. Sugi Kōji, whom we mentioned as the father of statistics in Japan, in 1875 in the April issue of the Meiroku Zasshi, envisioned Japan's future as containing the possibility of a degeneration to a French type of communism, or a national strengthening by emulating Sparta. Interest in, and feeling for, socialism, however, was rather to be found among the Christians. In 1881, in the April issue of the Rikugō Zasshi, in an article entitled "On the Origins of the Modern Socialist Parties," Kozaki Hiromichi attempted the first account in Japan of Karl Marx's teachings and a survey of his life. There are memoirs extant to the effect that Uemura Masahisa and Shimada Saburō in 1889 purchased a book on socialism in a New York bookstore. They apparently read this book on
shipboard on their way to London, and while in London they read other books concerned with the same topic. In 1888 Wadagaki Kenzō published an article in *Kokka Gakkai Zasshi*, (National Academic Journal), entitled “Lectures on Socialism,” and Motora Yūjirō wrote a series in 1888-9 entitled “On the Nature of Property: A Critique of Socialism.” Both Wadagaki and Motora were Christians. We have already mentioned the type and scope of the socialist thought which was introduced at this time in Tokutomi’s *Kokumin no Tomo*. Needless to say, there was also the influence of the theoreticians of the Popular Rights Movement. Sakai Yūzaburō, a disciple of Nakae Chōmin, was in Paris at this time and frequently reported on the state of the socialist movement there.

Sometime later, in the July 1893 issue of the *Kokumin no Tomo*, Sakai wrote an article entitled “On the Relationship Between Socialism and Modern Civilization.” He stated: “Friends and comrades all having assembled, there was a proposal to inaugurate a social problems study society. I too was asked to participate and was thus able to listen to the proceedings.” While this was only a small private study group of like-minded people, it does indicate that even before the Sino-Japanese War there was already an organized attempt made to study social problems.

This, then, was the state of affairs in connection with the development of socialist thought before the War of 1894-95. After the War circumstances markedly altered. As a consequence of victory there was a burst of feverish industrial planning; great factories were built and the number of wage laborers rose swiftly. Accompanying these phenomena, military preparations were expanded, the tax burden was increased, and commodity prices soared. There now was fierce conflict between management and labor; strikes took place one after the other, and the social problem, the labor problem, became real and pressing. What had before the war been theoretical problems, now became real problems.

In 1897 a social problems study group which included
many intellectuals, was organized and attracted public attention. This group was so heterogeneous and unwieldy that at the end of 1898 a small group of people who were especially interested in social problems organized a study group which confined itself to socialism. They held meetings at the Unitarian Church in Shikoku-Machi in the Mita district in Tokyo. The leading personalities of this group were Abe I soo, Katayama Sen, Murai Tomonori, Kōtoku Shūsui, and Kawakami Kiyoshi. Somewhat later Nishikawa Kōjiro joined; he had been editing Uchimura Kanzō’s *Tokyo Dokuritsu Zasshi*, (Tokyo Independence Magazine). Ishikawa Sanshirō, (Kyokuzan), wrote that “in October 1898 a socialist study group was formed with Christians as the nucleus of the group.” Kōtoku Shūsui, dissatisfied with this description of the character of this study group, wrote, “It is as misleading to speak of the socialist study group as centering on Christians as to say the study group centered on Unitarians...after all Katayama Sen was the only orthodox Christian member.” Abe I soo, who was the chairman of the group, disagreed with Kōtoku, saying, Kōtoku expresses opposition to the statement that the socialist study group had its origins among Christians, I do not feel this opposition is justified. A glance at the names of those adhering to the study group would reveal that they all were Christians. I wonder, furthermore, why Kōtoku regards Christians and Unitarians as being different. Originally the Unitarians were regarded as a religious club, not as a church. Since 1889 I have been, and still am, a member of the Okayama Christian Church. Though I severed my affiliation a few years ago with the Unitarians for certain reasons, I still adhere to the doctrines of Unitarianism in my religious views. And it seems to me that many of the Christian churches today are progressive in their thought to the degree that they accept Unitarian doctrine. The mistaken view that I have become a Unitarian after first being a Christian and later once again returned to being a Christian, is not held by Kōtoku alone. I should, therefore, like to take this oppor-
tunity to clear up this misconception.
The group's purpose at the start was mainly study, and as such, it resembled the Fabian Society in England. The real problems they faced in Japan, however, suddenly drew the group into activities to implement their theoretical socialism. The result was the formation of the Social Democratic Party in May 1901. The six founders were Katayama Sen, Abe I soo, Kōtoku Shūsui, Kawakami Kiyoshi, Nishikawa Kōjirō, and Kinoshita Naoe. These men founded the party after several meetings in Hongoku-chō, in Nihonbashi, in Tokyo. The very day the organization was formed it was ordered by the police to disband. It should be well marked that on this day the theory of socialism and the practical implementation of socialism were joined organizationally and became the Socialist Movement.

The socialist study group did achieve success of a kind in their practice of socialism even before the formation of the party. Probably the largest factories at that time were the Koishikawa Canon Factory and the iron works of the Japan Railroad Company in Ōmiya. There were among the people of the socialist study group some who were connected with the labor organizations at these places. Towards the close of 1899 a bill was presented in the Saitama Prefectural Assembly which proposed the establishment of licensed prostitution in Ōmiya. The ostensible reason was that without the establishment of licensed quarters the factory hands of Ōmiya would attack girls of decent families. The real reason was probably the possibility of engineering a price rise in the value of land in Ōmiya through the establishment of a prostitution quarter. In any event, the labor organizations at Ōmiya were opposed to this bill on the ground that it was a personal insult to the workers. The people of the socialist study group naturally opposed prostitution on principle. Shimada Saburō and Abe I soo went out stump speaking in support of the workers. Kinoshita Naoe also took part in this activity. The result was that in 1901 the movement against licensed prostitution culminated in the first brilliant success scored by socialism in Japan. Encouraged by
this, the organization of the Social Democratic Party in Japan was achieved. Here we can see one aspect of the socialist movement of that time.

It goes without saying that Shimada, Abe, and Kinoshita, were Christians, and it was natural that socialism at that time included humanistic aspects. In fact, we cannot ignore the Christian element which strongly colored the socialist movement of the Meiji 30's. Here, in a sense, French socialism and Christian humanism joined hands. It was this fusion of disparate elements that was responsible for the split between the two after the Russo-Japanese War. We will later take up the question of the split in the movement; at this point we can draw on the memoirs of Kinoshita Naoe to illustrate that at this early period there was already a built-in momentum which eventually split the movement.

After the Social Democratic Party was ordered dissolved, a Socialist Association was established with Abe I soo and his comrades as its central personalities. This Association was the center of the social movement until 1903, when Kōtoku Shūsui and Sakai Toshihiko founded the Heimin Shimbun, (The Commoner News). It was in April 1903, when a domestic industrial enterprises exhibit was held in Osaka, that the first assembly of socialists in Japan took place. From Tokyo there were present Kinoshita, Abe, and Katayama. At this assembly Kodama Kagai sang an impromptu song in which he “reported,” or paid respect to the spirit of Ōshio Heihachirō, the leader of a mass uprising which resulted in the burning of Osaka in 1837. The following incident described by Kinoshita probably occurred at about this time. It seems Katayama, Kōtoku, and Kinoshita were traveling together on the same train; they were to give speeches in Yokosuka. Kōtoku was supposed to have said to Kinoshita:

‘Kinoshita, why don’t you give up God! If you’d only do this, I’d gladly untie your shoelaces for you!’ Kōtoku’s voice was thin, but as sharp and penetrating as an owl’s. I hesitated to answer. Katayama came to my assistance.
‘Kōtoku, be careful that you yourself are not vanquished by God!’ There was a half smile playing about Katayama’s lips as he made this somewhat scornful rejoinder. Without even listening to Katayama’s words, Kōtoku continued, ‘I’ll make you give up God yet! I really will!’ Speaking thus, Kōtoku narrowed his almond-shaped heavy-lidded eyes and sat staring determinedly. Katayama and myself, though we were both Christians, were separated in that I was unaffiliated, a sort of tramp, while Katayama was an upstanding church member.

This anecdote appeared in Kami Ningen Shizen, (God, Man, and Nature) by Kinoshita Naoe.

It is clear that the socialism of the Meiji 30’s was tied to Christianity; but at the same time, and this may come as a surprise to many, it cannot be denied that the socialism of that period was also related to romanticism. The socialism of that time had something in common with the passion and romanticism which was manifested by magazine like Myōjō (Morning Sta). We can also see this throughout Kodama Kagai’s Shakai-shugi Shishū, (Anthology of Socialism).

Kagai’s work on socialism was banned in 1903, immediately after publication, and it is said that every copy was seized so that not one saw the light of day. Some of the poems in this work had previously appeared in Katayama’s Rōdō Sekai, (Labor World), others were published in Uchimura Kanzō’s Tokyo Dokuritsu Zasshi. One of the masterpieces of this anthology was called Niwatori no Uta, (Song of the Barnyard Fowl). “Shall we not sing of revolution like a rooster’s exultant crowing?” is the way the poem starts, and it continues with the writer hoping to be able to sing in the day of liberty’s dawning the way the rooster sings in the bright dawn from the darkest depths of night. The fact remains that it is somewhat strange to find a song of “revolution” in a Christian journal. And yet, when we reflect on the close connection between Christianity and socialism at that time, this type of poetry in a Christian journal becomes natural.
There is one thing, however, which cannot but seem strange to us, and that is that there also appeared in this anthology poems which were common to romanticist magazines like *Myōjō*. The finest example of this type is *Fumetsu no Hi*, (Immortal Flame). This poem tells of the revolution of a righteous person against social injustice and praises his immortality though he is reduced to ash at the stake. An excerpt reads:

The flames of the burning house have been extinguished;
The funeral pyre too has gone out.
His corpse, though reduced to ashes,
Left in our breasts an unquenchable flame.
The flame will shine forth through all eternity,
With the moon and the sun.

In a sense, romanticist poetry of this nature provides a real example of the union between socialism and romanticism in the Meiji 30’s.

Another point we may note is that Kagai was extraordinarily fond of the English romanticist poet Byron who in revolutionary fervor threw his life away fighting for Greek independence. In Kagai’s anthology the name of Karl Marx appeared; however, it was Lasalle about whom he most passionately sang in his poetry. Before Kagai compiled the socialist anthology, he wrote a poem which he dedicated to the dead Lasalle.

Sleep, dear father, gently repose,
To the accompaniment of the tear-filled people’s voice,
Sleep.
Covered with a mantle of snow,
Warrior, lover of your country,
Yet died you for love of a damsel
Your beautiful face in death.
Sleep.

At that time Lasalle was more talked about than Marx. Probably the fact that Marx’s writings were banned was a factor. Also, Lasalle was the organizer of the German Social Democratic Party. And, in addition, because of his love for
Helene von Racowitza he fought and was killed in a duel. All of this exercised a tremendous poetic attraction. In Lasalle there seemed to be a joining of romantic love and revolution. Togawa Shūkotsu had earlier, in Bungakkai, spoken of the common origin of the two.

Penetrating all things in the universe is but a single spirit; deep within the recesses of the heart there is a soul. In calling this we say Creator or we speak of God; in naming this we say spirit or soul; and combining these we speak of life, or essence. Life then is as diffuse as cherry petals. In concentrated form it becomes imperishable poetry. It appears in society as revolution and in the individual as Byronism.

In Kagai too we can find this same tying together of revolution and Byronism.

When we speak of the Myōjō we must recognize the fact that it was clearly a romanticist magazine. This is evident in the poetry of people like Yosano Akiko, who challenged old traditions. At the time of the Great Treason Affair involving Kōtoku Shūsui the people of the Myōjō used to gather at Ōgai’s home to hear his lectures on socialism. Hirazu Osamu, one of the defense lawyers, at the trial of Kōtoku was also a participant. Ishikawa Takuboku, who was able to examine the material pertaining to the Kōtoku Affair, was probably able to do this through the assistance of Hirazu. Be that as it may, by way of summation we can say that Myōjō was a romanticist magazine and yet was also linked to the socialism of that time. For this reason, it was opposed to anything smacking of Japan’s feudal past and at the same time was sympathetic towards, and concerned with, social problems. Kodama Kagai’s revolutionary poems which appeared in Myōjō appeared there not only because the magazine was the largest poetry magazine in Japan, but because of the social consciousness just mentioned, it was the most appropriate stage from which to present revolutionary poetry.

In the foregoing we touched on Kagai and the Myōjō to
show that in some aspects romanticism was tied to socialism. We acknowledged that the socialism of the Meiji 30's had its origins in French socialism, as distinct from Marxian "scientific" socialism, and was deeply rooted in Christian humanism. It was also our intention to stress the fact that the socialism of the Meiji 30's was fervently supported by poetic romanticism. In conclusion, we can say that while the Christian and romanticist tendencies strongly supported socialism in its origin in the Meiji 30's, ultimately it was because of this casual joining together of such qualitatively disparate elements that a split in socialism developed.

2. Chōmin's Thought and Kōtoku's Socialism

In the Heimin Shimbun there appeared an article summarizing the results of an inquiry on the question of "How I Became a Socialist." It is of interest to go into some of the responses made, especially those of Sakai Toshihiko, Kinoshita Naoe, and Kōtoku Shūsui.

Sakai answered by saying, When I was a child the first ideas that entered my head, it goes without saying, stemmed from the Analects, the Mencius, in a word, from Confucianism. Next, I was impressed by the Social Contract, and the entire body of popular rights theory and from French revolutionary history. Later, with the promulgation of the constitution and the opening of the Imperial Diet, popular rights were not implemented; principles of humanity, justice, and morality were not put into practice; the thought of Confucius, Mencius, and even of France proved worthless. Within my own thinking, traditional Japanese loyalty to the sovereign and patriotic thought, Christian thought, the doctrine of evolution, and the concepts of utilitarianism, were all hopelessly jumbled. I was greatly confused. Some of these doctrines seemed to be in harmony and others were in direct conflict with one another. I always felt very disturbed over this. It was just at this point that I happened to hear the fresh tones of socialism. Socialism
was to me like water to a thirsty man. The first book I read was Ely’s *French and German Socialism*. According to this book, it was because the French Revolution did not reach its true goal that modern socialism arose. For the first time I understood all this. For the first time the way was illuminated for me, and it was this illumination which made clear all the other thought in my mind. For the first time my thought ranged itself in an orderly pattern. I suppose that for the first time I was able to feel secure: the shadows were gone, the darkness was gone, and the tangled web of my thinking seemed to straighten out. At the basis of my socialism I think there still remained popular rights theory and Confucianism.

Through this short passage we can know how socialist thought acted almost as a beacon in resolving the confusion in the thought of many of the Meiji people. Of course, as Sakai himself said, there persisted in this socialist thought traces of its Confucian and popular rights origins.

Kinoshita Naoe replied to the questionnaire in this fashion. At first I studied law and completely believed in it. Gradually, doubts began to rise in me in connection with the source of legal authority. By chance, through Christianity, which I hitherto despised, I acquired a concept of ‘God’ and was thus to some extent given a sense of ease. While I had become a fervent believer in brotherhood, the earthly tragedy of the struggle for existence was inexplicable by theology. A contradiction of this nature was central in producing indescribable agony inside me. It was the economic theory of socialism which afforded me solace. After this, when I looked back and read the Bible all my doubts were resolved in the personality of Christ; His words and actions appeared to explain everything; I was surprised and overjoyed. And for this reason my faith became that of Christian communism, or, perhaps, communistic Christianity would be a better way to describe it. This is my way of finding an answer to the question of how I became a socialist. It is my present position
and, I hope, my future one.

It is clear that Kinoshita Naoe went from law to Christianity, and by way of giving practical expression to the Christian spirit he chose socialism.

Kōtoku, in his answer as to how he became a socialist, said: The environment and my reading constitute two reasons. As to environment, I was born in Tosa, and from my childhood I was intoxicated with the ideas of freedom and equality. After the Restoration, I looked with compassion at the decline in the fortunes of my family; it was unbearable. I felt that it was a mortifying and unfair fate for me not to have funds for school. As to reading, I read Mencius, European revolutionary history, Nakae Chōmin’s Sansuijin Keirin Mondō, [Questions and Answers on Statecraft by Three Drunkards], Henry George’s Social Problems, and his Progress and Poverty. These books inspired me and I became a believer in the principles of democracy, and it was thus that I came to have a deep interest in social problems. My socialism, however, only goes back six or seven years; it was then that I first read A. E. Schäffle’s Die Quintessenz des Sozialismus.

Later we will take up such questions as the complete transformation in Kinoshita’s thought, the relation between Christianity and socialism in Uchimura’s thought, and Kōtoku’s relation to the problem of peace. For the present, we will make clear the nature of Kōtoku’s socialism by comparing it with Nakae Chōmin’s.

Kōtoku, like Sakai, had avidly read Mencius, had matured within the framework of popular rights theories, and had become well acquainted with French or, better, modern European revolutionary history. The one thing that was decisive with Kōtoku was that in 1888, at the age of 18, he came under the wing of Nakae Chōmin. The closeness of the two men is apparent from the fact that Kōtoku wrote the introduction to Nakae Chōmin’s Ichinen Yūhan, (A Year and a Half), and Zoku Ichinen Yūhan. Also, it is clear from the work Chōmin
Sensei, which Kōtoku wrote in 1902 one year after the death of Nakae Chōmin, that Kōtoku was very devoted to Nakae, Kōtoku himself said about his Chōmin Sensei. "What is it that I am writing? A biography? A critique? A funeral oration? It is none of these! I write only of the Chōmin I have known and the Chōmin I still see. It is an outpouring of my unbounded grief, my unlimited regret." As we saw previously, it was from Chōmin's Sansuijin Keirin Mondō that Kōtoku was led to socialism. Still, the question remains, was Kōtoku the legitimate disciple of Nakae Chōmin?

It is not easy to answer this question affirmatively. The fact remains that just as Kōtoku's Chōmin Sensei seemingly is, and yet is not, a biography or critique of Chomin, so, too, Kōtoku's thought seems to follow Chōmin's, and yet does nor really follow Chōmin's.

Nakae Chōmin was a materialist. Seated on the veranda of his home one evening, he spoke as follows:
I am not in agreement with the interpretation that there is a distinction or a separation between the flesh and the spirit in human beings. Physiology and psychology ought not to be separated. Upon reflection, the complete health and vitality of the spirit is intimately related to the complete vitality and health of the body. The malfunction of a part must, of a certainty, affect the well-being of the whole. There is no question about it, the spirit is the fire, the body is the fuel: when the fuel is exhausted the fire goes out! There is no possibility for the existence of the spirit outside the body, and therefore I remain an obdurate materialist.

Zoku Ichinen Yūhan contains statements with the same purport. For example: "Though dust and offal are immortal, imperishable, the nature of the spirit is that it can perish. It is long since the spirits of Jesus and Buddha have perished, but horse dung, like the world itself, endures forever." Nevertheless, this did not go beyond 18th century French materialism. Despite this Nakae Chōmin's disposition was a philosophical one. He contracted cancer of the throat and was informed by the doctors
that he had a year and a half to live. After having a bronchotomy performed he had his wife announce to his friends that his prognosis was extremely good. People wrote him congratulatory notes; even his two children wrote a letter, running: "Father, you are gradually getting much better..." To this, Chômin made reply: "Now your father will have to adopt a somewhat stoic attitude as a device for protecting himself. Human beings are such stupid animals, aren't they? Ha, Ha." Concerning the time left to him Chômin wrote:

You, gentlemen, will say that a year and a half is a very short and hurried period; I say it is an eternity. If you want to speak of shortness, ten years, fifty, a hundred years, too, are short. One's life span is limited and after death there are no limits. In terms of the finite and the infinite, a year and a half is not merely short, it is nothing! Yet if there is something to do and to enjoy doing, is a year and a half insufficient?

Chômin's attitude was such that when he heard a recital by one of the famous actors of the period his joy was comparable to that expressed in the Confucian classic: "If I learned the way of righteousness in the morning, I would be able to face death in the evening."

There was a marked difference in Kotoku's attitude. Before his execution, Kôtoku sent letters to his three attorneys, Isobe, Hanai, and Imamura; these were his "Letters from Prison." The tragedy in these letters is readily apparent from lines like the following. "I am in a cell without any heat, the tips of my fingers are frozen. Even in writing this much I let my pen drop three times now." However, Kôtoku was, as a revolutionary, unable to resign himself to death completely; Nakae Chômin was, as a philosopher, able to acquire "insight" or enlightenment and thus endure the thought of death with resignation. Now, despite the fact that Chômin's philosophical awareness was a materialist one, there was nevertheless a cheerful sense of being "at one with the universe" in his makeup. We can sense the difference in the causes of the death confront-
ing both men, and we should note the fact that the two differed as to their past records and their characters. Probably there is contained in these differences a period or time difference. Nevertheless, we may sum up the difference between them by saying that Chōmin, though a materialist philosopher, was a metaphysician, and had a stoic awareness. Kōtoku, on the other hand, was a revolutionary theoretician and consequently a materialist, but he was not a metaphysician.

The difference between Kōtoku and Chōmin is made still more clear when we think in terms of how they conceived of the problem of Japan and the Orient, when we think in terms of how they thought about politics. When we examine the Heimin Shimbun, we find a passage from Chōmin's Sansuijin Keirin Mondō, which was probably excerpted by Kōtoku. Under the heading "Living Morality," it runs as follows:

In brief, the great powers of the world are all foolish. In maintaining monarchical systems they injure themselves and, perforce, do damage to the monarch, or are on the verge of so doing. Little powers, why do you not become democratic and so bring blessings to yourselves and to your rulers! The great powers of the world are all cowardly, they fear one another, they gather soldiers, they range their navies, and they end by endangering themselves. Why do they not, instead, determine to abolish their armies, disband their navies, and put themselves at ease... I wish that my countrymen would, without having a single soldier, without any armaments, fall by enemy hands, and thus transform the entire nation into a living morality, and set an example for future society.

When we look at this passage, which was entitled "Living Morality" and which was taken from Chomin's book, we are liable to assume that Chōmin like Kōtoku was a pacifist, an advocate of republicanism. However, Chōmin's position was not a republican one; he was an advocate of constitutional monarchy. This conclusion is apparent when we read the entire Sansuijin Keirin Mondō. In this book, whose title means
“Questions and Answers on Statecraft by Three Drunkards,” undoubtedly one of the “drunkards” was Nakae Chômin himself. Of the other two, one was a democratic philosopher or “gentleman,” and one, a conqueror or “hero.” The plot of this work is in the form of a discussion among these three on the nature of statecraft and politics. The quotation that we just presented from the Heimin Shim bun was the view of the gentleman who worships what might be called the deity of political evolution and advocates republicanism, is anti-war, a pacifist. In other words, the first step in the principle of political evolution is the system of rule by the monarch and his ministers; the second step is constitutionalism; the third step is democracy. When this is reached, liberty and equality become possible. Since “the trend of the world appears to be to go forward and not to retreat,” the first thing then would be “to down arms and opt for peace”; In this way, the gentleman stated, the ideal of world peace would be realized.

In contrast to the foregoing, the “hero” feels that the conditions of the modern world are such that the civilized countries of necessity are the powerful countries, the countries which fight and do not retreat: “in terms of the condition of the present day world, foreign conquest is the only policy and there is nothing to be done about it!” In effect, the hero says, look at Asia which now stands at the very brink of catastrophe! It is not necessary for us to go into the hero’s concept of “wealthy country, strong soldiery”; it is merely sufficient for us to note the fact that he deplores the state of affairs in Asia. We must now examine Chômin’s own views in contrast to those of the hero and the gentleman.

Nakae Chômin, in criticism of the gentleman, said that he too reverenced evolution. But was not the gentleman forgetting what it was that the god of evolution abhorred? “What is it that the god of evolution hates? Words and deeds which are not suited to time and place!” Also, the republicanism of the gentleman cannot be achieved unless there is the cooperation and support of the entire nation. The great object of
politics, from the outset, flows from the national will, is suited to the nation's intelligence. It is thus, then, that the welfare and security of the nation are achieved. Today, however, what is the will and the intelligence level of the nation? In general, there are two kinds of popular rights: those which, as in England and in France, have emerged from the people and have been restored to the people, and those which come as a gift to the people from the sovereign. In present-day Japan, to change immediately the popular rights which were an Imperial gift into a restorationist type of people's rights, is to want to go hastily from an authoritarian system to a republican one. Japan, in terms of the principle of political evolution, cannot go directly to republicanism but must first be a constitutional monarchy. "The accomplishments of all countries are the products of the thought of all countries. Thought and accomplishments are mutually linked." As yet Japanese thought has not matured, and thus for the "gentleman" to desire that the masses worship the type of thought which may be correct for himself, "this is intellectual authoritarianism. This is not something to delight the god of evolution, rather it merits the admonition of scholars." In the main, the gentleman was anti-war; the hero was in favor of strong armies; both, however, were overconcerned with the great powers of Europe. On the surface, the anti-war assertions of the gentleman and the military-preparedness assertions of the hero seem to be as mutually opposed as fire and water, in reality they both stem from a common point of origin, an overconcern with war.

We can sense, then, that Chōmin's position, in contrast to the abstract theoretical one of the gentleman whose words and deeds do not pay heed to time and place, is one which stresses time and place, is, in other words, a gradualist position. His rather excessive moderation is probably surprising. Chōmin, in concluding his Sansuijin Keirin Mondō, said mocking himself:

The other two, hearing these words, laughed, saying, 'We have heard that the theories held by you are singular ones indeed.
And yet if they are as you have just stated, they are not particularly outstanding. Today children, bumpkins, could understand them.' Chōmin changed his expression and said, 'It is all very well to compete for novelty and, even temporarily, to provide laughter. Yet where the grand design for our country for the next hundred years is concerned how can one feel at ease with novelty as a standard, with the constant brandishing of newness!'

Without doubt, Chōmin's thought was close to the democratic thought of the gentleman. Yet the hero too is a part of Chōmin, and is in a sense an aspect of his character. In his *Ichinen Yūhan*, Chōmin had said: "The State is a great emprise." And also, "While I do not wish to speak superfluously about the affairs of the Asian mainland, these affairs transcend diplomacy and confront us directly. Not words but action is necessary. We must reflect on Japan's mission, we must think of her fate for the next hundred years. It will be lucky if Japan does not become another Roumania." Chomin was not in favor of Japan, nor, indeed, of Asia, falling into the condition of Roumania. In this connection Chōmin mourned the loss of Inoue Kowashi. The latter played an important part in the drafting of the Imperial Rescript on Education, was at one time a Minister of Education, and has been criticized by many as the person who solidified the foundation of Meiji absolutism in government. Chōmin said: "Recently I have seen only two people who are serious, who are not deceitful, and not arrogant. These are Inoue Kowashi and Shirane Senichi who are both dead." He continued: "The late Inoue Kowashi was one of the few statesmen in our country who knew how to think."

These are examples of the flexibility and broadness of Chōmin's position; this was not, however, the case with Kōtoku. By way of conclusion, we may say the following. Kōtoku was a step ahead of that part of Chōmin represented by the gentleman in the work quoted above. To this extent Kōtoku was a follower of Chōmin's thought, but we must bear in mind that this was only one aspect of Chōmin's thought, and, at that,
Kōtoku went beyond Chōmin. For this reason we concluded that Kōtoku, in a sense, followed and, in a sense, did not follow Chōmin. We must now analyse the unique quality of Kōtoku’s thought, the part which differed so markedly from Chōmin.

In April 1901, Kōtoku’s Teikoku Shugi, (Imperialism), with the introduction written by Uchimura Kanzō, was published. This work preceded Chōmin’s Ichinen Yūhan by four months. In May 1901, as related above, the Social Democratic Party was organized by Katayama, Abe, Kinoshita and Kōtoku. In 1900 Uchimura Kanzō repeatedly appeared as guest contributor in the Manchōhō—he had been a reporter for the journal from 1897 to 1898—and under his influence, the reporters of this left-wing newspaper organized an informal group called the “Idealist Band.” The editor, Kuroiwa Ruikō and Kōtoku Shūsui were participants in this group. This was why Uchimura wrote the introduction to Kōtoku’s Teikoku Shugi. About the Idealist Band Uchimura said:

The Idealist Band is neither a religious nor a political band, and it is not an organ of the Manchōhō. It has social reform as its object, but it is not a social reform group in the ordinary sense. The Idealist Band aspires to reform society by a special method, namely, it desires first to reform itself before aspiring to reform society.

Chōmin too was acquainted with the Idealist Band and, indeed, in his Ichinen Yūhan, he wrote:

Since the people do not rely on themselves, neither do they rely on politicians. This is why the Idealist Band is necessary. Their function is to speak of ideals though there is no way of putting these into practice under present conditions. Yet, even the purest principle of righteousness and justice, if sufficiently spoken and written about, will sooner or later be implemented. Therefore, liberty, equality, fraternity, the breaking down of national boundaries, common currency, the setting aside of armaments, the abolition of private property in land, and the abolition of the inheritance of wealth, must all be among the Idealist Band’s great aspirations. There
must be no fear of the villains who know not righteousness and justice.

It is through this quotation from Chōmin that we have some idea of the position of the Idealist Band. And, at the same time, we also know why Uchimura Kanzō, who fundamentally differed from Kōtoku, was, nevertheless, tolerant of him. Through Chōmin we can learn the particular tendency Kōtoku's *Teikoku Shugi* followed. Chōmin continued: "Well, then, gentlemen of the Idealist Band...someday I will bless you, even from beyond the grave." But, as an admonition, he added: "Gentlemen, if you want to broaden your aspirations, eschew politics and quest philosophy. With philosophy you can smash politics. With morality you can suppress law. With the rewards of good conscience you can surpass all the worldly tokens of rank and the marks of esteem." Here we see clearly his attitude to philosophy. Philosophy was a weapon with which to smash politics. In a letter of thanks, upon receipt of Kōtoku's *Teikoku Shugi*, he said:

Imperialism today, is exactly like the unchivalrous and foul fighting methods used by the Chi’n Emperor and by Han Wu-ti plus modern precision weapons based on science. We can truly say an extreme in misery has been attained. If, at this time, we, like the ancients, Aristides, Cincinnatus, Duke Wu of Chou, and other virtuous men, expand to the Asian continent with the object of truly abolishing war, then we may be able to hope for the achievement of the great principle of world peace.

It is significant that this type of pan-Asian thought can be seen in Chōmin but not in Kōtoku. We now turn our attention to the contents of Kōtoku’s *Teikoku Shugi*.

Imperialism, which has been likened to a "spectre haunting the 20th century," was, according to Kōtoku, a policy "woven from the warp of patriotic sentiment and the woof of militarism." Imperialism is a characteristic of the modern State, and therefore to perceive clearly the nature of imperialism we must first analyze its twin constituents, patriotism and mili-
tarism. This is the way in which Kōtoku's study of imperialism begins.

Kōtoku wrote that in the words of the ancient Roman poet, "There are no parties or factions, there is only the country!" A person does not fight for a party but for love of country. Patriotism, however, is not so much a consequence of the love of one's own country as it is a superstition which emerges from the hatred of the enemy country and its inhabitants. It is only the "reaction to the stimulus of hatred for the enemy." What is called patriotism does not stem from the concept of love, but is a consequence of the intent to plunder the enemy and boast to the world about one's own military prowess. Therefore, the essence of patriotism is really hatred and militarism. Kōtoku said: "The core of patriotic sentiment is hatred, scorn, and vain pride...It is by nature brutish, superstitious, mad; it loves war." Since Kōtoku argued in this fashion, he sharply attacked British and German policies and also the psychology of the Japanese after the Russo-Japanese War. There is much in Kōtoku's writing which contributes to our knowledge of the period. The most important part of his thought was that patriotism was a reaction to the stimulus of hatred for the enemy and, as such, was a part of what was broadly called militarism. Militarism, of course, was in direct opposition to the humanism, justice, and righteousness of the civilized world.

Kōtoku explained militarism as follows:
It is the result of conscience overwhelmed by greed and the desire for fame, of righteousness and morality suppressed by the animal-like natural inclination for war (jingoism), of love for brotherhood destroyed by false pride, and of reason darkened by superstition.
He was critical of Mahan's theory defending militarism. What was then the essence of imperialism which was formed of the patriotism and militarism just discussed?

In objecting to those who advocated imperialism to counteract over-population and to acquire new markets, Kōtoku said:
In Europe the gap between wealth and poverty becomes ever wider. Wealth and capital tend to accumulate in fewer and fewer hands. The purchasing power of the masses is in a state of extreme decline. Is this not true because the capitalists and industrialists monopolize excessive profits from their capital? Is this not the result of the present system of free competition? The present economic task of the West should be to raise the purchasing power of the masses of their own countries rather than to control uncivilized peoples and force merchandise on them. There must be a more equitable distribution of profits to the working masses, the monopolization of the extraordinary profits of capital must be banned. In order to make possible an equitable distribution the modern system of free competition must be renovated from top to bottom and a socialist system must be established.

And, contrariwise, imperialism, "which is only a name for the policy by which loathsome patriotism is activated by hateful militarism," must be eschewed and replaced by a great reform in the direction of world brotherhood. With the following words Kōtoku concluded his argument on imperialism:

There must be a great cleansing and purification of the State and society! A worldwide great revolutionary movement must begin! From a small number of large countries there must be a change to a great number of small countries. The countries of armies and navies must become countries of peasants, workers, and merchants. Aristocratic societies must give way to societies ruled by the free and sovereign common people; the society of the arrogant capitalists must be replaced by the commonwealth of the toilers. Later the spirit of fraternity and justice will suppress one-sided and narrow patriotism; scientific socialism will destroy barbarous militarism.

The foregoing is the gist of Kōtoku's thought on imperialism. We can readily see that he made hatred the origin of patriotism, warlike instincts the foundation of militarism; and his point of departure is that imperialism and all related
forces stem from animal nature. Kōtoku is still not, in any significant sense, a materialist-socialist but rather a humanist-idealist. Consequently, in his desire for world peace, he was in agreement with Czar Nicholas II’s proposal for the reduction of armaments. To be sure, as we have seen, Kōtoku used some of the language of scientific socialism. His eyes, however, were fixed on the idea of a peaceful world and it was the utopian aspect of socialism that he adopted. While Kōtoku touched on the “contradictions of capitalism,” his position was Lasallean rather than Marxian. His humanistic idealism made possible his affiliation with Uchimura Kanzō.

When we come to Kōtoku’s position as expressed in his Shakai Shugi Shinzui, (Quintessence of Socialism), (1903), we are aware of a gradual sharpening in his views. In this work there is an analysis of capitalism from the socialist standpoint, and here, in place of Lasalle, the names Marx and Engels appear frequently and their views are briefly introduced. The closing phrase of the Communist Manifesto is inscribed at the head of the volume. And thus Kōtoku’s views of socialism were the most advanced on the subject in Japan at that time. Yet Kōtoku had not sufficiently studied Marx’s Capital and had no understanding of dialectical materialism. A book like R. Ely’s Socialism and Social Reform was the model for Kōtoku’s work on socialism. This is seen in a critical article on the subject “Socialism and Direct Legislation,” in which he thought of the Swiss state system as an ideal one. If we look, for example, at Abe Isoo’s Chijō no Risōkoku Suwitsuru, (The Swiss Utopia), (1904), we see that Abe Isoo’s position was like Kōtoku’s. In the article on socialism and direct legislation, Kōtoku recommended a Swiss-type national referendum and constitutional reform to bring about direct initiative. After the Russo-Japanese War he went to America, and coming into contact with American anarchists, became a follower of Kropotkin. In the introduction to Heimin Shugi, (Democracy), (1910), he confessed: “I have completely changed my thought.” Kōtoku had now arrived at a point where he rejected parliamentarianism
and stressed direct action by the workers. He said:

I honestly confess my opinions in connection with methods and means in the socialist movement began to change since I entered prison two years ago. Last year, when I traveled, my feelings underwent a tremendous change. When I think back on my position of some years ago, it seems almost as if it were the position of an entirely different person... For this reason I sincerely feel that the usual elective parliamentary procedures cannot achieve a real social revolution. There is no way other than that of direct action by the united workers to attain the goal of socialism. This is the way I think today.

In 1910, Kōtoku was mistaken as the ring leader in the plot to assassinate the Emperor Meiji. In prison he wrote *Kirisuto Massatsuron*, (On the Obliteration of Christ), and in 1911 he was executed.

3. Uchimura Kanzō’s Pacifism and Kinoshita Naoe’s Socialism

The Manchōhō, whose staff writers formed the Idealist Band, was at first strongly anti-war. Later, when it too adopted a jingoistic pro-war position, Kōtoku, Sakai Toshihiko, and Uchimura Kanzō withdrew. Kōtoku and Sakai started the *Heimin Shinbun*; Uchimura Kanzō once again retired to work on his *Seisho no Kenkyū* (Study of the Bible). When Kōtoku and Sakai resigned from the Manchōhō, they addressed themselves to the readers in the following words:

We unfortunately have, in our opinion, come to the parting of the ways with the publishers over the 'Russian Question.' Our view has usually been based on socialism. When we look at international war, it seems to us to be a private concern of the aristocracy and the militarist, a private concern, moreover, in which great numbers of people are sacrificed. That we have held and continue to hold such views should be apparent to our faithful readers...

Uchimura Kanzō set forth the reasons for his resignation in a separate article addressed to the editor Kuroiwa Ruikō,
October 9, 1903. He said,
I firmly believe that to agree to war against Russia is the same as to agree to the destruction of Japan. However, now that the people have determined on war, it is no longer possible for me to persist in my opposition. Yet, I feel I am betraying my duty as a patriot if I do not speak for what I firmly believe in as a scholar. And especially (though I adequately understand the paper's views) now that the Manchōhō has come out in support of war, I find it unbearable to continue to write articles in this paper whose views are in opposition to mine. To do this would result, I feel, in the paper losing the confidence of the public. I should like, therefore, to offer my humble opinion for your kind understanding and say that, since I have unavoidably come to this pass, I shall withdraw from this forum of opinion for a time. My good opinion of the paper has not been altered in the slightest.

What is of interest to us is that we can clearly see here the difference between Kōtoku's and Uchimura's positions.

The epitaph inscribed on Uchimura's tombstone reads: "I for Japan, Japan for World, World for Jesus." The point which should be made is that Uchimura also stood among the outstanding Meiji personalities who loved Japan deeply. In 1921, in connection with his Daihyō Nipponjin, (Representative Japanese), he said:

In introducing Japan to the world, in defending Japanese before Westerners it is necessary to use Western letters. I am thankful that one of the accomplishments of my life has been that I have been able to do this. I respect and cherish two things which begin with the letter 'J.' One is Jesus, the other is Japan. This book, then, was a way in which I was able to discharge my obligations to the second of the two 'Js.'

As early as 1903, in a work called Shitsubō to Kibō, (Despair and Hope), he used almost identical words. He wrote: "There are only two things in the universe we should love: one is
Jesus, and the other Japan. Both of these begin with 'J' in English. We should dedicate our lives to these two."

Most people would acknowledge that the most beautiful work of patriotic Uchimura's early period was the aforementioned Representative Japanese and Kösei e no Saidai Ibutsu, (The Greatest Bequest to Posterity).

When we examine Uchimura's Representative Japanese, we find that these were Saigō Takamori, Uesugi Yōzan, Ninomiya Sontoku, Nakae Tōju, and Nichiren. This work was originally published in English under the title Japan and Japanese. It was published in 1894 at the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese War. Uchimura's other work, The Greatest Bequest to Posterity, was published in mid-1894 and was based on a series of lectures given at the sixth seasonal meeting of the Summer School, which this year was held at Hakone. It is interesting to note that Uchimura's friend—they were friends since the days of the Sapporo Agricultural School—Iwasaki Yukichika, was an extreme nationalist. Concerning Iwasaki, Uchimura wrote in later years:

He and I were of different religions but our environment and morality were the same. We were both born poor, a fate we shared in common. To this we added the characteristically Japanese concept of morality. We both had the feeling that we would rather die than eat the foreigner's bread! Yes, poverty and Japanese morality, these are the two things that united us. Indeed, to the present day we are bound by these. Among my friends, Iwasaki is the one who best understands my Japanese spirit. This is because Iwasaki himself is, in a sense, a chip off the Japanese spirit. Despite the fact that Christians have mostly lost their Japanese spirit, I, fortunately or unfortunately, intend to cherish this.

(Iwasaki Yukichika Kun to Watakushi, Iwasaki and I). There is no question that Uchimura possessed "the Japanese spirit" and was a patriot. This is true despite the fact that he was often treated as anti-national, as someone who hated "the
Yamato spirit.” Uchimura’s works are replete with feeling for the Japanese spirit in the broad sense of the term.

It is not strange, therefore, at the time of the Sino-Japanese War, Uchimura wrote in English his “Justification of the Corean War” and that he wrote an article on the aims of the Sino-Japanese War. As early as 1892 Uchimura wrote on “Japan’s Mission.”

I feel that the greatest point which can be made about Japan’s mission is that she should want to mediate between East and West, that Japan should want to mediate between the mechanical West and the idealist East. I believe that the mission of the Japanese Empire is to develop the conservative East by means of the progressive West.

He also said: “Japan truly stands between the republican West and monarchical China; Japan truly holds the position of intermediary between Christian America and Buddhist Asia.” It was from this sort of a position that Uchimura Kanzō later wrote his “Justification of the Corean War.” His position was that Japan, the champion of progressivism, was awakening conservative (hence the enemy of progress) China. Also in an article he wrote on Sino-Japanese relations in the light of world history, he said: “The relations between China and Japan are those between a small country representing a new civilization and culture and a large country representing the old civilization and culture.” In his article on the objectives of the Sino-Japanese War he listed the guaranteeing of Korean independence, the chastisement of China, which would ultimately lead to her awakening and “the rise of China.” Since Japan’s goal was not the conquest and destruction of China, but rather her awakening, it was natural that from this Uchimura derived his third and ultimate objective, for which Japan was fighting, the bringing of peace to the Orient. As he put it, “We face this battleground as the saviors of Asia.”

The outcome of the war, however, was a different matter. In an article Uchimura wrote in 1896 there was no area in which he did not strike in his disillusionment. He excoriated
Japanese hypocrisy, arrogance, and the corruption of the Japanese people who were drunk with victory. About the politicians he said that it was sufficient for them merely to pay lip service to the Empire and the State and that they were not ashamed of the evil of their private practice, which the people also overlooked. He did not except the industrialists, scholars, and students, from this. The war had corrupted morality. The vaunted independence of Korea, for which supposedly the war had been fought, was now, after victory, being trampled under foot. There was no hesitation in ignoring and slighting the honor of China, he wrote. Was this then a "righteous war"?

Now that we stand in the position of victors we forget our chief aim, the independence of our neighbor; the attention of the entire nation has been stolen by such things as the carving out of new territory and the expansion of new markets. They are preoccupied with trying to garner more than enough profit and war gains. If this was a war for justice, a righteous war, why do they not fight even at the risk of sacrificing the existence of the State!...

As described in the foregoing, Uchimura, thinking the Sino-Japanese War a just one, "appealed to the world in my poor effort at composing in English, my 'Justification of the Korean War'." Therefore, the results of the Sino-Japanese War were all the more a goad to Uchimura's conscience. Ten years later, at the time of the Russo-Japanese War, he set down in an article entitled "How I Became a Pacifist," four reasons. The first of these was that the Bible, especially the New Testament, preached the evil of fighting. The second was that at the time of the "Disrespect Affair," when he was attacked by many people as anti-patriotic. The third reason was the Sino-Japanese War. In this connection he wrote:

The reason I have become an anti-war advocate lies in the past ten years of world history. The result of the Sino-Japanese War was that I keenly felt the damage or the destructiveness of war and learned that it had no advantages. The supposed objective of Korean independence was, on the
contrary, endangered; the morality of the victor, Japan, was greatly corrupted. Though we were able to conquer and subjugate the enemy, we have been unable to cope with rebels inside the country. This, then, has been the result of the war which my homeland fought (and, moreover, won).

The fourth reason that Uchimura gave was his having been an avid reader since 1887 of the *Springfield Republican*, published in Springfield, Massachusetts. Here we have been able to see clearly the origins of Uchimura Kanzō's pacifism.

From the foregoing it is evident that at the time of the Russo-Japanese War, though Uchimura, Kōtoku, and Sakai all similarly took anti-war stands, there was a fundamental difference between Uchimura's position and that of the other two. Uchimura, immediately after the Russo-Japanese War, wrote:

> I have been opposed to the war between Japan and Russia from the very outset. I opposed this war first on religious, ethical, and moral grounds; secondly, because there was no advantage to be derived by either country; thirdly, I opposed the war on the basis of Japanese national policy. I could not pour any passion into supporting this war. . . . Of course, as a Japanese, I feel I have observed the obligations it was proper and necessary for me to observe. Yet I spent this war period crying out by myself like a voice in the wilderness.

The question arises as to why Uchimura protested through this war period and yet did not break with the usual obligations it was necessary for a Japanese to observe.

To answer this question we must refer to the following from an article Uchimura wrote in 1904 on the attitude of a pacifist in wartime.

Until the outbreak of the war, we directed our energies in speaking against it. And yet our fervent hopes and wishes were not granted. And, now that the war has started, the measures we can adopt against war have come to an end for the time being. It goes without saying that to be against war is a negative aspect of pacifism. And now that our hope has been destroyed, the hope of preventing war and main-
taining peace, we must think about what we should do to restore peace as quickly as possible. It goes without saying that this is not for our own purposes, it is for country, society, mankind. We do not intend to achieve our doctrine in order to gain fame and honor for ourselves nor are we trying to purchase the satisfaction of publicly displaying our peerless integrity; the obligation, the responsibility, the goal of a pacifist is in the maintenance or restoration (where it has been destroyed) of peace. And, in the event of not maintaining peace, the second measure we must adopt is the speedy restoration of peace, the creation of the opportunity for this. It is like the building of a second dam to block up water which has broken through the first dam. Of course, getting angry at the breaking of the first dam, scolding the water, reviling the keeper of the dam, may give some satisfaction; there is, however, not much profit in this.

Uchimura Kanzō's attitude, from a socialist's point of view, was only a partial, an incomplete one, and, in a sense, he could be criticized as an opportunist. However, we must recognize that Kanzō was not a socialist; he was a Christian, and he drew a clear line between socialism and Christianity. The fact that there are many points of resemblance between the two, for example, both expected to root out and utterly destroy poverty, did not negate the socialist materialism which Uchimura hated. Above all, Uchimura could not agree with the chief objective of socialism, the overthrow of the social order. To Christianity "our kingdom is not of this world." Therefore, Uchimura wrote:

From the point of view of Christianity the injustices of society are consequences of man's having rejected God and do not come from the imperfections of the social system. The way to remedy these injustices is for man to return to God and not by his being given a new social organization. For this reason Christianity does not place much significance on such things as system or organization.

This quotation came from an article on "Christianity and
Socialism,” which Uchimura wrote in 1903 when both he and Kötoku were advocating pacifism and were affiliated with the Manchōhō. Also, in 1901 when social improvement was repeatedly being advocated, Uchimura wrote an article on “Christians and Social Reform,” in which he spoke of social reform as a hobby or plaything for the Christians. Uchimura, while allowing social improvement as a hobby, asserted that when Christianity became transformed into social improvement, then Christianity had greatly degenerated. In 1908, in an article on the principles of pacifism, he quoted approvingly a statement from John Bright that human sin and evil could all be grouped together in one word, war. And, basically, Uchimura’s position was the advocacy of non-resistance. Christianity’s function was a pacifist one, one of non-resistance. Social reform, if it existed within Christianity, could not be more than a “hobby” of individual Christians; it was not the core of the doctrine. At the time of the First World War, Uchimura wrote: “War places faith on trial: those who oppose war are Christians, those who do not are not Christians.” He also stated:

Opposition to war should be advocated in all circumstances. Nevertheless, war will not be stopped by pacifism. We do not believe that our advocacy of pacifism will stop the war. The Bible clearly teaches that war cannot be stopped by human efforts, nor will war be stopped when world opinion becomes pacifist. Indeed, such a time probably will never come. War is only brought to a close by God Almighty, it is an enterprise which rests in the hands of the Lord.

He said, “We advocate pacifism to speed the advent of the Lord; we preach the gospel of peace in order to prepare for the coming of the Lord.”

To Uchimura, it was not just social reform which was a Christian hobby, but pacifism too was a hobby. We can see an important characteristic of the Meiji 30’s in the fact that a Christian like Uchimura and a socialist like Kötoku both advocated pacifism and that, in some such form, a working relationship between Christianity and socialism existed. We
must also bear in mind that a position based on such qualitatively different doctrines could not but fall apart. This can be seen when we examine the transition in Kinoshita Naoe’s thought.

The first real socialist novel worthy of the name was Kinoshita Naoe’s outstanding work, *Hi no Hashira*, (Pillar of Fire), (1904). This novel ran serially in the *Mainichi Shinbun*, (under the editorship of Shimada Saburō) since 1903. The author Kinoshita had his heroine, Umeko, say the following about a sermon by the hero, Shinoda Chōji:

The subject of that evening’s sermon was ‘Christ’s Social Views.’ He spoke of the establishment of a heaven on earth based on Christ’s ideals. The present organization of society is completely in opposition to the doctrines of Christ and is governed by doctrines of egotism and utilitarianism. He said the object of Christianity is to construct a new era after the thoroughgoing destruction of the old. When I heard these words I was so afraid of his attack on the evils and sins of present-day society that my body shook. When he spoke of Christian peace, of Christ’s spirit of sacrifice and brotherhood, his eloquence was like a bright burning flame. The audience, without realizing why, was moved to tears. When his two-hour sermon ended, everybody seemed as if intoxicated….I feel that for the first time I was able to understand deep within my heart the significance of the crucifixion.

Kinoshita himself was an extraordinary and eloquent speaker. It has been said that people flocked to hear him talk. Shinoda Chōji is probably none other than Kinoshita himself. In his novel *Hi no Hashira*, there is a description of pacifist lecture meetings, the anti-prostitution movement, and labor struggles against the militarists, capitalists, politicians, and bureaucrats. Kinoshita’s fundamental position, his Christian socalism, is plainly evident in speeches by the hero of his novel, Shinoda. The first number of the *Heimin Shinbun* carried an article on the new ethics in which the same position appears,
that is, the Christian teaching that one should love one’s enemy. Of course, he was active in attempting to put his ideas into practice. Kinoshita was one of the leading activists in the 1906 Tokyo “Citizens Rally” to protest the raising of street car fares. This movement, incidentally, was one of the first of its kind in Japan. However, Kinoshita gradually became widely separated from socialist activism.

In analyzing Kinoshita Naoe’s thought there are certain preliminary questions we must take up. In 1905 the Heimin Shinbun ceased publication, and in its place two journals appeared. One was the Hikari, (The Light), which expressed the materialist historical viewpoint; the other was the Shin Kigen, (The New Origins), a journal of Christian socialism. Kinoshita was affiliated with the latter. Kinoshita wrote the following in an article on the disbanding of the Heimin Publishing Company. This was the company that published the Heimin Shinbun.

Though the Heimin-sha was, of course, a product of socialism, it can be said to have been established on the basis of pacifism. When we examine the contents of this company, we can detect different lineages and origins. Therefore, we want to put these doctrines into practice, it is unavoidable that different factions would be produced even among comrades and people of the same persuasion. (1907).

As we said at the outset, the Idealist Band on the Manchōhō newspaper was organized as a pacifist group, and for that reason someone like Uchimura Kanzō, though opposed to socialism, also participated. Similarly, with the Russo-Japanese War in sight, the anti-war movement again comprised fundamentally different elements: materialist socialists and Christian socialists. Both joined together in an unwieldy alliance. With the end of the Russo-Japanese War, the common enemy was now no longer before them and it was natural for them to go their separate ways.

Kinoshita wrote:

When the curtain descended on the Russo-Japanese War,
among us, in the pacifist camp too, a great disturbance occurred. We young people whose pacifism had been tempered in the furnaces of practical experience, moved on to a new stage. Kōtoku discarded the old garments of socialism and put on the new garb, anarchism.

In the main, the Heimin-sha movement was searching for a new construct, a new ideal in the midst of the confusion, scepticism, and agony of the Meiji 30’s, and it can be said that the anti-war advocacy became a focal point in this quest. What the youth of that period was searching for was not really systematized thought, or an organized body of ideas; on the contrary, they thirsted for confusion, they craved great confusion, and behind this great confusion there was the thirst for some great creation. Kōtoku’s Heimin Shinbun was a small crater for the whirling gaseous passions of these young people.

The war, of course, brought all this to a close. People had to advance to new construction, and the question was how this was to be done. People had to tread various paths; and those who left had to leave. Kōtoku visited America in 1905 and, as we stated above, was gradually converted to anarchism. The day before he left for America he was sitting on a stump outside Tokyo, talking with Kinoshita Naoe. Kinoshita said: “Oh, what a distance one word can set up between two people! The word ‘rejection,’ the rejection of authority! Kōtouk, you advocate the theory of anarchism whereas I speak of the love of God.” Kōtoku left for America before the publication of the Hikari, and it was on the basis of such principles that the Hikari and the Shin Kigen became separated. Kinoshita went with the Shin Kigen. This was the first step in Kinoshita’s separation from materialistic socialism.

Both Kōtoku and Kinoshita at first thought of realizing socialism through elections and parliamentarianism. As a matter of fact, Kinoshita stood for election to the Diet from Maebashi City and Tokyo. They both, however, came to feel deeply the powerlessness of parliamentarianism. What was to
be done? There were two roads. One was the way of violent revolution, of direct action, Kōtoku’s way; the other was the way of peaceful revolution, the way of the Christian revolution in human character, the way Kinoshita chose. At any rate, this was the first stage in Kinoshita’s separation from materialistic socialism.

Once this process of separation had begun, Kinoshita was not able to remain at this first stage but continued on to the second. Kinoshita, who wrote the inaugural statement to the Shin Kigen in 1905, wrote in 1906 the article of condolence over the demise of the Shin Kigen. He wrote in this address:

The Shin Kigen was a two-headed snake. While it was understood that these were two equal heads, socialism and Christianity, it was hoped that these two would be joined.... In the stomach of the Shin Kigen neither socialism nor Christianity was digestible. The Shin Kigen was thus hypocritical. It was trying to serve two masters at the same time, but actually it became a fawning courtier. It was trying to manage two lovers at the same time and ended as a promiscuous whore.... For this reason, I, who already announced my separation from my old comrades of the Japan Socialist Party, now once again, for the same reason, had to announce my departure from Shin Kigen.

Kinoshita Naoe had read a biography of Cromwell when he was a student at the Matsumoto Middle School. He was fascinated by the character of Cromwell, who had dared to sentence and execute a king to realize his ideals. Interestingly enough, the same Kinoshita was now opposed to violence. His feelings more and more tended, in contradistinction to formal legalistic socialism, towards the anti-legalistic or supra-legalistic Christian gospel. Later he wrote:

I was dominated by two forces. There was the aspiration towards political revolution which exploded in me during my middle school period and the joy of God which I acquired in my early manhood. These two forces, like black and white, combined to create a utopian, a dreamer, a visionary
and exhibitionist. This was the Kinoshita of the Heimin-sha period. At the time of *Shin Kigen* there was still a trace of this left in him. He had just separated from materialistic socialism, and according to some interpretations his separation was from socialism as a whole, and he was attempting to purify himself in Christianity. Having separated from the Shin Kigen-sha he had to travel a lonely road. With this Kinoshita mounted the second stage in his break with socialism.

In answer to the question as to why Kinoshita separated from socialism, we must consider whether it was the practice of socialism from which he withdrew. He wrote: "I must confess that I don’t think I was mistaken in my theories. It is only that... I always felt, deep inside me, there was a drop of poison, the ‘lust for power,’ which masqueraded as a concern for justice, public opinion, and popular referendums." He associated with many socialists and engaged with them in various practical activities. And yet there lay coiled in the bosoms of the socialists the snake of power lust. And Kinoshita could not help but feel that this was part of the vengeance, the eye-for-an-eye, tooth-for-a-tooth, banned by Christianity. Thus he withdrew from socialist practice, bringing the second stage to an end.

To sum up at this point, the transition in Kinoshita’s thought went from a break with materialist socialism, a break with socialist practice, and, ultimately, it can be felt there was a break even from Christianity, which in a sense was the third stage. Kinoshita’s book *Kami Ningen Jiyū* (God, Man, and Freedom), was written in 1934 and it records the changes in this thought. He wrote:

Twenty years of wandering—I cannot make any sort of answer in just a few words... It was a truly gratifying thing, which may be described as being like looking up at the starry heavens on a clear, crisp winter night. Before I saw only stars. Now, guided by the stars, I look at the blue sky; I look at an infinity of emptiness.... For the first time, looking
inside myself, I see a small crack. God has died. The well-springs of God have dried up.

He continued, "'The lust for revolution'—'the lust for power,' like the collapsing of an iceberg, have been shattered inside me. At the same time, the fantasy of the 'God' of the natural theology school was dissipated like smoke or clouds. I was once more, as in my childhood, an extreme pessimist and misanthrope."

Reading this, we cannot help thinking that Kinoshita sensed the error underlying the socialist movement, the desire for revolution, the lust for power. And consequently, to the extent that his fervor for Christianity had been fanned by the desire for revolution, to that extent did his Christianity peter out. And where formerly he had been attracted by the light of the Christian stars, now, thanks to the stars, he was looking at the "blue sky"; he was looking at "emptiness." It is probably that Kinoshita did not entirely reject Christianity. Yet, together with Christianity, he seemed to be searching the "emptiness" behind it. We can sense, somehow, the attraction of, and search for, Oriental "non-existence." There is here something that is common with Tōkoku whom we previously mentioned.

Kinoshita cannot be considered to have been an original thinker, a socialist leader, or even a representative creative artist. Nevertheless, it was necessary to trace the changes in his thought because they manifest an aspect of the agony in the thought of the Japanese from the Meiji 30's to the 40's. Also, Kinoshita's thought ultimately showed the same harmonizing of Oriental and European thought which was common in Japan at this time. We will deal with this theme later in connection with naturalism. For the time being, we will set aside this discussion and in its place we will attempt to examine the hardening framework of Japanism, or nationalism, and what form this assumed in the period from the Meiji 30's to the 40's.

As we have just seen, the Meiji 30's was a period of individualism, socialism, pacifism, and, ultimately, naturalism.
It was thus a period in which religious fervor like that of Uchimura Kanzō's and Tsunajima Ryōsen's welled forth. For this reason too, the period of the Meiji 30's was chaotic. These movements were in rebellion against the imperialism, authoritarianism, militarism, and Japanism which clearly were emerging. The Japanism of the Meiji 20's still left some leeway for reasonableness. However, the Russo-Japanese War marks the boundary after which Japanism became like a religion, became mystical, became absolutist. It rejected the intellectuals, and the intellectuals in turn were indifferent to Japanism. The consequence: the State and the intellectuals were separated, more and more unreason entered Japanism. Before we go into this topic, we have to say a few words about Taoka Reiun.

As Kinoshita said, the groundwork of the Heimin-sha movement rested in socialism; what fused the movement was its pacifist goal. For this reason there could be seen within the Heimin-sha movement both materialist socialists and Christian socialists. There were also in the movement liberals like Sugimura Sojinkan and Nishimura Isaku; artists like Hirafuku Hyakusui, Ogawa Usen; and even a novelist (and Buddhist) like Nakazato Kaizan was affiliated with the movement. The man, however, who was really unique among these people was Taoka Reiun (1870-1912). When Lo Chen-yü started his school in Shanghai, Reiun was invited to teach there. He was the teacher of the brilliant scholar Wang Kuo-wei, editor of the Chukoku Minpo and the Toa Shinbun. Reiun was the author of the Meiji Hanshin-den, (Biographies of Meiji Rebels), and was known as an enfant terrible, his personality was that of a typical adventurer in China. He was an active contributor to the Heimin Shinbun.

We cannot go into detail on the essays Reiun contributed, except to note that he believed the greatest error of the 19th century was in the nationalism which thought that the individual was the slave of the State, that "blood-letting was patriotic morality," and that sang hymns to war. For such an error to acquire strength, he felt, was a consequence of the misuse
of Christianity in the West.

He wrote: "Christianity has no history in Christian countries." Irresponsible newspapers pushed the idea that "might is right." And, ultimately, the misuse of Christianity derives from the mechanistic civilization of the West and from the commerce and industry grounded in this. He also said: "Science is not in the service of human life. It has become the puppet of commercial enterprise....Scholarship, learning, these are thought to be only for the purpose of mechanical creation and as such have come to suffice for these narrow purposes." Nor was this all. The evil practice of modern science of placing importance "only on make and measure" makes it impossible for human beings to emerge from this. To stress only the physical, only the material, means to lose the ideal. In place of life there is mechanism; in place of science there is the pursuit of precision and necessity; in place of ideals there is the dominance of matter. In such a time it is quite natural that the beautiful will be extinguished. Thus the 19th century has become a period in which the most beautiful has been lost. "The present time is one of the periods most deficient in aesthetic sensibilities." "The present time is one in which beauty, the aesthetic, is not only neglected but has come to be a positive evil, a sin!" He concluded, therefore, that 19th century mechanistic civilization because of its commercialism had produced uniform standard commodities; its journalism was "conceived by one person and standardized thought for 999 people." We can no longer see even a vestige of individuality.

In the 19th and 20th centuries, running through the so-called civilized and cultured world, there is uniform thought. In a given period, the same clothing is worn, the same customs and mores are practiced, and the same thought is held. It has reached the point where when the world whistles it whistles the same note.

Further, country after country is preoccupied with war and is actively competing in military preparedness. The question is what is to be done?
Reiun attacked the evils of the 19th century: nationalism and mechanism. He did not, however, really suggest any countermeasures. He only said:

From the very outset, it is to be regretted that in the 19th century there is a deficiency in the love of the arts. Moreover, it is loathsome that at this time the last vestiges of antiquity and ancient life are being utterly broken. Ancient life was, of course, not meant to be applied just as it stands. . . . But yet people today are like infants who smash the toys with which they have become bored.

Reiun's ideal was the small community as it existed in ancient China under a type of primitive communism. It was in this ideal community that he felt he could realize his aesthetic socialism and attain the goal of world peace. Sakai had translated William Morris's book on utopia for the Heimin Shinbun. Morris' and Ruskin's ultra-aesthetic socialism were fused in Reiun with his conception of the ideal society of the ancient Chinese sages. A man like Reiun, though a socialist and a pacifist, was directly opposed to materialism and yet was on the Heimin Shinbun. We see thus the various disparate elements which were held together for a time by a common pacifism.

4. The Establishment of the Civil Code and the Family State

Ishikawa Takuboku once wrote:
We, the young people of Meiji were educated to become useful. We were to perfect the new Meiji society which was created by our fathers and elder brothers. As everyone knows, we first became conscious of our own authority and power and began to assert ourselves directly after the awakening of the nation as a result of the Sino-Japanese War. Takayama Chogyū's individualism which according to some people contained early evidence of naturalism, was first plea in behalf of this self-assertion.

As we stated earlier, in the section on Chogyū, his thought gave evidence of having undergone a three-phase change, romanticism to Japanism and finally to individualism. We can
single out the rationale for the changes by an examination of Chogyū himself, still, in a broader sense, as the quotation from Takuboku makes clear, these changes were connected with the process of the development and growth of self-consciousness on the part of the Meiji youth. Meiji youth, which had been trained to take over the new Meiji society from their fathers and older brothers, broke through this narrow framework. Instead of being merely trained, docile, external people, they began to emphasize their own personalities and humanity. Before this, the typical Meiji personality regarded the Japanese state as almost the only reality, as the only basis for his existence. Interestingly enough, the Sino-Japanese War led, together with the aspect of a heightening in national consciousness, to a heightening of individual awareness and the awakening of social consciousness. As we stated previously, the result was that the thought of the Meiji 30’s represented a confluence of three streams: nationalism, socialism, and individualism.

The triple division in the thought of the Meiji 30’s should not lead us to overlook certain accompanying facts. These three thought tendencies were not equally supported as systematic thought by the intellectuals nor were they given the same refining. Speaking concretely, among the three intellectual tendencies the one that received support from the most intellectuals, and was most significant intrinsically, was the thought concerned with individualism. The heart of the youth of this time was won by the individualism that ran in a straight line from Chogyū to Ryōsen. On the other hand, socialist thought or, better, the social movement, was limited in its implementation to a relatively small number of people. Nationalism and Japanism were regarded with indifference by the intellectuals. The Nihon Shugi Kyōkai, (Japanist Association), established by Hozumi Yatsuka in 1897, did not receive the support of the greater part of the intellectuals, and finally petered out. It is noteworthy that the intellectuals at this time ignored nationalism. It was unfortunate for both individualism and nationalism that the intellectuals at this time despised serious thinking about
national problems and were proud of their unconcern with these.

Takuboku wrote the following in criticism of Nagai Kafū’s *Shinkichiōsha no Nikki*, (The Diary of a Newly Returned Person):

I never felt as much displeasure as when I recently read this diary. In this work, the son of a small town rich person, having been in Tokyo a long time and having spent a lot of money, returns to his native place. While shiftlessly wandering about, he tells all the people he meets, in a thoroughly distasteful manner, that the local geishas are boorish and smell of the earth...[To Takuboku this is a symbol of the returned intellectuals dissatisfaction with Japan and the State.] In any event the question remains—is then the problem of the country really as slight a problem as some people seem to think it is? (And this is not only confined to the question of country.) Until recently, I too was one of those who thought so. Now for me to think about the country means to think about whether I should be in Japan or leave Japan....Everybody must think more deeply about such questions. People must think deeply about why they give obedience to the State, and even those people who find nationalist thought dissatisfactory must think more deeply about why they feel this way....I do not think all people must arrive at a conclusion similar to mine. Someone like Mr. Nagai ought to go to Paris. I, however, have for the first time been able to discover the link or connection between the Tokutomi Sohō of before and now.

The reference to Tokutomi concerned the transition in the latter’s thought from indifferentism to a form of Japanism.

In another essay Takuboku wrote:
The foundations of the Japanese state organization are deep and firm. In this Japan surpasses every country. Therefore, if there is here a person holding a serious doubt about the relations between the State and the individual this doubt or resistance has to be far more serious and deep than that held
by people in other countries. The naturalist movement, which has recently arisen among a segment of Japanese, has almost identical reason behind it as the attempt to rebel against traditional morality, thought, manners, and customs. It is its nature to direct doubt against the existing state authority. What is it that we can learn from these people? That this accursed and pitiably shallow thought has raised its head and avoided deep, firm, serious thinking. It laughs at loyalty between husband and wife and mocks those who take the State seriously. This is the tendency which has recently appeared among our youth!

At first Takuboku was fond of Chogyū; then he was drawn to Yosano Akiko; he then moved towards naturalism; and finally, stimulated by Kōtoku and the Great Treason Affair, he was attracted to socialism. His socialism was, from the very beginning, state socialism. Although the quotations given above theoretically belong to the period when Takuboku was under the influence of naturalism, in about 1910, he was even at this time attempting a critique of naturalism. It can be said that by 1909-1910 Takuboku was criticizing that intellectual attitude towards the State which was rooted in the Meiji 30’s (1897-1907). What Takuboku was criticizing was the tendency of the intellectuals to be proud of ignoring the question of Japan and the Japanese state and the fact that the intellectuals did not pay attention to the relation between the individual and the State. Takuboku felt the Japanese state organization was ancient, strong; its cohesive power was tremendous; and, consequently, criticism and rebelliousness against this too had to be deep and strong. The Japanese intellectuals, for the most part, did not do this. Instead they merely contented themselves with avoiding the problem of the State—in spite of the fact that the reality of their position was that they lived in Japan! That they ignored the State and at the same time lived within the State, meant that the Japanese intellectuals were leading a double life. And because their individualism did not adequately face up to the State it was rootless, incomplete and ineffective.
This problem can be seen from another angle. The misfortune was not solely confined to the intellectuals. It was possibly even a greater misfortune for the State that the intellectuals were indifferent to it. The State turned its back on the intellectuals, and they in turn avoided the State. International conditions and the domestic structure of capitalism encouraged the transformation of the State into absolutism. In opposition to the individualism which ignored and avoided the State, imperialistic nationalism, more and more irrationally, asserted its own absoluteness. We can, therefore, understand the increasing tendency of the State towards mysticism and we can understand the militarization of the State. This flowed from the relations between the State and the intellectuals. A change had taken place from the earlier period when the State had been observed, studied and criticized. Now, by law, by myth, and by the revival of ancient ethics the State was to be revered; it had become something to be obeyed submissively. One no longer explained the State, one believed in it! The new thought fused the Oriental Confucian conception of the State and the traditional Japanese Shinto-theocratic concept: the union of the political and the divine.

Of course, there were also elements which derived from the extraordinary complexity of Japanese foreign relations since the opening of the country and elements which came from the growth of capitalism. As brought out previously, that there was no adequate facing-up to the question of the State on the part of the intellectuals, led to the transformation of the Japanese State into a sacrosanct mystery. The Japanese state was changed from something which could be dealt with theoretically and logically into something which had to be obeyed. This imperative was backed by the forces of law, myth, and morality. The sudden emergence of Japan since the Meiji Restoration gave birth to confidence and even over-confidence. And it was of historical importance that the outstanding ability of the Meiji Emperor itself was basic to opening the way for emperor worship.
In the next section we will describe the erection of the legal structure of Japanese nationalism and we will trace the sacerdotalization of Japan. We will study the thought of Hozumi Yatsuka who established, and was the leading theoretician of, the civil code, which formalized the above.

We must first examine the debate and controversy over the code which took place in the Meiji 20's. A consequence of this debate was the civil code which was established in 1898 (Meiji 31). This civil code and the Meiji Constitution, which was promulgated in 1889, constituted the structure of the Japanese State. In the words of Hozumi Yatsuka, this new State was a "Family-State." And we may note with interest the paradox that the structure of the modern Japanese State was in reality that of an anti-modern State with very ancient origins. It was precisely this Familial State concept of the modern State which characterized the nationalist thought of this period.

We must go back to the Meiji 20's once again and take up the debate over the civil code. It was in the early years of the Meiji period that we find the origins of the later civil code. In 1868 one of the seven branches of the Dajōkan [Council of State], was the Seidoryō, [Office of Institutions]. In 1869 it became the Seidokyoku, [Department of Institutions]. In 1870, Eto Shinpei, who was in charge of the Seidokyoku, convened an assembly for the compilation of the civil code. Mitsu-kuri Rinshō was assigned to translate the French legal codes. He would translate one or two-pages and immediately these would be discussed by the group. Eto thought to promote the independence and prosperity of Japan through the twin instrumentality of the soldier and the law. In 1872, Eto was placed in charge of the Shihōkyo [Law Ministry] and more and more he came to work on the compilation of the civil code. At the time, Eto sought the advice of the French legal advisor, Bousequet, as to whether or not to effectuate a Japanese legal code patterned on that of France. Bousequet felt that there would not be the slightest obstacle in the way of doing this, since the French Civil Code was "in accord with the principle
of nature and the customs of men." Etō then urged Mitsukuri on; he said, "Mistakes in translation are not so important; the important thing is to get the code translated as quickly as possible." He also said, "When you translate the French Civil Code into Japanese, change the title, French Civil Code, into Japanese Civil Code—and immediately upon translating it have it distributed." There is today in the collection of the Keio University Library a Minpō-Sōan, (Draft Civil Code), which is a simple translation of the French Civil Code.

Succeeding Etō in 1873, Ōki Takatō was put in charge of the Law Ministry. Ōki felt that the traditional customs, feelings, and sentiments of the people should be taken into consideration, and laws like the kinship law and the inheritance law should be worked out so as not to injure venerable traditions and customs. The Tokyo Nichi Nichi Shinbun for September 10, 1880 carried an article which noted: "We expect that a law suitable to both the French Civil Code and Japanese customs and traditions will be enacted." And in 1887, at the same time that Mitsukuri Rinshō was compiling a civil code, a classified compendium of the customs and mores of every locality in Japan was being made. This was printed under the title Minji Kanrei Ruishū, (Collected Folk Customs and Mores). In 1880 an Office for the Compilation of the Civil Code was inaugurated in the Genrōin (Senate). It was under this Office that the Zenkoku Minji Kanrei Ruishū, (All-Japan Collection of Folk Customs and Mores), was published; this work was more complete than the earlier work. The draft, compiled in 1878, was the first complete draft of a legal code in Japan. Concerning its content, Kiyoura Keigo, at one time Legal Minister, wrote: "Beginning with its compilation and format and going into its contents this code is not very different from the French code." Consequently, Ōki enlisted the assistance of the French legal advisor Boissonade, who was in Japan, for the re-drafting of the civil code.

In 1886 the compilation work was transferred to the Foreign Ministry; in 1887 the work was once more placed in
charge of the Legal Ministry. Boissonade drafted the greater part of the code (most of the property section, the acquisition of property section, loans and mortgages section, section on evidence); Kumano Binzo was largely responsible for drafting the personal affairs section. Isobe Shirō drafted the various parts on inheritance, gifts, bequests, and common property—property between husband and wife—which came under the section on the acquisition of property. At this time, too, the materials compiled for the above-mentioned work on customs and mores were scarcely used. For example, in the section of the code referring to human affairs and the acquisition of property, and especially in the part on inheritance, there was only slight reference to the Japanese customs connected with the inheritance of household headship. Thus, many old usages were not taken into consideration. As Hozumi Yatsuka said, these were "the peak years for the natural law school of thinking in Japan." It was in this period (from the opening years of Meiji to the mid-years of the Meiji period) that more than one hundred works which followed French legal thinking were published.

Ōkuma Shigenobu stated that there were two reasons for compiling the legal code. The first reason was that Japan desired to stand on an equal footing with the West by gaining the revision of the unequal treaties which had been forced on Japan. The second reason was that the breakdown of the feudal system and the fact that the aims of each clan differed from those of its neighbors, made the old customary law unworkable and it became necessary to create a new unified legal structure. The civil code was to meet the internal necessity for the erection of a central authority; also it was absolutely indispensable for the revision of the unequal treaties that Japan acquire a legal code based on Western principles. This code derived from the pioneer modern European code, the Code Napoleon. It was quite natural under the circumstances therefore, that Japan would not seek to fit in any of its old customary law. The person who called for the resolute carrying
out of this civil code was Ume Kenjirō, [an expert on French law connected with the compilation of the legal code.] It was from the current slogan "Destroy feudalistic customary law" that we can know the character of this new civil code. The aforementioned slogan appeared in the statement on the aims of the Meiji Kai, (Meiji Society), which Ume founded. This civil code was promulgated in 1890 and put into effect in 1893.

In the Meiji 20's, there began to appear signs of tension in the Japanese nationalist spirit and this led to the rise of strong reaction against the French-style civil code. Even before the promulgation of the civil code, that is, in 1889, a feeling of hostility to the civil code was brewing. In 1889, at its spring meeting, the Hōgakushi Kai (Law Alumni Association) which was organized by the graduates of the Tokyo University Law Faculty as well as graduates of the law faculties of other Imperial Universities, published a resolution opposing the legal code which was then being compiled. This went as follows:

The compiling of codes in Europe is in the main nothing more than the editing of laws already in existence, and even where there are changes these are nothing more than revisions and emendations of old customs and laws. In our country, however, the compilation of the legal code differs since it makes the European systems a model. It is merely in name that the old customs and traditional Japanese law have been considered. In actuality, because of the newness of almost the entire system, there is no comparison between Europe and Japan in the degree of difficulty and in the gains to be derived from, the legal compilation...We feel that, because of the discarding of feudalism in our society and because of many reforms, change has become limitless. Since we are now concerned with laws, customs, and mores, and want to achieve a code which will take these into account, it should be neither one stemming from the old feudal system nor one chiefly patterned on the Western systems. This enterprise is extremely difficult; if we force its achievement it will run counter to the customs of the people and there is danger that
the legal complexities will cause anguish to the people. For
this reason, it would be best to establish special laws limited
to absolutely necessary cases and to wait, before completing
an overall legal code, for the folkways, customs, and mores
to be settled.

The society resolved to dispatch delegates to the various
cabinet ministers and to the head of the Privy Council to plead
the above-mentioned cause. This resolution was published at
the time in all the newspapers and sparked the debate on the
civil code. Following this, there was extremely sharp contro-
versy between those supporting resolute implementation and
those in favor of postponement. The postponement faction
attacked the code in every section, from the legal-technical as
well as the legal-theoretical angle. Among these, a representa-
tive essay of the extremely fierce criticism directed against the
code appeared in 1892. It stated:

Civil law is like language which always accompanies a nation
when it constitutes an independent body. Civil law is a
development of customs and mores and is not something
growing out of society after completion of a legal code. We
have a society which is over two thousand five hundred years
old, and this is all the more reason why we must have our
own unique civil law.

In these words emphasis was placed on the historical and folkic
character of law. It was this that the code, written under the
influence of the thoroughgoing individualism and cosmopolita-
ism of the French Revolution, was destroying. It was destroying
the traditional ethics, which from ancient times rested on the
principle of ruler and subject, the relationship between father
and child, and the precedence of husband over wife. Also, the
thought of the postponement faction was that the emphasis of
the new code on natural rights and the influence of Rousseau's
social contract theory were in opposition to the spirit of the
constitution and rights granted from above by the Emperor.

Hozumi Yatsuka was a lively participant in this debate
on the civil code and his opinion can be summed up in the
following two points:

(1) The civil code in its property law does not make the State supreme, but by making the individual supreme it sets up the ideal of the freedom of contract with no limitations. And for this reason, while it is an extremely potent instrument for increasing the productive power of society, it greatly widens the gap between wealth and poverty, it causes the development of conflict between capital and labor, and endangers the State. Therefore, it is necessary from a national point of view to infuse national spirit into the civil law.

(2) Japanese civil law wants to stipulate a folkic familial system and knit this together with modern European civil law which makes the individual supreme and places relations between husband and wife, between older and younger brothers, on an individual basis. However, according to the teachings of our ancestors, of chief importance in maintaining society must be the maintenance of a civil code in which the family has the most important position, a system in which the relationships are like those between father and child, husband and wife: a familial state system. Moreover, the ethics of Oriental countries have been produced by the family system and are supported by the family system. And the reason why the family system is supported by society is the power of this unique and unwritten civil law. It will be deplorable if we only pay attention to the individual and not to the family or State, and if we replace these with the spirit of fraternity (consequent upon the late 18th century European legal theory), and if we only follow foreign legal codes.

Hozumi Yatsuka also said:
I would ask the legal scholars, what is the standard used in their conception of the law of property? How do they conceive this law, from the standpoint of the national polity, from the economic standpoint, and from the ethical standpoint: If this indispensable question is not to be discussed, then we may as well establish a civil law speedily.

This appeared in an article on the standards of the civil law,
published in Hōgaku Shinpō, (Law Report), for April 28, 1893. Hozumi's famous work, the Minpo Idete Chūkō Horobu, (The Emergence of the Civic Law and the Annihilation of Loyalty and Filial Piety), was based on views of this nature. It was, however, the second point, the one on the relationship between the family system, ethics, and society, the unwritten civil law of Japan, as it were, which led Hozumi and the people of the postponement faction to oppose most vigorously the civil law. A popular saying of the time had it that, "The personal affairs section caused the postponement of the civil law; the civil law, the postponement of the commercial law." In 1892 the Diet decided to postpone the date on which the civil code would become effective until 1896. This period was also one in which the compilation of the code was re-worked. The first point—the property law and freedom of contract—remained as before; the second, the weaving together of the Japanese familial-state concept with European civil law concepts was greatly revised. The civil law which went into effect in 1898 was the civil law in effect in Japan until the end of the Second World War.

The circumstances surrounding the establishment of the civil code are of great significance in understanding the nationalism of the Meiji 30's.

The French Code, because of Napoleon's pretensions to being a successor to the Roman emperors, used materials from Roman law. Its compilation keyed not individualism and liberalism and hence was a code with strong individualist coloration. The German civil law also was more Roman than Germanic in its first draft. The character and guiding spirit of the Japanese code, which drew on the French Code and the German draft code, was a fusion of Roman, German, and French legal concepts. And for this reason it was quite natural that individualism would constitute its guiding spirit. The influence of European law was especially strong in property law and commercial law; these lost almost all of their folkic elements. Instead of the native Japanese elements, there now ran through the law a spirit of European-style individualism, which in prac-
tice meant the three general principles of the independence (or autonomy) of the individual intent, respect for individual property rights, and the doctrine of individual liability. (In tenancy, perpetual-lease, in farm proprietorship there was scarcely a trace left of old customs in relation to the property law and transactions law.)

The section on domestic relations in the civil code and the section on inheritance were, ever since the 1890 civil law, objects of special concern to the members of the drafting committee and to others connected with legislation. This was the result of the outcry from all quarters that the old customs and traditions should not be slighted. The committee took into consideration, and exerted itself to absorb, the information concerning folk customs and practices which had been assembled in the above-mentioned compilation from Ōki Takatō's period, the Zenkoku Minji Kanrei-shū. They also paid attention to post-Restoration customs, mores, laws, and judicial precedents. In 1890 they adopted European codes on inheritance and property, but they also exerted themselves to harmonize the good points of individualism with the traditional family system. Thus there co-existed in the civil code: (1) the section on property with provisions which were extremely individualistic, liberal (capitalistic and hence modernistic), and (2) the section on human affairs with provisions for the traditional family system (feudalistic). Both sets of provisions went into effect, and while there were contradictions between the old and the new they were also mutually dependent and came to be the instrument regulating the private law of the nation.

The relation between this kind of civil law and the Meiji Constitution, which was promulgated earlier, constitutes a problem. The Constitution represented the summation of the period of “culture and civilization” after the Restoration; the Constitution was the culmination, the fruit, of the movement for freedom and popular rights. Those who were dissatisfied with the Constitution, like Nakae Chōmin of the left-wing of the Jiyūtō, were few in number; the majority of the popular-
rightists were pleased. The spirit running through the popular rights movement—a liberalism oriented towards state power—was the spirit manifested by the Constitution. In other words, by guaranteeing the freedom of the individual the independence and prosperity of the State was to be expected. And, contrariwise, as a result of the authority and power of the State, the nation would be given individual rights and these would be guaranteed. The civil law of 1890, however, was different in its fundamental principles. Katō Hiroyuki stated the following in a speech in the House of Peers, May 26, 1892:

I can firmly assert that the principles of the Constitution and those of the civil code differ. This is seen in the fact that the spirit of the constitution and the rights of the people derive from the authority and sovereignty of the State, whereas, the spirit of the civil code rests on a popular rights foundation which derives from the natural law concept of the rights of man.

Since the Japanese now felt that the rights of the nation derived from the power and authority of the State, the civil law was re-compiled. In the civil code enacted in 1898 the family system was centered on the headship and succession-to-headship of the family. Marriage needed the consent of the family head, he also had the authority to designate the residence (domicile) for the family. Inheritance of the family estate was by the successor to headship of the family. The consent of the family head for entering or leaving the family was necessary, the system whereby the husband has authority and the wife is regarded as without legal capacity, the system of statutory marital property, the inequality of husband and wife in connection with grounds for divorce, the inequality of father and mother in terms of the parental authority over children, and also the authority of parents over children, were all included in the re-compiled code of 1898. Since the rights of headship, husbands, parents, and the other rights in the civil code were regarded as apportionments of the powers and authority of the State itself, these were not really rights but
powers deriving from the central repository of power, the State. Hozumi Yatsuka said that since these powers had about them a public law nature, domestic relations law was not private law but public law! Put differently, the household or family was from a legal standpoint governed by the powers parcelled out from the State power to the family head, parents, father, and thus the household was to all intents and purposes a feudal miniature State.

In this fashion the family-household, which was a vestigial feudal institution, was once more placed at the base of the modern State. The family-household was not considered a hangover from an earlier period; it was felt to have positive value for the new Japan; it was felt to be a structure without which the modern State could not be built. We can distinguish two periods historically: the Bakufu territorial-clan-system-state represents one period, and the familial system-state from the early years of Meiji down to the end of World War II (and even, substantially, down to the present), represents the other. This familial state system is different from the modern State of the West and from what the present [post 1945] Japanese constitution envisioned. That is to say, the modern nation-state has freed the nation from the family and the bonds of other pre-modern groupings and has erected a State based on the individual. In this sense the familial-state system of Japan differs from the modern Western State.

5. The Rise of State Worship

The Meiji Constitution and the Imperial Rescript on Education were both the results and the crowning achievements of the movement for civilization and enlightenment which swept Japan in the Meiji period. These two events also proclaimed the start of the later phase of the history of the Meiji period. The modern Japanese state structure now had "law" and "education" (moral education)—represented by the Constitution and the Rescript, respectively. There now began the attempt to organize the structure of modern Japanese society along familial lines.
Running through this law and moral education was the establishment of a familial-state system which constituted the goal of both. Thought in this period, as we will see, was nationalist thought, and in conjunction with this, militarist thought became imperialist.

To be sure, nationalist thought pervaded the entire Meiji period, even the movement for freedom and popular rights, which rested on individualist thought, was developed from an underlying nationalist spirit. Despite the way in which the advocates of popular rights expounded their "thought," their life-feelings, as previously described, remained nationalist. Systematic nationalist thought appeared even in the early Meiji period. It was, however, nothing more than a successor to the mystical-nationalist thought of the closing years of the Shogunate and, as such, contained almost nothing new or fresh. While this thought showed no strength during the period of Europeanization, it did serve to nourish the roots of the mystical-nationalist thought of the latter half of the Meiji period, the Meiji 30's and 40's.

One of the currents of nationalist thought of the Meiji 20's emerged as a reaction to individualism and socialism. After the Meiji 20's, however, and down to the 40's, the development of nationalist thought showed the following conspicuous trends which corresponded to the previously-mentioned establishment of a familial-state system:

1. The foundation of the Japanese state and society was conceived to be the "family." The morality of the family was made, by extension, the morality of the country. The preaching of "the harmony and unity of loyalty and filial piety," loyalty to the ruler, and patriotism, these became the nucleus of the "national morality."

2. Family and State, filial piety and loyalty: these were unified by means of "ancestor worship" which was encouraged at this time, and by the revival of the belief in the unity of history and myth. If Japanese history is traced back it becomes myth and, conversely, Japanese history originates in myth.
This is the Japanese mythico-historical view. This, then, was broadly the process whereby the sanctification of the State—the concept of Japan as a “God-Country,” and the deification of the Emperor—the concept of Imperial divinity—came about. In this fashion, there was born in Japan “the myth of the 20th century.”

3. This myth was not just one expounded by the folk, rather it was presented to the nation by the State as a new state-religion, belief in which was mandatory.

We can distinguish three periods, in this trend, the Meiji 20’s, 30’s, and 40’s. More precisely, the Constitution and Education Rescript mark the 20’s, the civil code the 30’s, and the revised national moral training or ethical training textbooks date from the 40’s. During these three periods there occurred the wars on which Japan staked her destiny, the Sino-Japanese War and the Russo-Japanese War.

The first period was one which was partially influenced by the rationalist tendencies of the age of the enlightenment, the earlier Meirokusha tendencies. This period was one in which there was propagated a nationalist thought which included newly-arisen romanticist tendencies. It was an age in which, on the basis of the national spirit, the national character and uniqueness strove to manifest itself. The second period, the Meiji 30’s, was one which was more retrogressive than the first. The family was the unit of Japanese society, and the family and the State were thought of as joined. It was during this second period that, together with the establishment of a family-state system, there was a renewed growth in nationalist thought. The third period—the Meiji 40’s—was one in which myth and history were joined, and the State encouraged the belief in its sanctity and established the idea of family-statism.

In the latter half of the Meiji period the Japanese state structure and its social organization were formed, it was a period in which the nationalist thought corresponding to this social and state structure emerged in completed form. This sacredness-of-the-state type of thought, which was forced on
the nation, was the original model for the two works published during the Pacific War: the *Kokutai no Hongi*, (Principles of the National Polity), and the *Shinmin no Michi*, (The Way of the Subject). The development of nationalist thought since the Taishō period (1912-26), was only an elaboration or embellishment of the thought which already reached perfection in the latter half of the Meiji period.

The idealogues of this type of nationalist thought were people like Kuga Katsunan and Miyake Setsurei for the first phase and people like Hozumi Yatsuka and Inoue Tetsujirō were central figures in the second and third phases. Hozumi exerted himself during the controversy over the civil code, and afterwards, to maintain the mechanism of a familial-state society from the legal standpoint. Acting in concert with Hozumi’s legalistic defense of the familial-state, Inoue Tetsujirō similarly defended the familial-state from the position of moral education; he was an exponent of a familial-state morality. Thus both Hozumi Yatsuka and Inoue Tetsujirō, as influential members charged with the revision of the national moral education textbooks in the period from 1908-1911, were active in the establishment and dissemination of familial-state nationalist thought.

Hozumi’s nationalist thought stemmed from the learning he acquired almost by birth, as it were. His grandfather, Shigemaro, was a samurai of the Uwajima territorial clan in the latter part of the Tokugawa era and a disciple of the National Scholar Motoori Ohira. As the only National Scholar in the Uwajima clan, Shigemaro took the lead in expounding the great principle of reverence for the Emperor, and it is said that his writing overflowed with patriotic fervor. He also devoted himself to education and was said to have bequeathed to his family hand copies he made of biographies of loyal subjects, filially pious children, and heroic, virtuous women. Hozumi’s father, Shigeki, studied the National learning under both Hozumi’s grandfather and Shishido Dairyu. At the time of the Restoration, the clan lord, Date Muneshige, reformed
the Meirin-kan clan school, for the first time instituting a faculty of National learning. Hozumi's father held a post here as an instructor and towards the close of his life he opened a private school devoted to the National learning.

Hozumi graduated from Tokyo University in 1883. In 1884 he went abroad to study. In Germany he studied European institutional history and public law. It was while he was a student in Germany that Ito Hirobumi and Inoue Kowashi were working out the details of the Constitution with painstaking and scrupulous care.

We can feel that the National learning type of nationalist thought of the latter Tokugawa period was, through Hozumi Yatsuoka, revived in Germanic guise. In support of this assertion, Takahashi Sakuei wrote in his book *Hozumi Yatsuoka-den*, (Biography of Hozumi Yatsuoka):

The instruction in the National learning he acquired as a child gave him insight into the profundities of the national polity. The teachings bequeathed to him by his father were carved on his brain; his intellect was moved by deep feelings of loyalty and patriotism. This upbringing and this sincerity were blended in sweet harmony with a proficiency in the intricacies of Western learning. Thus he entered the area of greatness; he transcended the verdict of the crowd and was able to contribute to the culture of the glorious reign of Meiji.

Hozumi contributed articles to the *Tokyo Nichi Nichi Shinbun* arguing for the sovereignty of the national polity (*Shuken Kokutai*), and the *Yūbin Hōchi Shinbun*, (Mail Intelligencer), he refuted the theories of the sovereignty of the people. These articles were written in the period when Hozumi was still a student at Tokyo University.

We will now examine Hozumi's thought more closely. First, we will attempt to trace chronologically the ripening of his statist thought. Hozumi's statist thought, or *etatisme*, was manifested in an essay he wrote in 1889-1890 called "Kokka Bannō Shugi," (The Doctrine of State Omnipotence). This was
immediately after he returned to Japan. The Meiji Constitution, which had been compiled on Imperial order, had just been promulgated. Hozumi interpreted the constitution from the standpoint of German statist thought, he espoused statism as opposed to individualism, he ardently proclaimed that the individual should be submerged in the State.

At this time, however, Hozumi did not deal with what was later to become of crucial importance in his statist thought, the "family." Even in his essay on the civil code, "Kokumin-teki Minpō", (The National Civil Code), which appeared in 1891, there was no evidence yet of his later state-socialism nor of his social-policy position. In this essay he did no more than advocate a more nationally or state-oriented civil code in the interests of the socially downtrodden. He felt that while the individualist-oriented civil code contributed to the development of Japanese capitalism, it also served to greatly increase the gap between wealth and poverty.

In August 1891 he wrote an article on the pre-Christian European family institution for Kokka Gakkai Zasshi [Vol. IV, No. 54]. In this article he wrote: "Our country is an ancestor-religion country, a family institution country. Authority, power, and law originate in the family." He also went on, "The state, too, is nothing more than an expansion of the family institution." Alluding to the civil code, since there was active debate over the extension of the date for its going into effect, Hozumi said: "Since the advent of Christianity the family is said to be constituted when a man and a woman establish a common residence on the basis of love. This is also the basis of our new civil code, but it is not the basis of our nationally characteristic traditional family institution." Therefore, Hozumi warned, the promulgation of the new civil code would mean the destruction of the Japanese national traditions of loyalty and filial piety. In this essay various concepts like family or—in its Japanese sense—country, loyalty and filial piety, ancestor worship, the idea of the "unbroken line of Emperors for ages eternal" all appeared. At this time, however,
the inner cohesiveness of these concepts was as yet inadequate; that is, how these various concepts were linked, was not yet made clear. Hozumi actually wrote, "Even supposing that the family institution proved inadequate, statism or nationalism can constitute the standard of a legal system."

At any rate, after 1891 Hozumi's position was essentially a German statist position influenced by his study in Germany. Nevertheless, he was already moving on to the concept of the familial-state. In 1892 with articles he wrote on "ancestor worship as the well-spring of the public law," (Kokka Gakkai Zasshi, Vol. V, No. 60), and on "the family system and the national polity," (Hōgaku Shinpō, No. 13), Hozumi was well on the way to the worship of the State via his assertions on the familial-state institution. He stated:

Reading European history and examining the record reveals that the founding of each country exhibits nothing more than the phenomenon of social upheaval. There is, thus, no special reason for worshipping the national polity of any given European country. The difference in our country is not merely limited to our having an immutable unbroken line of sovereigns. Our traditional religion, by the sanction of which we rectify our social order and worship our ancestors, also unites us into one country and one society presided over by the founder of the folk-family: the Imperial House. These points of difference and this historically-rare law, have sustained us these thousands of years. This patriotic sentiment underlies the founding of our country. When we desire to preserve society by the spirit of loyalty, filial piety, and ethical relations there is no device for doing this other than our ancestral religion.

The above is evidence of the growth of Hozumi's thought; it manifests his view of the Imperial House as the founding house for all the households in the nation. Paralleling this, were the symptoms of a growing attempt to see the beginnings of Japanese history in the Japanese mythology, to unite history and myth. In 1893 in his article "Minpō no Hon'i", (The Intent
of the Civil Law), (Hōgaku Shimpō, No. 25), Hozumi joined his earlier concept of a statist or national civil code to the concepts of the Japanese family institution and the unique national polity which he voiced in his article “Kasei Oyobi Kokutai”, (The Family Institution and the National Polity).

In 1896 in an article on the ethical uses of the law, (Hōgaku Shinpō, No. 62), Hozumi wrote:

In my opinion our country has been isolated in the Far East from time immemorial, and consequently its relations with foreign countries have not been intimate. Our country, thanks to its unique national sentiments, has been able to preserve its more-than-a-thousand-years-old national polity and society. This unique ethic is the means whereby the customs, mores, and usages of our society are constituted and which, as history attests, has brought the development of the life of our society and our national polity to perfection and effectiveness. Stated briefly, this ethic has its origins in ancestor religion. The Emperor is to the country as the family head is to the family. The great moral principle of ancestor worship, by extension, includes the progenitors of the nation. The obedience to the ancestral representative, the headship of the family is, inferentially, what we confer on the Imperial House as the extant progenitor of the nation.

Thus, gradually, Hozumi’s thought took shape and it was about this time that he began to deal with the questions of national education and national morality. In 1896 he wrote on national education for the Hōgaku Shinpō (No. 66) and in the New Year’s Day Tokyo Nichi Nichi Shinbun for 1897, Hozumi wrote on the national education. At the beginning of the latter article he commented on Article I of the Elementary School Ordinance, which stated: “The elementary school pays heed to the bodily development of children and has as its great objective the support of the usual intellectual skills and capacities indispensable for life, as well as the provision of a foundation for moral education and national education.”

Hozumi’s comment on this was:

— 381 —
It is characteristic of our country that its strength has grown by combining the doctrine of ordinary human morality with the doctrine of the nation.... Therefore, it needs no special pleading for us to realize that moral education and national education, which are the bases of morality and the nation, cannot be separated. It is, however, to be deplored that the present day concept of morality is easily distorted towards individualism and is at odds with the basic objectives of national education.

As compared with what he wrote in later years, in the above he still had not arrived at his national education-moral education position.

By the year 1898 (Meiji 31), in an article on the legal theory behind the concept of the "family" (Hōgaku Shinpō, No. 85), Hozumi staunchly advocated the sacerdotalization of the state and the divinity of the Emperor since he felt both were inseparably bound to ancestor worship.

The concept of the family has its origins in our characteristic folk-belief in our ancestors. The establishment of the family is dependent on our worshipping our ancestors, on obeying their remonstrances and reverencing their awesome spirits. Parents love their offspring, children are obedient to the protective authority of their parents. This natural rule, by extension, means that even when parents lose their bodily forms their spirits still live to protect their offspring. The offspring worship their combined ancestors—their parents and the original progenitors of their house—and under their august spirits constitute one harmonious corporate group. This type of family institution is the origin of the social order... The family is a continual religious service for the ancestors. The family head holds religious celebrations for the ancestral spirits, represents them in this world, and protects their offspring. The household is the residence of the ancestral spirits and the household head is their representative in this world. The family members are under the protective authority of the family father and are thus under the au-
tority of the ancestors. Parents and children are not merely involved in a this-worldly, blood relationship, a relationship which—corresponding to the obligations of a given social status—merely means that children are obedient in exchange for parental love and protection. The family head, having his vocation or calling from the ancestors, has the duty to protect the ancestral offspring. The members of the family, in their obedience to the ancestral spirits, submit to the authority of the head of the household....Stated more precisely, the family constitutes the ancestral votive tablets and the ancestors thus exist continually with the members of the family....This is the pure concept of the family....Our national polity, stemming from remote antiquity, is governed by the family institution. The family expanded becomes the country; the country in microcosm is the family. To clarify the family institution is the reason for making clear the national polity. Our nation is a united folk stemming from common ancestors, submitting to the august spirits of these ancestors by whom we are endowed with life. The Throne is the residence of the spirits of our folk ancestors and the Imperial Scion represents the Imperial Founder and is protected as the beloved offspring of the Imperial Progenitor. We loyal subjects, in submitting to the Imperial Scion of the Unbroken Line, thereby, submit to the august spirits of our common folk ancestors. This constitutes the great essence of the national founding upon which is based the confidence of our folk. And when we reflect on our family institution which is the very fundament, we can not be indifferent to whether the family institution is maintained or abolished!

In the foregoing we can finally say Hozumi Yatsuka's familial-statism emerged in completed form. It may also be noted that at precisely the same time, in 1899, Hozumi's elder brother, Nobushige, spoke to the same effect in a lecture on "Ancestor Worship and Japanese Law" which he gave to an assembly of international orientologists meeting in Rome.

In 1900 Hozumi Yatsuka showed clear signs of Emperor
worship. He wrote in an article on the spirit of the Constitution:

The founding of our country is established on the basis of a racial folk and is unified by ancestor worship. The family is constituted on the basis of common parentage and this is the origin of society. By the extension of this thought, the folk, having common ancestors and worshipping these ancestors, constitute, under the hegemony of these august spirits, a blood kinship. This is the basis of the folkic founding of our country. The natural sentiments of love and respect for parents, protection for children, by extension, come to comprise the harmonious racial State. Just as the parents are the natural heads of the family, so in the State the natural sovereigns are the common progenitors of the folk. In our unbroken line of emperors, the original head of the folk-family is the august spirit of the Imperial Ancestor, and the Imperial Scion, as the direct descendent and representative of this spirit of the Imperial Progenitor, rules over his beloved offspring. The Imperial Scion is holy, by virtue of the divinity of the Imperial Progenitor. By virtue of the august spirit of the Imperial Progenitor, the authority of the extant Emperor is inviolate. Moreover, the supreme authority of the family-state exists by virtue of the love and protection of the ancestral spirits for their offspring, the folk. This power and authority is not solely for the benefit of the extant father-Emperor. This, then, is the glory of our national polity, the ground on which our country rests.

Here we see a marked strengthening in the tendency to transform the Imperial institution into a mystic entity, sacred and "inviolate." Hozumi later expanded his concepts of the Imperial institution and the family-state still further. On July 14, 1909, (Meiji 42), Hozumi attended an All-Japan Middle School Principals Conference and gave an address on the education of national morality. There no longer was any dualism, any clash between national education and moral education as had existed in former years. He repeatedly said about his
doctrine which had transformed the State into a "mystery" that Japan's family-statist cohesiveness is "for the purpose of competing in the world"; and, "With this firm cohesiveness we will be able, in the fierce competition with the societies of the great powers of the world, to attain more and more prosperity." It is also obvious that this prepared the way for ideological union with militarism.

The significance of filial piety to parents, and of reverence to ancestors, is that these become by extension the concept of loyalty to the sovereign, the concept of patriotism. Basically, loyalty and filial piety are a unity; the concept of the family, the concept of the country too are a unity. To carry this one step further, when we think this way the concept of self, of ego, is assimilated into the family-state society; and we, as fragments of this whole—the family-state society—have it as our basic duty to contribute to this whole. This, I feel, is the concept which must be well taught.

He was now preaching the unity of loyalty and filial piety with loyalty to the sovereign and patriotism. We might add that loyalty and filial piety antedate the modern national state. "Loyalty" meant the traditional Confucian loyalty to one's superior in either the feudal Japan or the imperial Chinese society. Here Hozumi made a transition, he connected the modern national state with the deep-rooted feudal concept of loyalty which still was powerful in Japan. This is what he meant by saying, "loyalty is patriotism and love of country."

There were many at this time who thought in identical fashion. The opinions of these people strongly favored the interests of the State. Examples of this can be seen at the time of the revision of the national moral education textbooks. These people were extremely dissatisfied with the Rescript on Education for 1904. This rescript was the basis for compiling the first national moral education textbooks in Japan. Higashikuze Michitomi, Tanaka Fujimaro, and Nomura Yasushi presented an "Opinion Concerning the Mombushō's Elementary School Moral Training Textbooks." They severely took to task "these
scriptures of national morality which have no consistency from a spiritual standpoint and are confined to being merely handbooks on good manners in everyday life!” They wrote: The great moral principle of loyalty and filial piety gives rise to the natural sentiment of love for our Imperial House and our country. This great moral principle is the unified spiritual faith of our folk and is truly the glory of our national polity. Irrespective of all varieties of religions, and moral theories, this great moral principle makes for independence and is an eternal characteristic of the Japanese people. This is what must be handed down to endless generations. It is clear that the Mombushō’s moral education texts do not basically intend to slight this principle. It cannot be felt, however, that the reader is given an especially deep impression of this great moral principle.

When we make a detailed survey of all the sections devoted to the principle of loyalty and filial piety and the principle of loving and cherishing the Imperial House and the country, we see that the elaborations on these themes in general do not go beyond a simple focussing of attention on the relations between individuals. These sections neglect to foster eternally important concepts.... A special characteristic of our people is that they look up to the Father-Ruler. He exists for us as a living person at the same time we do and directly protects us, but besides this, we also regard the Imperial Throne, the Imperial House of the Unbroken Line, as sacred. Our people love not only the persons of their parents who exist in the present, but their families as the families of their ancestors. Because these texts attempt to demonstrate, in explaining our duty towards the Father-Ruler and the Family-State, that we should love and respect these solely by virtue of the direct thanks we owe these, a debt of gratitude similar to the obligation we have towards our friends, they leave something to be desired in terms of transmitting to our descendents our unique national ideals.

In answer to this criticism, the Education Minister replied:
"We should pay adequate attention to the purport of the honest advice of these three gentlemen; there is in their advice that which can contribute to reforms."

In addition to the foregoing criticism, there was published in 1905 by the Nihon Kōdō Kai, which society has been mentioned in connection with Nishimura Shigeki, an "Opinion on the National Moral Education Textbooks." The main points presented were: (1) deficiency in the fostering of virtue and moral character in connection with the State and the Imperial House; (2) inadequacy in fostering respect for the gods; (3) inadequacy on the score of cultivating virtuous behavior towards family and kin.

The Imperial House and the State in our country, of themselves, constitute one body. Since our national polity is one in which there is no State apart from the Imperial House and the Imperial House does not exist apart from the State, loyalty to the ruler is patriotism and patriotism is loyalty to the ruler. The national moral education textbooks, however, do not sufficiently make clear that, at the bottom, loyalty to the ruler and patriotism are one and not two. This criticism, too, was based on dissatisfaction with an incomplete family-state ideology.

As a result of the criticism based on the thought of those holding the same views as did Hozumi Yatsuka, the revision of the national moral education textbook took place. The national textbooks of 1904 were subjected to revision in the period from 1908 to 1911. And if we compare the 1904 books to the later ones, the latter contain, in worked-out form, the doctrine of the family-state. More precisely, in the older textbooks there were chapters dealing with "Freedom of Others," "Progress of Society," "Competition," "Trust," "Money," etc.; these were left out of the new moral education textbooks. In place of these, the new texts contained headings like "Kōtai Jingū," [The Great Shrine at Ise Dedicated to the Sun Goddess Amaterasu]; "Founding of the Country"; "The Glory of the National Polity"; "Guard and Maintain the Imperial Prosperity";
“The Unity of Loyalty and Filial Piety”; and “The Teachings of Our Imperial Ancestors.”

In the fourth edition of its prospectus on the amended national moral education textbooks, the Mombushō explained these changes listed above as follows:

The former moral education textbooks gave much attention to fostering the concept of loyalty and filial piety, which is the axis of our national morality. Every volume of the old edition certainly made mention of matters connected with the Imperial House. Besides this, there was a suitably proportional distribution of sections dealing with such topics as ‘The Rising-Sun Flag’; ‘The Empire of Great Japan’; ‘Religious Holidays and National Holidays’; and ‘Ancestors.’ The present revisions strive still more for the fostering of this kind of spirit: as early as the second-year texts [grammar school], they take up topics like the ‘Kōtai Jingū’ and ‘Revere the Ancestors,’ and in the third year and beyond, the topics of the old texts have been greatly expanded.

In December, 1910, at the request of the Mombushō, Hozumi Yatsuka held an address for educators in charge of moral training texts. These educators were meeting at the Mombushō for a special orientation course. The topic on which Hozumi spoke was “The Main Points of National Morality” (in terms of the texts to be used for the third year of higher school). In September, 1911, Hozumi held a talk on “The Objective of National Morality” for the Tokyo City School System’s principals who were convening by Mombushō directive. In July, 1911, the Hombushō convened an assembly of educators of the normal schools, middle schools, and girls higher schools for orientation lectures. This took place at the Law School of Tokyo Imperial University, and the group was addressed by officials designated for the task by the Mombushō on the topic “The Essence of National Morality.”

The purport of these three speeches was basically the same. There was agreement with the idea of the complete revision of moral education textbooks. Hozumi said:
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The subject matter of my talk is the essence of our national morality. The middle school instruction programs promulgated this morning by Mombushō Directive No. 15, have as their object to assist what I feel is the essence of national morality. In this education program, in the section on moral training subjects for the fourth and fifth years of middle school, and, especially, at the end of the section on moral training texts, there are presented topics related to the essence of our national morality, like, 'The Origins of Our National Morality'; 'Ancestor Worship'; 'The Unity of Loyalty and Filial Piety'; and 'Patriotism and the Duty to One's Country.' Gentlemen, as you know, of course, these topics are the main object of moral training instruction in the middle school education. And it is on this subject that I wish to speak today.

He went on to explain the doctrines relating to the inviolateness and sacredness of the Emperor and the State. In effect, he said that since both sovereign and subject had the same ancestor, the Imperial House was "the founding house of the nation"; the Imperial House was "the progenitor of the nation." In this sense, the sovereign power of the State, which adheres to the Emperor, was an expansion of the authority adhering to the head of a household as the living representative of the ancestral authority. Thus the family or the household is the country in microcosm and the country is the household in macrocosm. The unity of family and State, which constitutes our family-state, is what is unique about the founding of our country. Herein, in this national founding, lies the unity of loyalty and filial piety; herein, loyalty to the sovereign becomes the same as love of country, patriotism. He further stated that the fact of the unity of contemporary households with the Imperial Household arises on the basis of the myth that the households of the nation are an outgrowth from the original Imperial House. History thus pushed back into the past, into the remote past, became myth; myth was conceived as the origin of history.
In this connection Hozumi stated:
Since our national polity is the crystalization of our unique system and our unique moral concept...in desiring eternally to transmit this national polity we must make clear this unique legal system and the moral concept on which the national polity rests...An important purpose of national education is to make this clear to all our people. It is to be hoped that the middle school instruction programs instituted this morning by Mombushō directive, will also include this object.
Hozumi Yatsuka's thought, just as it stands, shows the development of nationalist thought in the latter half of the Meiji period.

It is interesting to note the contrast between Hozumi Yatsuka and Inoue Tetsujirō. Hozumi added German statist legal thought to his own traditional National Learning upbringing, and, to support the family-state juridically, he exerted himself to establish a nationalist, or state-oriented, law. Inoue exerted himself to establish a *nationalist moral education* backed by the family-state morality which rested on his Confucian upbringing.

It is not necessary to go into particulars on the development of Inoue's nationalist thought. We will confine ourselves to mentioning his *Kokumin Dōtoku Gairon*, (Outline of National Morality), which he published in 1911 (Meiji 44).

Inoue, in explaining the family-state system, distinguished between a general family system and a particular family system. The individual family, taken, that is, family by family, he considered as being in the *particular family system*. The Japanese state he regarded as a composite, as the *general family system*. Thus, he argued, the ethical principle of filial piety, which is an attribute of the particular family system, and the principle of loyalty, which adheres to the general family system, together, form a unity and underlie the Japanese national polity. Inoue strongly urged the necessity for protecting the particular family system which is the base of the general family system "in order to preserve and maintain our national polity." It goes without
saying that Inoue's thought contributed greatly to the growth of mysticism in connection with the State, and to the increasing sanctification of the State.
PART VI
After 1910

CHAPTER I
NATSUME SÔSEKI, MORI ŌGAI, AND NATURALISM

1. The Significance of Naturalism

In this chapter we will examine the part played by naturalism in the history of Japanese thought. As a movement, naturalism dominated the Japanese literary world from 1906 to 1911 and then rapidly gave ground to other literary intellectual trends. In this brief period it demonstrated such vigor that scarcely any literary figure was untouched and yet naturalism was doomed to be ephemeral.

Attempting to assess its significance, some writers maintain that naturalism was merely a spiritual costume which adorned the history of thought in Japan for a season. They feel that it neither possessed any inner necessity, nor did it sink roots in the Japanese spiritual climate. To some, naturalism was nothing more than one novelty among many which held the attention of the Japanese intellectuals. Certainly this cannot be denied, for the fact remains that naturalism was a fleeting phenomenon in the literary world and it was replaced by other trends before it produced many outstanding works. After frankly acknowledging this, however, we must also admit that naturalism was responsible for a great transformation in the Japanese way of thinking; the emotions, feelings, and, indeed, the ethos of the Japanese, underwent a profound alteration.

In the period after the opening of the country, the Japanese were able to set up the structure of a modern State; this was true in a formal sense and also in a deeper and more fundamental
sense. With modernity as a keynote, the Japanese succeeded in establishing a military system and a legal system. Success also attended their efforts to foster the development of modern industry; the victory in the war against Russia was proof of this. In their thought patterns, however, in social usages, mores and conventions, and, above all, in the life of the emotions, the old Japan lived on. The great transformation worked by naturalism is readily apparent precisely in these areas. We can conclude that while the old Japanese sensibilities were not entirely extinguished after naturalism had run its course, they lost much of the normative force they once exercised over the society. This was especially true in the urban centers.

Literature is one of the most direct expressions of the consciousness of society. And we may note that in this area once naturalism declined and was replaced by other trends, literature never went back to the pre-naturalist period. The new trends—neo-idealism, humanism, neo-romanticism, aestheticism—were trends which had themselves been forged by naturalism, or, were reactions to naturalism, or, were variations on naturalism.

In September 1911, at the time of the collapse of naturalism, Shimamura Hōgetsu said:

Our literary world stands now on the threshold of an autumn in which once again new things can freely emerge ..... This time the surge will be quantitatively different from the last time; the changes and upheavals of the last four or five years [referring to the naturalist movement in literature] were more fundamental. This time the vicissitudes and surge will be based on the same winds and currents. The word reality keynotes the naturalist school, true value will be perceived only in what is not apart from this. All are waves within this keynote: reality.

The fundamental stress of these words was not mistaken; the naturalist trend was an entirely modern line of departure. The trend to naturalism, the development of modern science and
the growing complexity of the life of society, are the unavoidable destiny of modern man. In this sense, naturalism which stands on a par with romanticism and idealism, also, as modernism, confronts medievalism and feudalism. Japanese naturalism too possessed this dual nature: a romantic, idealist sense and yet, as a modernist phenomenon, opposition to medievalism and feudalism. The incompleteness of the naturalist movement was a consequence of its shallow concepts. Its adherents conceived of it as simply a struggle between old and new forces within the literary world. There is, therefore, some justification for the criticism which naturalism incurred at that time, that it was a leaping at novelty; a worship of newness without any determinate viewpoint, that it was a movement imported from abroad and that it nowhere evidenced maturity.

Japan, by entering the modern world and joining in the community of Western nations, could not but receive a baptism of naturalism. Though naturalism did not arise spontaneously in Japan, its character was such that once Japan had been exposed to it she had to choose whether to enter the camp of naturalism or to oppose it. Despite everything, this was a problem of the period. We must acknowledge that there is great significance in the rise of naturalism after the Russo-Japanese War.

There are two ways of looking at this phenomenon. The first of these is that the tension aroused by the outside world which had never been absent from Japanese minds since the opening of the country was eased with the victory over Russia. After the victory over Russia the tight national unity which was a consequence of the instinct for self-preservation was loosened. The other way of looking at the adoption of naturalism is to regard it as a consequence of the tiredness of the Japanese after the war. The victory gained was not an overwhelming one. After fighting beyond their capacity and expending their entire strength, the Japanese, though victorious, were like fallen heroes. Japan lay prostrate, gasping for breath.
This exhaustion, this enervation, was the basis for the acceptance of naturalism. These, then, constitute the two views on Japan's adoption of naturalism after the Russo-Japanese War: naturalism resulted from a loosening of tension because of military victory, or utter exhaustion and spiritual lethargy led to the adoption of naturalism.

These two positions, while completely different—one is optimistic and the other pessimistic—are both justified. The one stems from a powerful self-confidence; the other is based on the exhaustion and sense of disillusion engendered by the victory in the Russo-Japanese War. In both cases we see that now, for the first time, attention was withdrawn from the country and was devoted to the individual. Those who had been intent on advancing, on pressing forward, came to a standstill. They looked at themselves and at the world about them and became lost in thought.

If we assume that human spiritual needs are divided into truth, beauty, virtue, and wisdom, then the dominant characteristic of modern times is the strength of the quest for truth. And in this desire for truth there were two factors which exerted great influence on Japanese emotional life: the drive for civilization and enlightenment after the opening of the country and naturalism after the Russo-Japanese War.

The enlightenment type of naturalism which dominated the period of civilization and enlightenment jolted feudalistic feelings and as such possessed truly great significance. This naturalism, however, did not necessarily penetrate the spirit. The spiritualism of the Meiji 20's and the religious trend of the 30's were, broadly speaking, anti-naturalist trends. Finally, the spiritual need to quest truth assumed the form of speaking the truth concerning oneself. It was extremely significant that naturalist works were produced which took the form of speaking openly of what had hitherto been secret, that it took the form of confession of the inner life.

In the work *Hakai*, Ushimatsu breaks his father's command
to keep secret his origin in a village for outcasts. In the introduction to *Futon*, (The Quilt), Tayama Katai said: "I too felt I wanted to traverse a painful road. I felt I would struggle bravely against the world and against myself. I would attempt to disclose these things, the hidden things, the concealed things—even if thereby my spirit were demolished."

Not to speak of oneself was the type of moral behavior which had hitherto been characteristic, was in a sense one of the accouterments, of the older generation. This behavior was supported by the moralistic ethos which was universal in Japanese society. It was a fact that a person was shackled both by the ethos of social custom and by the possibility of disgracing himself should he rebel against these customs. In view of this, to speak of oneself was a negative challenge to social custom.

Natsume Sōseki, whom we will take up later, spoke of "romanticist morality" in connection with this type of social custom. In contrast to romanticist morality stood what was called "naturalist morality." To speak of oneself, to disclose reality, was what was manifested in the literature of naturalistic morality. The past, then, was characterized by a social custom which was designated as "romanticist morality," and the naturalist movement's "naturalist morality" centered on the ego and was a morality based on the nature of the human ego. While speaking of oneself, one was released from the regulative power of romanticist morality and became free within one's emotional life.

It cannot be denied that naturalism brought about a complete change in Japanese emotional life, in the Japanese ethos, and was the catalytic agent which caused the residues of the past to be swept into discard. This is the greatest intellectual historical purport of naturalism: it afforded the Japanese the opportunity to develop a new norm after sweeping away the old ethos which had hitherto held them bound. In this liberation of Japanese spiritual life from the dead spirit of the past, the modernization of the fifty years since the opening of Japan
finally achieved a solid foundation. Clearly, a line must be drawn between the periods before and after naturalism. While the change was imperceptible, the significance it possessed is of great importance. We can agree with Tayama Katai, one of the central personalities of the naturalist movement who wrote: “We today can say that the sweeping incursion made on the currents of thought by the Russo-Japanese War and the end of the century caused Japan to become different from what she had been.”

2. The Character of Naturalism

In the foregoing it was stated that Japanese naturalism consisted of two aspects. In one sense it stood alongside such movements as romanticism, idealism, and aestheticism as one of the modern literary streams of thought; the other aspect was that, possessing identical meaning as modernism itself, naturalism (like modernism) was a stream of thought confronting feudalism and medievalism. The adherents of the naturalist movement probably had no consciousness of this dualism; otherwise the history of Japanese naturalism would have been different by far. Naturalism exerted great force as a catalyst and led to a complete break with the old Japan in the areas of the social ethos and the emotional life. Indeed, it was after naturalism that Japan entered the modern age in the true sense.

In this section we will examine naturalism from the standpoint of intellectual history; we will not concentrate on it as a literary history phenomenon. When, however, we do look at naturalism as a literary movement, we cannot help facing a dilemma concerning its origin. Even among the writers of the naturalist movement there is no consensus on this question. That naturalism was born in the smoke-filled Ryūdokai was what Chikamatsu Shūkō said. Shimazaki Tōson said concerning the Ryūdokai:

We speak of the naturalist movement. However, while we frequently met together on the second floor of the Western-
style restaurant called Ryūdoken and had many discussions on modern art and literature, these gatherings were chiefly connected with our mutual friendship. And I cannot make a distinction as to what part of these gatherings was *amity* and what part *movement*.

Among those gathered under the banner of naturalism there was not the clarity of position, the sense of commitment, found among the Marxists. Tentatively, we will examine writers like Kunikida Doppo, Shimazaki Tōson, Tayama Katai, Masamune Hakuchō, Iwano Hōmei, and Tokuda Shūsei. They can all be regarded as representative followers of naturalism. We must see what was common to them, but we must also recognize that their views of nature were remarkably diverse.

Kunikida Doppo said “I have been regarded by the critics as a naturalist. Yet in my work up till now I do not know what a naturalist is; I only know that my work is a product of what I see and what I believe.” Doppo also said:

What the naturalists manifest in their works, or what they advocate in the literary world today, is entirely different from Wordsworth’s naturalism. At very least Wordsworth was unable to regard man and nature separately; he was unable to think separately about this wonderful nature and life. Among our naturalists, however, there is man and there is life; but while hitherto they have looked at society they have not apparently looked into the bosom of nature, which is for man the greatest of all facts.

It goes without saying that the naturalism of Doppo was close to Wordsworth’s. At this point the continuous relationship between man and nature was still effective. Rather than set up the ego against nature, the ego was absorbed in nature and Doppo attempted to harmonize, to integrate, with nature. He wrote:

This great universe, eternal and wonderous, this great nature, eternal in its flux of life and death: struggle as we may, we cannot escape from it. Whatever sentiments intellectuals
may cherish concerning the true nature of the great reality they confront here, their attempts to reproduce—even with the greatest of skill—this reality, can be little more than a stunt. In view of this, of what value are the arts and literature? What is the worth of this so-called naturalism?

It is also clear that Kunikida Doppo’s naturalism was not focused on man’s instincts, on his brute-nature. Doppo’s "nature" was more than this: it was the eternal wonderous universe around us that he spoke of, and it was his desire to fuse with this deep unknowable universe. And, of course, Doppo was not thinking of the struggle of the ego against the world. His type of naturalism had fatalistic undertones.

Doppo was really an exception; however, the other writers, too, were not uniform in their views on naturalism. Tōson’s naturalism, for example, was free from the bonds of society, morality, and religion, but was not morbid or unhealthy. Tōson’s naturalism pointed at the fullness, the richness, of human life. To Iwano Hōmei, the ultimate of nature was to be found in the dawn period of the world when there was no separation between flesh and spirit. Katai, who stood in the van of the naturalist movement, constitutes a problem; it is not clear how he conceived naturalism. At first Katai apparently regarded naturalism as being largely in the same category with instinct; in his later years he came to see nature as universal flux, in the fact that everything was temporal. In view of this diversity of opinion on nature, we must find some other basis for defining the naturalist movement.

It is obvious that there was no common consciousness among writers concerning anything about naturalism. This was not only the case with writers, it was even true for the critics who were supposed to be giving theoretical leadership to the movement. When works like Morita Sōhei’s Baien, (Soot and Smoke), Nagatsuka Takashi’s Tsuchi, (Earth), are brought to mind, we see the truth of Tōson’s statement that it was not clear whether naturalism was a literary movement or a mere
grouping of friends. We must, however, push our enquiry further and see whether these people were not more than a group of friends.

In 1916, when some ten years had elapsed since the rise of naturalism and the movement was nothing more than a name, Shimamura Hōgetsu wrote:

... What was the most profound spiritual need evidenced by the youth and also by people who were in their prime at that time? To this day this is still not explicable. Various people, of course, have attempted to affix a name to it in the course of these ten years, and yet, looking back today, there has not been one unshakably precise name for it. Perhaps the name of this spiritual need can not be permanently affixed.

An extremely universal name which was given to this almost indescribable spiritual need was reality. Yet reality is not a term which can basically define inner content; it is nothing more than a temporary or provisional makeshift. Fortunately, however, in terms of epitomizing the attitude, the frame of mind behind this spiritual need, reality was an extremely appropriate name. Naturalism was essentially a movement through which we attempted to discover our spiritual needs in artistic and literary reality. Accordingly, it was a movement which tried to smash all the forms and conditions which would block this reality.

Most people would agree that the fundamental requisite of naturalism was this quest for reality. However, the expression "reality," as Hōgetsu pointed out, was nothing more than a broad generalization. A more refined or precise description would be to think of its as a quest for the reality of human nature. We stated previously that naturalism was the artistic-literary expression of the human need to quest the reality of human nature. Of course, the limiting expression "human nature" includes both a positive and a negative sense. We will make this clear in terms of the history of naturalism.
There were three stages in the history of Japanese naturalism. The first of these lasted from the formative period of naturalism until the appearance of the novel Hakai; a novel of epoch-making significance. The second stage was represented by Katai’s Futon. We may say that if Hakai cleared the way for naturalism, then Futon for the first time gave naturalism a definite direction. That is to say, what had been vague in Hakai assumed a clearly expressed form in Futon. It was in this novel that naturalism attained the phase of clear-cut disillusionment, that naturalism entered a destructive phase with respect to the old ways and customs. In the third phase, the appearance of Masamune Hakuchō’s Doko E, (Whither), meant that naturalism was now asserting itself positively. In this period naturalism reached a constructive stage, as distinct from the earlier period in which it could offer no more than “skepticism” and “confession.”

1. The formative period of naturalism. To examine this period, we must go back to the Meiji 20’s and the beginning of the 30’s. It goes without saying that the literary world of the 20’s was dominated by the work of Kōda Rohan and Ozaki Kōyō. The Kenyūsha, of which Kōyō was the central personality, was the literary arbiter of this period. The Kenyūsha, Rohan, Kōyō, constituted what could, in a sense, be called a literary guild. They were dominated by the old-style customs and usages. In literature these were expressed as a partiality towards light jests, witticisms, flippancies (the mannerisms of the older literature), or in terms of the extraordinarily formal relationships between disciples and masters. This held true for them because they were under the influence of their rearing under the old morality. Yet it was in the midst of this period that the youth who were to bear the burden of the succeeding period were assiduously preparing for their role.

Mori Ōgai’s varied enlightenment activities gave them guidance. But what especially served to stimulate them and lead them into the new literature was the work of two people: Hase-
gawa Futabatei, and Kitamura Tōkoku. Futabatei opened the eyes of the young men of letters to the new prose literature. A passage like: “Autumn! The sound of an empty cart resounded to the heavens . . . ,” was read over and over again, and was copied by naturalist writers like Katai, Doppo and Tōson. They were proud of their infatuation for the new literature which, surprisingly, had demonstrated that Japanese words could express delicacy and could be precise. Tōkoku’s activities breathed a new spirit into the atmosphere of the literary world of that time. In the end, however, he was a broken man and committed suicide. In Shimazaki Tōson, Tōkoku found someone to carry on in his footsteps.

Tōson’s Haru, (Spring), Katai’s Sei, (Life), Doppo’s Azamukazaru no ki, (Memoirs), make us realize how full of agony the youth of these men was. To blaze a trial to the new age they had to walk lonely and isolated paths, they had to ignore the anguish involved. Tōson wrote:

The period of our youth was one in which somehow a fresh start had to be made in everything. As for myself, the further I went, the more I came to question the harmonizing thought of that period. It was probably the youthfulness of my feelings, but I thought that genius is like gold, which cast into a blazing fire yet cannot be burned. How was the creativity of genius to be fused and harmonized? Could the artistic and literary splendors of East and West, the works of genius which differed in their essences, in their careers and development, be brought together? Was it possible to accomplish this by casting them into a common furnace?

Tōson did not stand alone in this. Katai wrote: “It was the period from 1897 to 1899. We no longer felt it necessary to lean on anything else . . . In my case, as well as in the case of Kunikida Doppo and Shimazaki Tōson, this was basically clear; we had previously discovered the way along which we should travel.”

The question arises as to how these men chose the paths
along which they felt they should travel. In reflecting on the maturing of Töson’s character, we cannot disregard the years he spent as a student at the Meiji Gakuin. Religious conversation, which was never in the true sense of a sudden “meeting with God,” the break with the faith, the conflict between God and nature, and finally the process of awakening to an awareness of nature, all this was freshly portrayed in Haru and in Sakura no Mi no Jukusuru Toki. What can be noted here is that the first step in Töson’s spiritual wandering began by doubting the Christian faith.

He wrote, for example:

Sutekichi [the character who represents Töson] to the question, ‘You’re a Christian?’, could not answer as formerly when he had been baptized in the Church of Mr. Asami. By this time he had largely withdrawn from the type of Christian believer’s life which consisted in going to appointed meeting-houses Sunday after Sunday and listening to sermons. He had largely ceased to feel he had to sing hymns; he had even quit praying before meals. ‘Well, then, you don’t believe in God?’ To this question Sutekichi wanted to answer that his quest for God had been crude, he had made a mistake in being baptized, and that now he wanted to receive his real baptism. And further, Töson wrote:

I wonder why God created this wonderful world, why He made some things beautiful and others especially ugly? Why did He put the hawk alongside the sparrow, the wolf by the sheep, the weasel by the chicken? I wonder why a ‘God of Peace’ endowed His church with interminable strife, why did He set rich presbyters and impoverished deacons to quarreling?

Sutekichi meditated thus: ‘Thou shalt not commit adultery; thou shalt not violate a virgin; these and all other types of immorality are warned against by the Lord Jehovah. It cannot be felt that Byron’s life was one which in the long run was in praise of God. When the English poet journeyed to
Italy did not the mothers of Venice who had nubile daughters shut the windows of their homes against that dissolute man? Despite this, I wonder why the pessimist Byron’s poems captivate one’s heart so? What is their power of attraction? And, even though his deportment was so unseemly that clergymen’s faces wrinkled in disapproval, how can one say that his art was not beautiful?"

The awakening of youth is the awakening to love. Tōson’s secret love gradually shook his Christian faith. The soul of youth was in anguish over the attempt to contain such disturbing elements as beauty and faith, sexual love and the love for, and faith in, God, in equilibrium. The fear and anxiety generated by having to travel a road no one had traveled made him reject everything. For ten months he roamed about aimlessly. Tōson finally “happened across Rousseau’s book and while reading it avidly, I felt as though I were being awakened to a consciousness of self which I had not known till then.” The book which opened Tōson’s eyes was not drama, or poetry, but a book by Rouseau. The flowering of Tōson’s naturalism in literature was the consequence of the seeds implanted at the age of 23, by this contact with Rousseau. It was through this book that he came to understand modern man’s way of thinking; he was taught to look at nature directly and he felt that to some extent the road which he should travel had been made clear. Rousseau’s life made a great impression on him; later when he faced various trials and when he was in the throes of spiritual anguish, he always drew strength from it. We must conclude that Tōson was enlightened about life by Rouseau, the liberal, free-thinker, rather than by the usual novels and poetry which were avidly read.

While still confined to Shinshu, Tōson repeatedly read Darwin and felt that the rise of a new literature had to be preceded by the establishment of a new view of man. Tōson was not a voluminous reader like Katai and he was not necessarily a seeker of novelty. He met Rousseau, as it were, at the very
depths of his personality, and, while ruminating on the significance of this author, his whole life was permeated by him.

What can be seen in Tōson’s case is that, while he developed from Christianity, he later discarded that faith and returned to the belief in human nature. Kunikida Doppo, who also emerged from a belief in Christianity, was, to the very end, unable to discard his faith. In Doppo’s case, naturalistic thought patterned after Wordsworth’s hardly can be said to have been orthodox or standard Christianity. Both Iwano Hōmei and Masamune Hakuchō were once baptized and later broke with Christianity. Thus, it must be noted that the naturalist writers for the most part were Christians who later transferred their allegiance to naturalism. This is a fact which poses various problems. In the first place, without entrance into the Christian faith in Japan, would it not have been rather difficult to develop a consciousness of the nature of man? It goes without saying that naturalism from the outset rejected ideas and ideals and had doubts about the source of these, God. As such, it was rather easy for naturalism to develop in the Christian world (the West) with its dualism: God and Nature. In the spiritual climate of Japan (the Orient), where there had not been, traditionally, an anthropomorphic or personalized God, was not naturalism, on the contrary, something which could arise spontaneously only with great difficulty?

Behind the emphasis on the nature of man there exists the problem of the consciousness of self, the awareness of one’s ego. If this is indeed so, why could not the rise of a spontaneous naturalism, as a criticism directed at the ideas and ideals which shackled the minds of the Japanese and regulated their society, have taken place even without Christianity? Would not the consciousness of self have been sufficient to develop this? Still, the fact remains that this type of naturalism was not produced in Japan. It is questionable whether Japanese naturalism, which developed as a revolt against Christianity, possessed either universality or indispensability for all Japanese. And since the
awareness of self did not take place to any overwhelming degree, was Japan's naturalism, then, without an emotional component? Did not naturalism end by shaking up the Japanese ethos? Furthermore, in Japan the criticism of ideas and ideals did not arise spontaneously from social and spiritual conditions. Despite the emergence of the writers from Christianity, Japan was not, as was European society, permeated by Christianity. In Japan naturalism which emerged from the confrontation with the Christianity of the writers themselves ended by liberating man's nature. But it could possess a positive aspect beyond this freeing of man only with extreme difficulty. In any event, these are questions we must bear in mind in our analysis of the character of Japanese naturalism. We might express the foregoing schematically:

A. Naturalism was not a spontaneous growth in Japan. In the West the duality introduced by Christianity—God, Nature—made the emergence of naturalism almost spontaneous.

B. The naturalist movement in Japan was essentially a writers' movement. The majority of the naturalists were writers whose naturalism arose as a revolt against their earlier Christianity.

C. Christianity apparently produced an awareness of self which was essential to naturalism. The majority of Japanese were not Christians nor did they feel this self-awareness to be necessary.

D. Naturalism in Japan had a liberating effect, freed man from old societal ties, and broke old ideas and ideals. Its origins in Japan made it difficult for naturalism to go beyond this negative, destructive aspect.

The efforts of the naturalist writers of the 30's were no longer directed at composition or style in the formal sense. They no longer worshipped style; instead, their admiration now turned from style to content. In composition too they rejected mere craftsmanship. Katai said:

If writing just follows the pattern of thought, if we can just
write down what we ourselves think, this would be satisfactory. The task of writing can be splendidly accomplished if we can only have faith in our ability to set down what we think, whether poorly or skillfully written. The ranging of complex phraseology or the gleaning of colorful expressions is not in the least necessary considering the distress and anguish these require.

In this call to discard florid style, to place emphasis on content, we see the spirit of a new age. The new literature was to be free from all exaggeration, it was to be a literature in which the attempt would be made to record facts and nothing else. The establishment of this new style in literature was the prime task of naturalism. Besides the effort of the writers, preparation was steadily going on for the reception of naturalism. An example of this preparation was the advocacy by Chogyū of an individualism based on instinctivism and romanticism. Further, there appeared, after the age of skepticism and anguish, the religious individualism advocated by Tsunajima Ryōsen.

Abe Yoshishige reminisced:
We were at that time extraordinarily moved by Chogyū's subjective emotional individualism . . . At any rate, I feel that crude though it was we were taught the meaning of 'I' by Chogyū and we thus came to possess a consciousness of 'self' . . . We were kept busy reflecting on ourselves and criticizing ourselves. We were puffed up with the newly-arisen self-consciousness, which we felt burning inside us. We really felt the force of our 'Ego.' And with this force of our 'Ego' we felt as if we wanted to strike out in all directions without thinking. We felt that without us there was no life, there was no world, and if the country or the family were separate from us they, too, did not exist. We were everything, and if we did not exist, nothing did. Therefore, the most accurate judgment as far as we were concerned was, per force, a subjective judgment. It was utterly distasteful for us to
submit to anything outside our subjective judgment. It was thus quite natural for us to reject the heretofore accepted concepts like patriotism and loyalty. Our emotions had by then reached a climax. There were times when they were so extravagant and wild we were even prepared to face death.

The young people like Abe Yoshishige, whose words we have just quoted, wanted to attain to ever higher pinnacles of subjectivism to give vent to their new-found awareness of self. Inexplicable though it was, however, at the very time that these young people were being influenced by the thought of Tsunajima Ryōsen, and were only searching for an object for their worship, the flame of their passion went out and they could no longer follow Ryōsen.

Abe Yoshishige wrote:

Our blazing subjectivism for the most part flickered out. We sensed its vagueness; we felt our own mediocrity and despised our baseness. We reached the point where our burning tears, which had gushed forth like a fountain, dried up; the coursing hot blood began to slow down; we soon were utterly exhausted. Materialistic thought registered a victory by taking advantage of the chinks in our weakened emotions. We reached the point where our value judgments were dulled. Tsunajima Ryōsen’s thought continued to record his characteristic needs stubbornly, without flagging, and gradually he began a type of Buddhist life. We were unable to follow him in this.

As is apparent from these admissions by Abe Yoshishige, Chogyū and Ryōsen opened the way to romantic and religious individualism, but this was not the thought which could be welcomed by youth grown disillusioned with this kind of individualism. It was truth, and before all else truth, which naturalism in literature stubbornlyQuested. As stated previously, naturalism was never something which emerged spontaneously from the Japanese spiritual climate or from the circumstances of Japanese society. Yet the spiritual circumstances were ripe among the youth to receive naturalism. Generations
were changing; education was qualitatively transformed; the composition of society was undergoing a change; and literature possessed nothing that could fill the needs of those aspiring to a new literary upsurge. Kōyō was dead, Chogyū again was silent, Ōgai had withdrawn to Kokura; in the literary world it was the age of the epigones. It was an age in which the main currents of the literary world were dominated by the family novel and by the tendentious novel. It was in the period after the Russo-Japanese War that a change came about; Shimazaki Tōson’s novel Hakai appeared. This work, which was unquestionably of epoch-making scope, was decisive in turning the literary world to naturalism.

We must state that Hakai was not Tōson’s most outstanding work. The fact remains, however, that Japanese naturalism is inconceivable without this work. The hero of the novel, Segawa Ushimatsu, is a teacher in an elementary school in Iiyama, in Shinshū. Ushimatsu is a man with a secret which he can scarcely afford to reveal to anyone. He was born an outcast. His father told him, “Whatever person you may encounter, never reveal this to him! For once, whether in anger or sorrow, you forget this, from that moment on you will be cast out by society!” And with this parting injunction, Ushimatsu was sent out into the world. There is in the subsequent dilemma of the hero a typical psychological problem which is modern in its developmental process. Ushimatsu faces the problem of whether to observe or break his father’s injunction against revealing his origin. The dilemma is resolved finally when a person from the same outcast community, for whom he had unbounded respect, died violently. With the occasion afforded by the death of Inoko Rentarō, Ushimatsu broke his father’s command and confessed before all his pupils that he too came from an outcast’s community.

Then, Ushimatsu first realized that this continued concealment had actually abraded the temperament he possessed from birth. Because of this constant hiding, he could not
forget about himself for even a moment. He thus felt that his life had been a fraud; he had cheated himself. Such worry, such anxiety! Would it not have been better to stand up like a man and confess to society, 'I come from the outcast's community!?' This is what the death of Inoko Rentarō taught Ushimatsu.

As Kamei Shoichirō also pointed out, the psychological process in this sequence of "secret," then "confession"—this shaking-up of the sensibilities so characteristic of a modern man—was a motif which was ever present in Tōson's work. Tōson, a writer who started as a poet, was dominated by the idea that "locked in the depths of my bosom dwells an unutterable secret." Tōson tried to make Ushimatsu the crystallization of this type of personality.

As critics have said, the construction of the characters in this work resembles Dostoevsky's *Crime and Punishment*. Ushimatsu resembles Raskolnikov; his best friend, a lively youth named Tsuchiya Ginnosuke is reminiscent of Raskolnikov's friend Razumikhin; the teacher, Kazama Keinoshin, a drunkard, resembles Marmedalov; the teacher's daughter, Shiko, is like Sonia. Nevertheless, the basic reason for the failure of *Hakai* as a novel is the limited scope of its particular problem. *Crime and Punishment* presented a murder, moreover, a type of murder which had not as yet appeared in literature. This murder was different in that it was an attempt by the hero to discover whether or not he was a superman, and thus Dostoevsky's work was portraying a murder which, in a sense, possessed metaphysical meaning. Thus *Crime and Punishment*, in the sense that it portrayed a process of breakdown and destruction as a consequence of *hubris*, has universal significance for modern man. *Hakai*, however, with its "secret" of the protagonist's emergence from the outcast community, could not possibly possess such universality. There is nothing more evil than murder; the murder in *Crime and Punishment*, however, is an act which possesses autonomy in that it is murder to test the
superiority of the murderer. In contrast to this, there is nothing evil in being born into an outcast community, since we have no control over our origins. Discrimination against those who have come out of this community is nothing more than socially-conditioned prejudice. Ushimatsu, a person with an extremely sensitive nature, has alternative possibilities: to suffer mental anguish while heeding his father’s injunction against revealing the secret of his origin, or, to take the path that Inoko Rentarō took and become a fighter for the emancipation of the outcasts. Ushimatsu’s anguish and torment did not thus possess the inevitability, the quality of necessity, that Raskolnikov’s did. This is a fundamental flaw in the makeup of the work. Nevertheless, there are manifest in this novel all sorts of new spiritual developments. Tōson intended, through Ushimatsu, to grasp the developmental process of the psychology of modern man.

Tōson said the following of Rousseau:

When I read Rousseau’s Confessions I did not feel that I was reading the life story of a hero or a great man. His Confessions are in the final analysis like our own; they are the record of a weak man’s life, of a disappointed, a despairing, man. Among the multitude of great men, we sense him as being closest to us, a kind of uncle . . . We can open his Confessions and discover ourselves on every page.

In the attempt to portray an average person’s extremely likely mental state lay the newness in both Tōson’s work and Futabatei’s Ukigumo, (Drifting Cloud). When this work appeared it received all kinds of criticism. Among these criticisms, that of Masamune Hakuchō merits special attention. In his review Hakuchō said:

I feel it is a happy tendency of Kinoshita Naoe and his group to make his hero noble, a person without any weak points who yet is persecuted by society, beaten and spat upon. Tōson, however, is more concerned with portraying the inner anguish of his hero, his insecurity, the lurking fears and chimeras which are produced by this insecurity. From the start he
does not make his hero a person of god-like purity and while I believe it reasonable that his hero is without shame over being an outcast, still the fact that this does bring shame to him which comes from unjust or unfair attitudes is, I feel, of interest.

It is in a passage like this that one detects Hakuchō's outstanding critical ability.

Among the works of this time one can detect serious creative attitudes and a fresh new style of writing. This prevailed among those who thought of overthrowing the Kenyūsha and establishing a literature diametrically opposed. Natsume Sōseki, author of Botchan and Wagahai wa Neko de Aru (I am a Cat), in a letter to Morita Sōhei (1881-1949) about Tōson's Hakai, wrote:

What pleases me first off, is the composition. It does not have the novelist's usual, artificial, superfluous embellishments. I especially approve of writing that is serious, flows smoothly and is brisk. I find pleasure in words and sentences which are not overly elaborate as is the style of the so-called great masters. What next pleases me is the treatment of the subject matter; this is done in serious fashion; life is treated without useless adornment. This is because the object of this work is different from that of the sophisticates, the dillentantes and the so-called literati.

Later, when Sōseki too became critical of naturalism, he nevertheless continued his unqualified praise. Shimamura Högetsu wrote: "I was unable to resist the feeling that with these works the novel in Japan had arrived at a new turning point." Tōson's Hakai especially symbolized a great change in literature. Tōson wrote:

We are born into this world as human beings, not as specialists. It is from this fact that literature must first start. When 'life' can be regarded just as it is—living, loving, dying—a person's lifetime is not very much. Short as it is, it is a precious time, a natural time. And this time, no matter how brief, is spent by the individual, and has much signifi-
cance for him.
This was the type of literature which now arose. This new spirit in Japanese literature developed in the midst of the vestiges of old Japan and marked a great advance towards the growth of modernism.

2. *From the disclosure of reality to skepticism and confession.* When we think about naturalism in Japan, we must bring to mind Tayama Katai. Katai, as compared to Doppo and Tōson, was a very ordinary, likeable person. His work, however, had tremendous influence on the naturalism of that time and, in a sense, determined the direction in which naturalism moved. The tendency which governed Katai consisted of an extra-ordinary degree of adoration for Western literature, an absolute view with regard to literature in general and a strong interest in the literary world. He was a vehement and redoubtable apostle of naturalism, yet his own character was that of a pure sentimentalist. What lay at the base of his work assumed the form of a lament over the evanescence of time, the certainty of change in all things.

Early in life Katai had endured adversity and without his belief in the absolute nature of literature to sustain him, he would have vanished as a mediocrity. His unflinching efforts to realize his absolute view of literature in the face of an abusive world was responsible for elevating him to a leading position in the naturalist movement.

Mention must be made of Katai's personality, his refinement and the fact that had it not been for his warmth, his sense of dedication and camaraderie, the establishment of a naturalist movement in Japan would have been difficult indeed. Ōgai spoke of the adherents of naturalism as a *clique* and to Sōseki, they were a *faction*. We must admit that there was something to these strictures, and yet even so, the naturalists can not be regarded in the same light as the Kenyūsha. The personal relations between Köyō, the central figure in the Kenyūsha, and his disciples, was different from the relations among the various adherents of naturalism. The latter were bound by a
sort of amity emerging from their friendship; they were comrades who together loved literature. And at the center of this group and bound to it by camaraderie, stood Katai.

The year before Katai wrote Futon, Hakai was published and received extremely good notices. The Doppo-shū, Works of Doppo), too was published, its reprinting and 3rd printing were also well received. Katai, who felt he had been deserted, was both disappointed and irritated. Through his readings in Tolstoy, Ibsen, Strindberg, and Nietzsche, Katai felt the suffering so apparent in fin-de-siècle thought. He identified his own isolation with the isolation of Folkrat in Hauptmann’s Lonely Lives. Hence, “I too felt I wanted to suffer. I felt I wanted to fight bravely against both society and myself. What I had blocked and smoothed over I would attempt to reveal, even if I felt my soul was being destroyed.”

It was with such feelings in the back of his mind that Katai wrote Futon, a love story about a middle-aged man of letters, Takenaka Tokio and his young pupil Yokoyama Yoshiko. Tokio is unable to feel any significance in his work and endeavours, indeed, he no longer has the courage to apply himself to his literary life work. His marriage has long lost its pleasures in the fatigue and ennui of middle-age. Tokio has now reached the dangerous stage where he is eagerly desirous of having a new love affair. At this point a young graduate from the Kōbe Women’s College, Yokoyama Yoshiko, appears and Tokio’s feelings and mental state undergo a complete change. Another woman reports to Tokio’s wife: “Since Yoshiko came, Tokio’s manner has completely changed! When you see them talking there seems about them a spirit of yearning. You really shouldn’t ignore this.” However, Yoshiko acquires a lover, Tanaka Hideo. Tokio now felt that while he “had not from the outset thought of making this pupil of his his sweetheart...yet Yoshiko, his beloved pupil, had added something of beauty to his lonely life, had brought him infinite strength. It was unbearable to have her suddenly stolen from him.” Tokio’s character was such that he “could not lose himself in, or, be infatuated by, sex as
such, which meant that he possessed a certain strength... People at large believed him to be an honorable man, a trust-worthy man." Therefore, Tokio did not have the passion to be with his beloved Yoshiko to the point of destroying his married life. Nor did he, on the other hand, want to break off with Yoshiko. The novel can be considered as intending to portray the egotistic mental state of such a middle-aged man. In this work, however, egotism as such is never self-consciously portrayed. In the first place the author, Katai, was completely unaware of the unattractiveness, the unwholesomeness of his own middle-aged egotistic love. Had he this awareness, had he gone into this more deeply, we should be able to detect somewhat more humanity in this work. As it stands, characters like Tokio's wife are little more than dolls, and what flits before us is only the author's penchant for sentimentality. This is not the same as making us feel that awful strength which lies hidden in people, the conflict that arises stealthily from the ferment of personal relations, and which develops with destructive force. On the other hand, Futon is not exactly a cold, calm, clear portrayal of love, the logically calculated love of a typical modern man who has forgotten the meaning of the word. We have frequently said that to Katai, naturalism was a product of the fin-de-siècle spirit. This work of his, however, is rather far removed from his professed fin-de-siècle spirit. The following excerpt should make this clear:

While reading this letter [from Yoshiko], different feelings raged in Tokio's bosom. "That 21-year old fellow Tanaka had really come to the capital. He had gone to meet Yoshiko. Why? What happened?" Tokio didn't know. "Perhaps what she recently said, too, was completely untrue. Perhaps Tanaka has gone up to the capital to pursue Yoshiko, to accomplish what had started after they had met together at Suma during the summer vacation. Perhaps in Kyoto too he had acted to satisfy his desire. Were they holding hands, embracing; what were they doing on the upper floor of some secluded inn?..." These thoughts became more than Tokio
could bear. 'My responsibility as her supervisor is also at stake!' he exclaimed to himself. I can't permit such freedom to a woman whose mind is not yet mature. I must give her guidance, she must be protected!' 'We also have passion and reason!' he read in Yoshiko's letter. 'We? Why did she not use I, why did she use the plural!' Tokio was extremely disturbed.

Here is something about which the author Katai was really in earnest. Yet Katai was unaware of the falseness within his earnestness, of his self-deception. There is here, however, an expression of the degree of human truth which Katai reached at that time. A writer today would probably not exclaim "My responsibility as her supervisor is also at stake." A modern writer would attempt to open new horizons in man's spiritual life by delving more deeply into the mutual rivalry between love and social obligations. This work, despite Katai's intentions, is nothing more than the anguished soul-baring type of confession of the rather shallow love life of a person living under the dictates of the old-fashioned moral standards.

To be sure, Katai was aware of the ethos which governed his society. Yet, in his novel he did not develop a new phase of the life of feeling and love. He felt an identity with characters in the European works he read. "Inadvertently Hauptmann's Lonely Lives came to mind." "Together with Johann of Hauptmann's Lonely Lives I was forced to feel how meaningless was a wife." "Thinking, 'There is Turgeniev's superfluous man!' I felt the same sadness over the fleetingness of life as the hero of that work." "Inadvertently I was reminded of the lowly Russian people, drunk, sleeping it off by the roadside where they had fallen." "Fate, life, there rose in Tokio's breast the memory of what he had once taught Yoshiko from Turgeniev's Punin and Babrin..." With mental associations of this nature, Katai eagerly savored feelings of intense misery regarding his destiny. He was savoring the anguish of the fin-de-siècle. We can also see why some critics have condemned naturalism as nothing more than "imported finery."
The newness of Katai’s novel consisted only in his speaking of what people were not eager to speak of openly. People reacted with amazement to the candidness of this kind of personal confession. Despite the fact that as a moral lesson there was nothing especially new about it, as a result of its freshness the work was welcomed as the kind of naturalist writing people were tirelessly awaiting. This can be felt to have been a fateful problem for Japanese naturalism.

Oguri Fuyō eulogized *Futon*, saying, “What was of most concern to me as a writer when I read *Futon*, was that whether the material was factual or not, at any rate, it manifested the author’s spiritual and psychological background.” Shimamura Hōgetsu praised the novel saying:

This document is the bold confession of a sensual, stark-naked person. This aspect had early appeared as a mere trace or first step in the works of Futabatei, Fuyō, and Tōson. In Katai’s work it had become extremely clear. Confession, sensuality, was now an avowed object of the novel. The unvarnished, factual disclosure of beauty and ugliness was pushed a step further by some of the naturalists and there was now also a tendency to portray mainly ugliness. This tendency was given full play in the novel *Futon*.

Masamune Hakuchō wrote in *Shizen-shugi Seisui-shi*, (History of the Rise and Fall of Naturalism): “Tamura Shogyo was in America studying and a friend of his who was living with him came downstairs bursting with laughter, saying: ‘Hey! Look at the asinine piece Tayama Katai has written!’ and he thrust the magazine he had been reading at Tamura.” Despite Tamura’s scorn, Katai’s work *Futon* was received with extreme seriousness in Japan. Katai in his *Meiji no Shōsetsu*, (The Meiji Novel), spoke of “a stream of thought tightly and intimately bound to decadence, individualism, genius, the superman, and also emphasizing ordinary everyday-life, yet close to a satanic sexual gluttony, a strong emphasis on the subjective.”

We attempted to transmit some of this in the foregoing. The freshness and the novelty in Katai’s work was not its presenta-
tion of reality or fact, but rather the emphasis on mental processes by means of intimate disclosures. That the content deals with love, passion and lust, raised Katai’s work to representative status in Japanese naturalism.

When naturalism came to the attention of the public, it was in its iconoclastic period. Hasegawa Tenkei was one of the leading critics at this time. He was the editor of Taiyo (The Sun), which was noted for its vigorous, firm stand. While Hasegawa’s criticism was poor in content he had a talent for sensing popular trends. He summed up his position in simple, straightforward words which became popular expressions; some of his catch phrases were, “the age of disillusionment,” “the pathos of the disclosure of reality.” “logical pastimes”; his was indeed a facility with words. His coarse, bold arguments were perfectly suited to a time of upheaval, an epoch in which the old and the new alternated.

To Hasegawa, naturalism made its literary stand in “the area of the destruction of the imaginative,” and the “great goal” of this doctrine was, “to destroy the ideal and to make reality manifest.” Ideals were nothing more than “logical pastimes,” literature and art were not for pleasure, but to portray living human beings and their relations. Hasegawa distinguished between “philosophers” who quested theory and what he called “practical moralists”, “religionists.” He felt that the attitude of naturalist literature should be like that of the latter, but that the naturalist must, in distinction to the moralists and religionists, adopt an attitude rejecting all ideals and laying bare reality. In answer to the question as to which ideals must be destroyed, Hasegawa felt these were, in the first place, what he called reason and the power of imagination. “What we call truth explains life and the real world about us, anything else is a logical pastime, a dialectical amusement.” Hasegawa thus brought up that aspect of the sensual, the reality of the flesh, which he felt was concealed for us by imagination. He wrote,

The reality which we perceive directly is a spiritual and sensual one. The idealists, however, elevate the mind or
spirit and loathe the sensual, the flesh; mastery over the flesh serves the ultimate Ideal. Consequently, anything smacking of the sensual aspect of a portrayal is avoided and even if portrayed, is done so only to depict evil and corruption. Why the idealists do this they know not. The conquest of the spirit by the flesh, by the sensual, is reality; that this is evil or hateful, is a consequence of the useless over-fondness for the Ideal."

This criticism appeared in the Taiyō for October, 1907, one month after the publication of Katai's novel Futon. There are two points to note in the essay from which this passage was taken. The ideals which Hasegawa subjected to criticism, whether concerned with religion or philosophy, were extremely diffuse. There was not one word in reference to the specific ideals of Japanese society. There was not a solitary reference to the ideals which were unique to Japan, a country whose historical circumstances differed markedly from those of Europe. It is this omission which permits us to know upon what the conceptions of Japanese naturalism were contingent.

The reality which Hasegawa Tenkei wanted to make manifest was that comprised by the sensual aspect of our life. He did not go beyond giving us this one example of what he meant by "making manifest of reality." This essay was written with Katai's Futon in mind, nevertheless, we can sense that Japanese naturalism generally regarded instinct in the same light as nature, and that "reality" meant the life of the flesh. At another point Hasegawa Tenkei said, "We shall only transmit the aspect of reality. What the idealists are at pains to conceal, or to reject, as unpleasant, we, nonetheless, shall without hesitation discharge as our duty, albeit, with a feeling of sorrow." Tenkei did not, however, go more deeply into the question as to why the "disclosure of reality" was conducive to feelings of sorrow. And this problem could indeed become a fatal one for naturalism, as Natsume Sōseki pointed out. The naturalists, beginning with Hasegawa Tenkei, found that wallowing in the feeling of pathos was itself sufficient and they did not ask why this was so.
Through the novel *Futon*, naturalism, which had had the trail broken for it by *Hakai*, now came to possess a character of its own. *Hakai* can not be said to have been a successful work of art, but it did possess possibilities. As mentioned earlier, it dealt with the problem of a modern, up-to-date, person who lived in an area still dominated by feudal thought and feeling. The hero was a teacher who was tortured by the secret that he had come from the former outcast or parish group. The vexatious problem of the novel is concerned with how a modern person ought to live under such circumstances. *Hakai* was thus a standard "orthodox" work of modern literature but the Japanese preferred the realism of *Futon* to the imitation of reality which was patent in *Hakai*. True, *Futon* was little more than a personal confession, yet people reading it recognized in it a kind of truth about human nature. It was the truth which was in compliance with what naturalism demanded, it was the truth of human passion and lust.

When we come to the later naturalist novels by Töson, Katai, Hakuchô and Tokuda Shûsei, we can scarcely find evidence of Western influence. We do not see the positive indictment of the age which is typically Western. Where is that unceasing emphasis on self to the subjection of everything else? Where in these novels do we find portrayed the fierce confrontation between the older and younger generation? Where the discord between the old Japanese morality and the new morals? We see no trace of the struggle between the gradually hardening nationalism and the independent morality of the individual. We find little of the "new man's" quest for a *modus vivendi* in the midst of this regnant spiritual anarchy; there is nothing of the flux, the agony and distress of this period in these novels. The novel *Haru* by Shimazaki Töson, is, to some slight extent, an exception, but it was limited to the Meiji 20's.

Without question, passion-lust possesses great significance for human nature. And it goes without saying that literature is not propaganda for social justice. But writers who only portray man as passively addicted to passion as the Japanese
naturalists did, force us to conclude that they are profoundly limited, they possess no active or positive attitude towards their age or their society. Of course, men of letters are not activists. We must also acknowledge that the Japanese naturalists taught us much that was new about human nature. The consequence of their work led to an enriching of our emotional life, feudal remains were swept out of our ethos. By way of criticism we can say that when the naturalists spoke of individualism, it was an individualism which emphasized their own egos. In this sense, we may question whether they understood the true meaning of individualism; whether their individualism ever transcended the glorification of themselves. Did they really perceive the significance of the ego? In the final analysis, did not naturalism, which should have been intellectual, become strongly shaded with the emotional? The naturalists successfully disposed of pre-modern ideas, and yet, was there not in their nature too, vegetative-passive-Oriental resignation? The theme which they stressed most, after the passion-lust motif, was the family. However, the naturalist did not concern themselves with the question of how to solve the contradictions between the old and the new in the Japanese family system. Their primary interest was to deal with human beings enmeshed in the toils of the family system. To the very end the attitude taken in their work was a negative one. In the modern age naturalism should have acted to liberate the life of the emotions. In Japan it was unable to emerge out of the characteristic oriental resignation.

Shimazaki Töson's work has a vital toughness and can be regarded as an exception to the foregoing strictures. Töson said. "It is not time which passes but we who pass." The motif in Katai's works deals with the flow of time, the sorrow over the evanescence of human existence, of life. Katai's emphasis on intuition as well as his objective rational delineation stem from the same source: the urge to expunge the self. Katai aimed at perfection in works of art, and was severe in the thoroughness he demanded in objective delineation. Yet his own work lost the power of tight structure. His work, con-
sequently, degenerated into trivality. Life is from the outset a meshing of freedom and necessity, an antinomy of ideal and actuality, and when freedom and ideals permeate necessity and actuality the result may be thoroughgoing naturalism. More likely is it that the end result will be a full-fledged Buddhist view of existence as an act of *Karma* or *Fate*. And in fact, when Katai, in his later years became a Buddhist, he discovered for the first time his own true position.

3. *Skepticism and Confession.* As we have seen, the naturalist movement at first was in the service of *fin-de-siècle* thought. And *fin-de-siècle* thought in turn was a logical result of the collapse of the idealism which was the very apex of Hegelian philosophy. At bottom, what the naturalist movement had to confront was Christianity. From these circumstances individualism, naturalism, decadence, and nihilism emerged. Also produced was diabolism, that peculiarly 19th century concept that beauty could be found in the very heart of evil, and the worship of genius. These were all signs of the disintegration of the European spiritual tradition. We must see how these were conceived in Japan where the spiritual atmosphere was utterly different from that of Europe. How did Japan, which was now going through rapid modernization, receive that thought which was symbolic of the disintegration of the modern age? From Katai’s writing it is impossible for us to derive anything on this score. To be sure, at that time there was not the consciousness that we have today of the distinction between the *present* age and the *modern* age. Therefore, it is natural to think of the *fin-de-siècle* thought in Europe and its struggle against the old European tradition, as analogous to Japanese naturalism’s struggle against the Japanese tradition. Yet what was here called *fin-de-siècle* thought was causing the disintegration of the modern West, and it was this thought which Japan was henceforth going to learn. What the naturalists were facing, only formally had the appearance of a modern State. Actually, it was replete with vestiges, contradictions from the past, and
only later was Japan able to become modernized in the true sense. Had there been a clear consciousness of this, naturalism would have been able to bring about a positive change in Japan even without waiting for the criticism of Natsume Sōseki or Isikawa Takuboku. At the time, naturalism was only concerned with the positive assertion of self and this took form as skepticism and confession. Naturalism, thus, possessed no more than the negative power to destroy existing conventions. And that naturalism soon gave way to other intellectual currents, was a logical result of this negativeness which was inherent.

Masamune Hakuchō and Shimamura Hōgetsu are the representative writer and critic respectively, for this period. In distinction to Katai, Doppo, and Tōson whose naturalism was tinted with romanticism, Hakuchō was a naturalist writer through and through. And it was with him alone that Japanese naturalism appears in pure form. His consciousness was unequivocal, clear, and sober. Let us examine, for example, his novel Doko e, (Whither). Suganuma Kenichi, the hero, graduated from the faculty of letters in the university and became a writer on a magazine. Previously he had been a carefree youth, but had now become a person "no longer elated by 'isms', reading, drink, women or wit and intelligence." He was now a person who despaired of life. He even contemplated trying opium to fill this emptiness he felt. Nevertheless, within him there was deep contempt for people who were not conscious of the emptiness and meaninglessness of life. His friends, Oda, Minoura, and even Dr. Katsurada, he felt to be ridiculous and deserving of scorn. He well understood his own emptiness.

When he went out in public his mind was agitated and he was distracted. Alone, sitting mutely in his quiet room, the triviality, the unworthiness of his daily activities, his lack of trust in the future, tore away the mask and his own self was vividly apparent. And in the end the unbearable feeling of wretchedness and hatefulness extended even unto his own body.

He fervently wished for the repletion of his feelings and
yet nothing was able to satisfy or fill his mind. The sight of Salvationists, their preaching, made him envious of their having convictions. He also thought.

Righteousness, justice, these are not problems. To be saved from this tepid world, to feel enthusiasm gripping the muscles, to feel something with one's viscera, this would be his only saviour. To become a revolutionary though he be blown to bits by a bomb, to be taken like a brigand and meet the same fate, beheading, hands tied behind his back, whatever the result, it would be good to fling oneself into the first thing which he felt stimulated him, whether for long or for short, even if he were instantaneously destroyed.

He attempted also to think about "either plunging into the vortex or scaling the cliffs." Indeed, when he thought in terms of social purpose or of serving ideals, when he thought that for something like this he would be able to scale precipitous cliffs, he experienced sobering ennui and was not able to step into the brambles. He was not able to rush about frantically by himself on the broad highway. For him there would never be any salvation.

This work was appropriate to the period when naturalism made its position clear. It was the period in which naturalism preached the absence of solutions, the absence of ideals, when naturalism excluded everything other than skepticism and confession.

As we stated above, Shimamura Hōgetsu was a representative critic at this time. From his work Torawaretaru Bungei, (Captive Literature, 1906), we see that he was influenced by mysticism and symbolism. After the publication of Hakai, (1906), and Futon, (1907), which greatly impressed him, Hōgetsu said: "I am in agreement with naturalism." Subsequently, his critical essays appeared under such titles as: "Bungeijō no Shizenshugi," (Naturalism in Literature), (1908); "Shizenshugi no Kachi," (The Value of Naturalism), (1908); "Geijutsu to Jisseiaktsu to no Sakai ni yokotawaru Issen," (The Line Intersecting Art and Real Life), (1908); "Jo ni kaete Jinsei-
kanjō no Shizenshugi o Ronzu,” (In Place of a Preface I Discuss Naturalism as a Philosophy of Life), (1909); “Kaigi to Kokuhaku,” (Skepticism and Confession), (1909).

Hōgetsu felt it was of great importance to provide naturalism with a clear-cut aesthetic base. At this point, however, we can only deal with his concepts in cursory form. We will attempt to present what he felt to be the most important problem in naturalism; the problem of “action and contemplation.” In his essay, “In Place of a Preface I Discuss Naturalism as a Philosophy of Life,” Hōgetsu summed up his attitude towards naturalism and made clear the lines along which it was moving. He wrote:

What am I to do now? How do I live from day to day? Is it in improvised, hand-to-mouth fashion? Not necessarily. What really governs one’s daily life is, after all, a very old and conventional morality. One’s past and present deeds are seen, upon reflection, as not very far removed from this morality. I cannot believe, on this score, that this kind of life is the most desirable or the best. In part it seems, clearly, like the unwarranted act of infusing life-blood into a corpse. And even that part of life which seems reasonable represents only one aspect which stands in contradiction with another aspect which is likewise true.

There is, therefore, no hard core of certainty within me, I cannot be firm. Instead, there is unease, there is resistance, I am disappointed. Nevertheless, I have not the courage to be resolute—and trample these feelings underfoot. It comes to this: as a result of being dilatory, we are dragged along by the force of convention. And if we think about it we realize that the only resource left us does not go beyond what is expressed by the word resignation. This too is merely a surface covering. Resignation is not strong enough to wipe out the unease and the misgivings which are embedded in us. It is a resignation born of ineffectualness.

For these reasons I cannot now construct a determinate philosophy of life. I find it more appropriate to confess my
doubts and my uncertainties just as they are. And to the extent that these are real and true, the constructs which have preceded these run the risk of being artificial and contrived. Indeed, all who regard the world with the "I" as a standard, even those who claim to have a definite philosophy of life, are in a similar fix, their position resembles mine. If this is so, possibly we stand in an age in which confessions will be given to the world. This 'age of confession' means that we must abandon shams, that we must blot out from our minds fripperies, that we must examine our own condition in depth. And when we do so, we must confess about ourselves with sincerity. It is quite possible that throughout eternity man will never transcend such an 'age of confession.'

We have repeatedly stated that there was in Japanese naturalism no real concept of "self" in the modern sense of the word. While the quest for the truth of human nature liberated men from the spell of concepts and ideals, it was only the pursuit of a human nature in the abstract. Naturalism did not depict man who possesses an ego, cherishes desires, bears ideals, and suffers under the yoke of necessity, who rejoices or is miserable in his position in society and history. Abstracting man from society and history, naturalism busied itself with the pursuit of "human nature." Social and historical elements in man were nothing but addenda, the living, the physical human being constituted the ultimate in this style of thinking. There is certainly some truth in this view of man. It does not, however, go beyond being a partial truth. It may be true, of course, that society is evanescent, history is fleeting, the State is a temporary phenomenon, and that only the physical can be affirmed. When all kinds of ideals are disintegrating, it is not possible for men to believe in anything outside the consciousness of self. In such a case, however, what will be the circumstances which drive men on? Such a time will be characterized by eternal repetitiveness, everlasting recurrence; it will be, in truth, a time of waste. Animals live only by sensation and undoubtedly have no history. What we call "feeling men," physical men, find
their driving force, properly, in moods and emotions. We who bear the pressure of history and society, and who are gasping under the pressure of the reason we ourselves have produced, have a strong need for emotion. Yet, will not what remains after liberating one’s self from history and society, be only emptiness? A human being possesses within himself the drive to complete the destiny of the entire race coupled with the drive to leave this eternally incomplete. Here is humanity in its most concrete form. Faced, for example, by the reality of his own death, a man dies all deaths. At the same time, however, though a man dies, his progeny remain; other men go on living. In this sense, the race is eternal. History or society, abstractly, in a sense, can be the extreme affirmation of our corporeal existence. Contrariwise, the perishing of our bodies and the transcendence of our lives abstractly by historical life which continues eternally can, in truth, be said to be a concrete fact. One of the conclusions we are led to is that man’s life is involved in abstraction. Therefore, it is natural that when physical life rests on an abstraction the result will be skepticism and confession. To be sure, naturalism, which was based on this kind of nihilism, had no reason to attempt to affirm its feelings. It was the nihilism, the utter lack of feeling, which appeared after the liberation of feeling. And yet, human life possesses drive or a kind of momentum as its underlying principle. A physical, sentient human being, grasped in his historical and social circumstances, becomes, for the artist or man of letters, an ever-fresh and ever-developing subject. There are, of course, many instances wherein grasping only the historical and social aspects is apt to turn a work of art into an ideological tool, into propaganda. Conversely, to depict human beings only in their physical and sentient aspect—detached, as it were, from history and society—means that despite the pliancy, the suppleness, these human qualities have, which enables them to endure the storms of any age, the result will be the depicting of an everlasting sameness which cannot but lead art and literature to an impasse. The works of Japanese naturalism which we have
cited, as well as their lineal descendant, the "I novel"—that is, the novel in which the hero tells his own story—contain both the virtues and shortcomings just enumerated.

The standpoint of naturalism is in all respects an impressionist standpoint. It is devoid of any spur to action and, taking the framework of actuality within which it is placed, naturalism pursues reality and truth. No matter how precise the method of this pursuit, the fact that other frameworks are left as is, gives rise to the possibility that this precision will be utterly annihilated. Indeed, to the degree of precision with which naturalism pursues reality within its confining framework, it cannot but end in a blind alley. The abstract nature of the position of consciousness dooms it to this.

The line drawn between Högatsu's "practice and contemplation," and the position that there is "nothing outside of skepticism and confession," shows us how circumscribed the naturalist movement was. The naturalist movement began as a literary movement and ended as a philosophy of life. There arose problems which were not in the original expectations of the naturalists. People did not necessarily interpret naturalism as simply a literary movement. Ishikawa Takuboku brought colossal expectations to bear on naturalism which were, however, in vain. As has been stated all along, there was in naturalism from the very outset nothing which could meet such extravagant expectations. The reason contemporaries pinned their hopes on it lay in Japanese society. Nevertheless, by freeing the life of feeling, naturalism was sufficiently effectual to make a beginning in the destruction of the pre-modern Japanese ethos, but it did not have the force thoroughly to demolish it. To accomplish the destruction of the pre-modern ethos in a thorough manner, individual self-consciousness was necessary and, in addition, it was necessary to reform the society which held Japan in thrall at that time. The criticism directed against naturalism by Natsume Sōseki, based on individualism, and that of Ishikawa Takuboku, was close to socialism, was exceedingly accurate. This will be taken up later.
The realistic view with which naturalism regarded human nature was essentially a negative one which naturalism was not able to transcend. Its only achievement was that it liberated the emotional life of men. The narrow path along which the predecessors of the naturalists minced their way to modern literature now became a broad highway. Ever after, whether they agreed with naturalism or not, people, perforce, trod this broad highway. No one today can deny that modern literature makes reality its chief goal. This goal flows from the nature of the emotional life of modern man. The problem that the naturalists faced was how to interpret the content of this reality. Masamune Haukchō stated:

Doppo died in June, 1908. This was a period which, in a sense, was a golden age, though the popularity of naturalism soon waned, indeed, seemed to collapse. And though it would seem from this that the fervor for naturalism was akin to the excitement at a festival, this was not the case at all. The surface popularity declined, the clamor of the debates between opponents and advocates subsided, and the blind, unthinking following, too, fell away. For that very reason, there now appeared works which were truly representative of naturalism. And, having arisen, this literature could not be off-handedly nullified.

Tōson, in his work *Ie*, (A family), Shūsei, in *Kabi*, (Mold), as well as Katai and Hōmei, demonstrated marked improvement. Writers like Shūko, Shōken, and Kano Saku-jirō, too, began to produce original naturalistic works. It is of interest to note that even opponents of naturalism, Natsume Sōseki, Mori Ogai, inadvertently composed works inspired by this group.

Sōseki’s modernistic "quest for self," was manifested with the publication of his work *Sore Kara*, (And Then). Now there was a worthy theme for the naturalists, since naturalism was based on self-conscious individualism. The character of natural scientific positiveness and limpid observation with which Ogai enlivened the structure of the historical novels he wrote
in his last years, was what should have logically been developed in the works of the naturalist writers, but was not. The neo-Romanticism, Aestheticism, and Dilettantism of writers like Kafū, and Junichirō, as well as the humanism of the Shirakaba, (White Birch), School which developed out of the conflict with naturalism, could be thought of as the direct opposite of naturalism. We must keep in mind that this did not represent a return to the period before naturalism. On the contrary, these new trends were able to develop on the ground which naturalism had cleared. Indeed, their opposition to naturalism rested on this very same ground. In this sense, then, it can be said that there was a clear division brought about by naturalism in the Japanese literary world which could now be periodized into pre-naturalism and post-naturalism. In a certain sense it can even be said that the later currents of thought purified and developed the various forces inherent in naturalism. We cannot develop this theme in detail since it is treated in another volume in this series, *Japanese Literature in the Meiji Era*. We must now turn our attention to the attitudes assumed by Sōseki and Ōgai during this period.


At the time the literary world was filled with the din of voices for and against naturalism, Ōgai and Sōseki steadfastly kept themselves apart, albeit, they assumed critical attitudes towards naturalism. Sōseki wrote:

To tell the truth, I am neither a naturalist writer nor a symbolist. Nor am I, what seems to have become current of late, a neo-Romanticist. People like myself have not the confidence to decide on the coloration of our works. We have not the confidence of those who espouse the 'isms' which have attracted the attention of the public. Nor, indeed, is such self-confidence necessary. It suffices for me to maintain confidence only in myself. That I am not a naturalist or a romanticist with 'neo' affixed is of complete unconcern to me. Sōseki can be considered as "only an ordinary person who,
without having experienced the byways and alleys of the literary world, conducts himself properly, sincerely breathing nature's air." He was a man who, by publishing his works for the "educated but average gentleman," exercised an influence outside the literary world which was exceedingly difficult for the naturalist writers to attain.

A. **Attitude towards naturalism**

There is a question as to whether Sōseki, who was denounced by the naturalist camp as a "follower of the Leisure School" and "a writer who does deal with life," was, as he himself admitted, really guilty of these epithets. As early as 1906, at the time when Soseki was known only as a romanticist, he wrote a letter to Suzuki Miekichi and spoke of his ambition in these words:

I don't know what fraction of the significance of life is comprehended in living beautifully, gracefully, that is poetically. I do think, however, that it must be a small fraction indeed. And so it won't do to be like the hero of *Kusamakura*, (The Grass Pillow). While that too may be all right, still, to live in the present world, to advance one's good points, means somehow to emerge from the Ibsen School... While I have seen this aspect of passing in and out of Haikai-like literature, that is to say, literature as poetry, I should at the same time like to attempt a literature which will have the give-and-take spirit of life and death, which will breathe the fierceness and ardor characteristic of the patriots who brought about the Meiji Restoration.

Even at this early period Sōseki lived more in terms of ego, conceived in the modern sense, and pursued his own destiny in this same sense, than any naturalist writer of the time. The naturalists made almost no attempt to depict the conflict between the individual and society or the struggle between the generations. Sōseki, on the contrary, did portray these conflicts in his works. The naturalists vainly lapsed into a deterministic position and by drawing a line between practice and contemplation ended by depicting personal trivia. Sōseki, on the other
hand, basing himself on an idealist position, portrayed the struggle between the modern ego and the old Japan and was on this account able to give primacy to such things as the fate of the modern ego. The problems the naturalists dealt with scarcely went beyond the personal, whereas Sōseki, standing as it were, outside the literary world, was able to contemplate such things as the problems between Japan and the West. Even at this early time he was already deeply concerned with Japan's destiny.

In contrast to the naturalists who made the novel portray facts, or better, made it an impressionistic portrayal of facts, Sōseki regarded the novel as fiction. In this connection, Sōseki replied to Katai, saying:

What would happen if, rather than worrying about shams, we concerned ourselves solely with living people and with plots drawn from nature? If we only think of the human beings we fabricate as living and of the plots which we construct as nature, then we fabricators become a species of creators and it becomes proper for us to take pride in our creation and knowledge.

Sōseki, then, was a writer—all too rare in Japan—who, in complete contrast to the naturalists, was able to attempt to experiment with concepts. He was not, however, as has generally been thought, simply an anti-naturalist.

In an essay entitled "Bungei no Tetsugaku-teki Kiso" (Philosophical Foundations of Literature), Sōseki wrote:

I feel that the present world order is not deficient in heroism, nor is there a scarcity of literature which exalts heroism. I understand, nevertheless, that in the present world there has not appeared one tragedy arousing feelings of sublimity. There is no beauty in the present literary ideal, nor virtue, nor grandeur. Yet must it be said that the ideal of literature today is comprised by the one word, reality.

In other words, one can conclude that Sōseki thought the trend of naturalist writing to be the quest for reality and this quest was the center of the literary ideal.
In his essay "Bungei to Dotoku," (Literature and Morality-August, 1911), Sōseki called pre-Restoration morality "romantic morality" and post-Restoration morality "naturalistic morality." The former was "a perfect morality determined in exact accordance with the ideal"; the latter was "a system based on the observed fact that human beings are imperfect and at all times impure." To Sōseki, writing in 1911, this naturalistic morality was characteristic of the trend which ran through moralist thinking. And he came to the conclusion that the force of the present in human consciousness was such that romantic morality had been superseded. As can be seen from these statements he frankly admitted that the trend of the age was a naturalistic one. The next question which arises is: in what points did he oppose naturalism and express his criticism of it?

The naturalists in their writings tended to act as a group. They based themselves on a doctrine and did not use their writings as a means of self-expression or self-assertion in any individual sense. Sōseki, in a letter to Komiya Toyotaka, amplified this, saying: "The followers of naturalism today constitute a group in which the word naturalism is meaningless. They are nothing but a group of admirers of the works of Katai, Tōson, and Hakuchō!" Sōseki felt that it would have been proper for the naturalists to stand doggedly by a position of individualism.

Sōseki directed his criticism against the meagerness of the literature naturalism produced. The naturalist movement was prone to end in mere sloganeering with no works to accompany the brave words. Sōseki wrote to Takahama Kyoshi in August, 1907:

Nowadays, the followers of the naturalist school seem to be eager to rush forward blindly. I, therefore, feel like flaunting my opposition to naturalism and going backward. Is there then no alternative to this espousing of doctrine, whether naturalist or anti-naturalist? To me, it is like frantically expounding the art of swimming while lying by the fireside. Sōseki sharpened his criticism, saying:

Recently some Japanese men of letters have been eagerly
asserting that craftsmanship is useless... I feel, on the contrary, that there is no reason for discarding craftsmanship... If your meaning is that the work of great men is sufficient to make any unskillfulness a matter of unconcern, then perhaps technique in writing too is unnecessary. I cannot feel this way. Among those who look on technique as useless, there are many who, while indifferent to technique, yet claim that their object is to deal with life... When I hear such words I feel somehow strange. When one speaks continually of dealing with life without defining a precise object, it leads to perplexity. And though they repeatedly shout this object is life, what life is they don’t explain. They are like people who ring fire bells when there is no fire in sight and move about briskly calling to everyone, 'make way, make way!' That they will be greatly inconvenienced later can be surmised. Were they to say, before demanding that we deal with life, that life is this kind of a thing, and to deal with it is that kind of a thing, and all—this and that—were made clear, and then, if on the basis of this clarification, it is said that technique is unnecessary, I do not feel it would be too late for me to accept this. Until, however, some such clarification is made, I am reserving judgment.

As we stated previously, Sōseki was not grudging in his praise of what he considered the good points of naturalist literature, nor was he one-sided in his feelings.

Another factor which has bearing on Sōseki’s attitude towards naturalism was his latent, samurai-like, stoicism, a component of his superior intellectual capacity, which caused him to loathe the sentimentalism inherent in naturalism. In his novel Sore Kara, Sōseki had his hero Daisuke say that he believed there was nothing as vulgar as what moved a man to tears. Nothing, he felt, was as offensive as the feigning of tears, anguish, earnestness, and enthusiasm.

Sōseki felt that Japanese naturalism did not arise from an inner necessity. Neither Japanese society nor the spiritual life of the people themselves had gone far enough to produce those
conditions from which naturalism could emerge. In the final analysis, Sōseki felt that naturalism did not go much beyond being "an imported commodity."

Daisuke did not use much the words which had of late become popular, words like 'modernistic' and 'anxiety.' The reason for this was that he felt implicitly that he was modern and that this did not necessarily mean being anxious. This was because he believed only in himself. Daisuke interpreted the anxiety so obvious in Russian literature as based on climatic conditions and political oppression. The anxiety encountered in French literature he felt was a result of the fact that adultery was a commonplace. The anxiety in Italian literature—the writing of Gabriele d'Annunzio was representative—he judged to be the feeling of self-injury emerging from unlimited moral depravity. Daisuke regarded the depiction of society only in its anxiety aspect, which was so favored by the Japanese writers, as an imported commodity. (Sore Kara).

Daisuke's opinions, of course, were Sōseki's.

Naturalism which is a segment of historical development in the West and is consequent upon causal relationships in both life and literature, has become, in outline form, a commodity transported overseas. It is clear that we do not exist to provide the content for this outline. When the development of our own living energies constructs such an outline then, only, will naturalism have significance for us. ("Izumu no Kōka," [The Merits and Demerits of "Isms"]).

When we think of the gap, discussed previously, between the naturalist critique and the literature of naturalism we must grant the correctness of Sōseki's views. Naturalism was just not suited to Japan; Japanese society had not matured to that extent. The condition of Japanese naturalism was reflected in the poor works of the naturalist writers.

Sōseki also directed his criticism against the assertion by naturalism of its own absoluteness and its rejection of ideals. As previously noted, Sōseki sincerely acknowledged that the
trend of the time was towards naturalism and that contemporary literature was aimed mainly at truth. That this alone comprised all of life, Sōseki could definitely not admit.

Society hates naturalism. The naturalists have come to speak of their doctrine as a kind of eternal truth and are forcing it on the entirety of our life. If the naturalists persevere in pushing forward their doctrine they will come to realize a future which they completely dominate. Rather than depicting this vast outline covering the entirety of life and attempting to force the future into it, I feel it would be more profitable for them to grasp firmly a small fragment within this outline and to attempt to get society to acknowledge the permanence of naturalism within these limits.

Sōseki enumerated the following literary ideals:

1. The esthetic ideal...the emotional response to sensory objects.
2. The ideal of truth...to manifest truth through sensory objects.
3. The ideal with regard to love and morality...to manifest emotion through sensory objects.
4. The ideal of sublimity...to manifest volition or will through sensory objects.

According to Sōseki, literature and the arts, by means of various sense perceptions, manifest certain ideals. And, in reality, these four ideals themselves—by going through various divisions—are in the end altered in form.

To Sōseki, the ideal man of letters, "the sage of the arts," was the man who combined in himself all the newest ideals, the man who acknowledged the new consciousness in life, the man who realized the deepest ideals, who most deeply dealt with life, who realized ideals of wide scope, who touched on life in its broadest sense. When naturalism, within the bounds of manifesting truth, attempted to transcend these bounds and assert its own absoluteness over every other ideal in an unwarranted arrogation of power, it fell into great error.

If one arrives at truth as a consequence of respecting truth,
whatever one writes will become a matter of indifference. The result of showing truth will be that beauty does not matter and even sublimity will be of no concern. But, if one goes a step further and injures beauty for the sake of truth, damages good, tramples on sublimity, this will perhaps win the plaudits of the 'truth factions.' Of course, the 'esthetic faction,' the partisans of good and sublimity, will probably be cowed into silence. If they say that it doesn't matter since their goals are different ones, it is said because they do not want to injure others. The others who go about shouting that this is a world of 'truth' are not even aware of the injury they may be doing. They are like those who, shouting that the modern world is by definition one of convenient transportation, would have trolleys running on roads convenient to themselves. Perhaps it is a source of satisfaction to be a person for whom trams run especially and who would not budge without a tram. Yet for those who walk, or who only use bicycles, this is extremely inconvenient. ("Bungei no tetsugakuteki Kiso").

With this kind of critical attitude, Sōseki's attack on naturalism became particularly acute. In the face of the progress of science, the increasingly complicated mechanization of society, and the self-alienation of man, he felt that the dominance of naturalistic tendencies was understandable. What he rejected, however, was the tendency to paint everything with the same brush. Kusa Makura, which was a representative work exhibiting romantic tendencies in Sōseki's early period, as well as various other forceful works of this period, went, in a sense, against the trend of the age. These works were, for one thing, more logically constructed than those of any other writer, and they revealed Sōseki's outstanding intellectual capacity as well as his unclouded view. Also, the fact that they represented his own personal agony meant that they were both a critique and a catharsis for him. Indeed, Sōseki, better than anyone else, was aware that reality existed only in the poetic temperament, "to slumber in such a microcosm was to be totally
ineffective.” Sōseki’s works, Neko, and Bottchan, can be thought of jointly as social satire and criticism. From the time that naturalist literature dominated the literary world, the leitmotif in Sōseki’s works was concern with the ego in the modern sense and the problem of morals. The lively flavor of his early works, their sprightly chatter, was buried, his works now took on an air of solemnity.

He happened, by chance, to read the posthumous notes of Sakuma Tsutomu, the submarine captain. Captain Sakuma set a remarkable example of quiet heroism in 1911, when his experimental submarine did not surface after a dive, all hands, including Sakuma, died. When the submarine was salvaged it was discovered that no one had panicked and that Captain Sakuma had, in his last moments, made careful notes on what he thought was wrong with the vessel. While in an unusual state of exalted emotions, Sōseki wrote “Bungei to Hiroiiku”, (Art and Heroism). This was a famous short essay which vividly revealed Sōseki’s character. However, in the later period of his life, the theme which runs through Sōseki’s “Truth as an Ideal” and “Love and Morality as an Ideal” is conflict. Conditions no longer permit self-satisfaction on the basis of the catharsis achieved through the esthetic ideal. Sōseki, who knew the meaning of individualism better than anyone, came to the point of feeling that naturalism, by carrying the quest for truth to an extreme, had fallen into a species of determinism, had rejected individual free will, and was completely avoiding the question of ethical responsibility. He felt that the naturalist who explained everything on the basis of the “disillusionment over the revelation of reality” or who said that “to arrive at objective truth means to know subjective anguish,” could not but fall into a false position.

The agony that these people speak of is based on a phenomenon not controlled by the mind, a phenomenon which cannot be changed at will; the will itself falls into contradictions and inconsistencies because it is based on a mechanically progressing nature in which there can be no hope of wanting
this or being that. Stated differently, it is because of the lack of harmony between the subjective and objective worlds that reality which does not accompany us, is outside us, is hated. In other words, it is because our ideals are isolated in our minds and completely cut off from contact with the outside. It is because a cold, heartless, nature, which despises our wills, emotions, and intelligence, acts in a completely capricious manner as the mover of an inhuman society. ("Bungei to Hiroikku").

In other words, the pathos and agony of naturalism, in the words used by Sōseki, is nothing but conflict between nature and the ideal, between necessity and freedom. Thus, if we say that Sōseki's position was based on idealism, this idealism was one which was contained in naturalism and developed by transcending the latter. If we describe Sōseki's position as based on individualism, it must be spoken of as a moral type of individualism. We can conclude, then, that the naturalism in Sōseki was nothing more than a small phase of his literary idealism which was centered on how we ought to live.

B. Sōseki's Social Consciousness

We shall now turn our attention to Sōseki's social consciousness. His manner of thinking here was extremely practical and sound. He can be described as one who based himself on individualism yet contemplated bringing the individual and society into harmony.

Sōseki looked at modern civilization with the idea that the enlightenment it brought was the road to the development of human energies. He spoke of positive and negative methods for bringing about the development of these energies. The former he called an "energy dissipating device," the latter an "energy preserving," or "energy economising contrivance." A concomitant of the former was pleasure-seeking and debauchery. Sōseki referred to a literature, science, and philosophy which had for "s object the quest for pleasure. The negative aspect of development was the sense of duty and obligation. This,
however, differed from Kant's conception of duty—it was a device to enable us to lead a free life. A more appropriate term probably would be the word *vocation*, as Sōseki used it in an essay he wrote entitled "Dōraku to Shokugyō," (Pleasure-Seeking and Vocation). What he meant was the performance of the duty necessary for men to carry on life in society. Even the sense of well-being after fulfilling obligations was to Sōseki nothing but the manifestation of the desire to escape the shackles of obligation, to be free, to compress any unavoidable task into as small a compass as possible, and to conclude it as handily as possible. The development of civilization was nothing but the process of the endless blending and differentiation of the negative and positive energies. The question arises as to how this development of civilization exerts an influence on our lives.

Vocation leads to doing things for the sake of man; pleasure-seeking, on the contrary, is pursued for one's own sake. And basically, when we do something for the sake of man, the result will also redound to our own benefit. Again, when we do something for ourselves, the result will work to our disadvantage.

The standard for vocation is based on others. Accordingly, to live on the basis of one's vocation, perforce, becomes to live as others desire and command. Depending on the circumstances, it means the necessity of being in the good graces of others, of currying their favor. Within the framework of a vocation we must serve as a divisor for others: the variety, selection, and size of the dividend are all at their discretion. Which means, then, that neither the power of selection nor our fate is in our hands. In order to maintain our material existence there are many unavoidable things to which we must submit. In the life of the vocation it is usual for us to do many unworthy things; where morality is concerned we venture to act immorally—to that extent we diminish ourselves in the intellectual sphere too; we often debase our sense of obligation to others and do senselessly cruel things. And in the area of taste and sensibilities, too, we must often lower our artistic sights. This comes
about because, perforce, our vocation is from the outset based on other people. Furthermore, it is from the specialization and refinement of this calling of ours that what we come to speak of as the civilized life arises. That is to say, the civilized life means the specialization and complication of the life of our vocation. With the advance of specialization, the content of life becomes richer. Sōseki indicated, however, that with this increasing complexity and differentiation human beings, of a necessity, became deformed. To Sōseki, doctors of philosophy were specimens of this deformity. With the specialization of our vocations, mutual understanding between like-minded people becomes difficult.

Sōseki spoke as follows concerning the content of contemporary social life:

If the present trend continues, the trend where everyone is immersed in his own vocation and the area of knowledge as well as interest grows daily narrower, then though it may be said that we are leading social and cooperative lives, we are in reality each shut up and isolated within society. Though we set up our abodes next to each other, there does not arise any mutual understanding or sympathy. Finally, though we live in groups, our internal life has fallen apart, its connecting links have been severed. ("Pleasure-Seeking and Vocation").

Sōseki felt literature served to fill the emptiness within people and bridged the gap between people. Sōseki presented scientists, philosophers, and artists as examples of people in vocations not based on others. The reason for this was that the vocations in which these people engaged permitted of no compromise with society, and therefore there was no possibility of material remuneration. Since scientists and philosophers have no real income they cannot avoid looking to the government for support. In the case of the artist confronting society it is evident that his material remuneration is only an irregular one. The creation of the artist exerts influence on only a segment of society and, if this influence does not ultimately take form as a material reward, the artist may well starve.
It was in this fashion that Sōseki regarded vocations—and within the framework of modern society this vocational view was a sound one. We can derive Sōseki's manner of thinking about the organization of society from this. In a lecture entitled "Nakami to Keishiki," (Form and Content), Sōseki said: "Form exists for the purpose of content, content cannot be determined by form. When content is altered, external form must, perforce, become altered."

With respect to socialism, Sōseki's feelings were at variance with those of Ōgai. In his novel Sore Kara, there is a conversation between the hero Daisuke and his friend Hiraoka concerning the Kōtoku Shūsui Affair. Kōtoku was referred to earlier as the anarchist leader who was implicated in an attempt on the life of the Emperor Meiji and executed after a secret trial in 1911. This, of course, was only one small part of the whole. It indicated, however, that Sōseki was not a conservative. "If the contents of a given structure undergo qualitative change it does not necessarily mean that the old form develops into the modern form." Why, for example, were the Tokugawa destroyed? Why was it that the revolution we call the Meiji Restoration took place? In dealing with this problem, Sōseki wrote:

Probably these events took place to reject an externally continuing structure once the content of this structure had been altered. To be sure, for a time the customary structure could suppress content. Yet, I think it is a logical explanation to take place because of the lack of correspondence between form and content.

He taught that it was necessary to construct a social structure which would be in accord with the times and the circumstances. The question arises as to what the necessary structure for the Meiji period was.

Stated simply, the structure which most suits the Meiji period must be the one with the least amount of artificiality. Nowadays, the proof that the content of our lives has naturally undergone a change since olden times exists in the lively controversy over individualism and the novels of the naturalist
school. Because these have at some point clashed with the existing structure, those committed to preserving the structure are attempting to smash the naturalists and the individualists. Those people who are attempting to build a new structure based on the content of modern life are often in conflict with the conservatives. Just as by confining the voice to a musical score—no matter how freely the voice comes out it nevertheless does not go against the structure of the notes—so, too, we are given a type of structure by society and the problem we must concern ourselves with is whether it is natural for the structure to regulate the people of the society or whether we should subject this structure to questioning. This problem is one which should concern people in general, but it is of special concern to the man who teaches large numbers of people, to the man who rules over large numbers of people. Over and beyond our being individuals in society, we are also children of fathers, we are linked with friends, we are citizens, we are ruled by the government, we receive education, and, in a certain sense, we are people who must educate others. I feel that now is the time to think carefully about this aspect of the problem and to try to match the psychological condition of our fellow man with our own, not as outsiders but by attempting to enter into, for example, the feelings of young people, to suit ourselves to these people, to educate them in a manner that we would be in agreement with, and to give them guidance. Also, I feel that if we do not deal with people in this fashion, the result will be indescribable anguish.

In 1911, in response to the social problems described by Sōseki—the confrontation of individualism and naturalism by their extreme opposite, socialism, ultimately leading to the Great Treason Affair (1911), the eddying of decadence and idealism—there arose the national morality movement. This movement, among others, attested to the vigour of conservatism at this time. It was at this time that this sturdy conservative force began to pass like a shadow over the visage of Meiji society in
response to the conflict between the old and the new generations, and the collapse of the Japanese tradition. Sōseki's attitude to the society of that time was that of a gradualist; he believed in progress and reform but at a leisurely pace. The question arises—in comparing Sōseki with Mori Ōgai—as to whether one may speak of Ōgai's conservatism as having a flexibility about it which brings it close to Sōseki's gradualism. Both men looked at their age from a broad perspective. They differed in that Sōseki's viewpoint was that of the citizen whereas Ōgai was the eternal official and consequently close to the hub of state authority. The difference in their social consciousness was a consequence of the foregoing and meant that even people like themselves, who transcended their age and could hold themselves aloof in their attitudes, still could not escape the limiting conditions of the society.

C. The West and Japan.

Sōseki felt that the confusion and turmoil of the age stemmed from such conflicts as that between enlightenment and barbarism, the modern age and feudal remnants. Above all, he felt, the ultimate conflict was between the West and Japan. It was in this last, that Sōseki discovered the inevitable, the fated agony, of a Japan committed to enlightenment. In his novel Sore Kara, the following passage occurs:

Daisuke, as a human being, could not feel contempt for others, yet he spoke of modern society wherein there could not be any attempt at reciprocal contact, as the degeneration of the 20th century. And he interpreted the tremendous force of the sudden expansion of the lust for life in the present as something which encouraged the collapse of the desire for moral principles. He regarded the present as an arena in which the old and the new passions collided. Finally, he took the striking development of this passion for life in the sense of a tidal wave which swept in from Europe.

These two factors must somewhere come into balance. Daisuke believed, however, that until the day poor insignificant Japan could compete in wealth with the greatest powers
of Europe this balance would not be attained. He was resigned to the fact that such a day would not dawn in Japan. Therefore, the majority of Japanese gentlemen who had fallen into such a predicament were forced daily to commit crimes just short of violating the law, or else they had to commit all sorts of crimes in their imaginations. And since there is tacit knowledge of what kinds of crimes others are committing, they must make pleasant conversation. Daisuke, as a human being, however, could neither bear to give insult nor to receive insult.

Sōseki created his hero, Daisuke, as the archetype of modern man seeking a *modus vivendi* in the midst of the vortex of the modern age. People have said that Sōseki’s works are rather artificial. Certainly there is truth to this, in the sense that his works are often the objectification of his concepts. Nevertheless, the problem remains as to what degree these concepts possess reality. The reality observed by Daisuke was that which existed in the Japan of some forty years ago, and yet we somehow feel that this is close to our own sad reality.

Sōseki’s thinking about this problem was more concretely developed in an essay called “Gendai Nihon no Kaika,” (Enlightenment of Modern Japan). This essay, which first appeared as a lecture, begins with a statement concerning general enlightenment. Enlightenment, as stated previously, is a product of the blending of the economizing or negativistic life forces produced by the stimulus of duty and obligation (discoveries, machine power) and the expenditure of positivistic life forces (pleasure seeking). If we ask who was happier, the men of the previous ages or modern enlightened men, we must conclude that in terms of the sheer agony of existence the modern enlightened man suffers more by far. Formerly the struggle was one over simple survival. In a period of enlightenment the struggle has moved to a less elemental sphere and is now concerned with such things as having to rack one’s brains over whether to live under Condition A or Condition B. In the period when the elemental question, life or death, was primary, human
cravings were extremely small. In the age of enlightenment, however, even such petty questions as whether to change from jinrikishas to automobiles arise with a certain amount of authority and invite disturbances. It is just as if a low pressure area had suddenly appeared within civilization; each area is thrown out of proportion and until equilibrium is once again restored unrest is unavoidable.

Our lives in this kind of a period of enlightenment cannot but be subject to the onslaugths of anxiety and suffering. However, because the enlightenment in the West—what Sōseki called "general enlightenment"—is an internal development and the enlightenment in Japan is externally derived, Japan, perforce, must suffer twofold agonies. It is Japan's fate that its enlightenment, which must be transformed into an internal one if it is not to be false, must remain an externally developed one. Sōseki described this by saying:

It is as if within the two general domains of the development of civilization, the domains of husbanding and dissipating vital energies, which hitherto were on a scale of 20, suddenly, as a consequence of outside pressure, the scale of economizing and expenditure was forced up to 30.

Sōseki compared the extreme avidity with which the Japanese abandoned themselves to these developmental processes to a man spirited away by a goblin. In the West when there is a transition from intellectual tendency A to intellectual tendency B, for example, it stems from some internal need. This means that in the West movement to B takes place after the good and bad points of A have been thoroughly experienced and, in a sense, its sweetness and bitterness savoured. "In Japan, which is under the sway of modern enlightenment, a feeling of hesitation arises because the Japanese feel like hangers-on within the new and old currents bursting in on them from the West." This rapid transition from A to B, with no breathing spell in between, is like sampling dishes at a banquet and, before being able to feast on these dishes, to have them suddenly withdrawn and replaced by an entirely new cuisine.
Sōseki said further:
The Japanese are under the influence of this kind of enlightenment, and must, consequently, experience feelings of emptiness somewhere along the line. And at someplace or other they must feel a sense of anxiety and dissatisfaction. It is not at all good that there are some who proudly take on airs as if the enlightenment in Japan had developed internally, from Japan’s own resources. There is extreme snobbishness in this. No, it is not at all good. It is both a sham and a deceit.

Sōseki castigated this attitude of the Japanese by pointing out that, regardless of how proud they seem to be of this enlightenment, this pride had to be judged a superficial one. And yet, the superficiality cannot be helped. The Japanese must, in a sense, swallow their tears and accept the superficiality of their externally developed civilization. Nevertheless, it is quite obvious that there is no other way to be quit of this feeling of emptiness than the transition from this externality to an internally developed enlightenment.

Let us set aside the question of the bragging about the new teachings acquired from the West, which are only superficially mastered. Let us suppose that in forty or fifty years after the Restoration, by the power of education, by really applying ourselves to study, we can move from teaching A to teaching B and even advance to C—without the slightest vulgar fame-seeking, without the slightest sense of vainglory. Let us further suppose that we pass, in a natural orderly fashion, from stage to stage and that we ultimately attain the extreme of differentiation in our internally developed enlightenment that the West attained after more than a hundred years. If, then, by our physical and mental exertions, and by ignoring the difficulties and suffering involved in our precipitous advance, we end by passing through, in merely one-half the time it took the more prosperous Westerners to reach their stage of specialization, to our stage of internally developed enlightenment, the consequences will be serious indeed.
At the same time we will be able to boast of this fantastic acquisition of knowledge, the inevitable result will be a nervous collapse from which we will not be able to recover.

In other words then, to Sōseki, Japan's destiny was either to make do with superficiality or else to face the probability of nervous prostration. This being the situation, what hope did Sōseki hold out for Japan?

"I have no brilliant ideas to offer," he said, "except that I feel there is no other alternative than to avoid a nervous collapse at all costs and to develop an internal enlightenment in as seemly a fashion as possible."

There is a discussion which takes place in Sōseki's novel Sanshirō: "'But from now on Japan too will gradually undergo development,' he argued. Upon this, the other, in a matter-of-fact way, said, 'Then she will be destroyed.'" This was a discussion between Sanshirō, the hero, and the philosopher, Hirota. Sōseki could not but think about Japan's future pessimistically. Katai, in his work on the Meiji novel, reminisced that,

Even if this were so, the Japanese had to, strangely enough, accept this kind of indefinably fin de siècle intellectual trend which, together with the Russo-Japanese War, was of epoch-making significance. Reflecting on this calmly, it can be said that Japan, internally and externally, was facing a serious crisis. Yet, that both of these occurred at the same time could also be considered fortunate.

This statement of Katai's, as compared to Sōseki's view, was an optimistic one. We can assert that possibly the naturalists of whom Katai was representative were to some extent separate from the period. The fundamental problem—should literature or life be primary—repeatedly comes to mind.

The problem of Japan and the West (East vs., West) was an extremely important one in Sōseki's work. Indeed, in his own studies it was extremely important to him to master the problem as to the nature of English literature and he finally suffered a nervous breakdown. Sōseki even came to the point of trying to surpass Englishmen in the mastery of their own
literature. There is scarcely anyone in Japan today who cherishes the ambition to master foreign literature in such an exhaustive fashion! Today most of us would dismiss this as foolishness. Whether or not this ambition of Sōseki’s was foolish, it was proof of his passion and fervent spirit. Western culture, while not assimilated in any exhaustive manner, was, as we today have come to realize, the source of the great impetus of the Meiji period and it made possible maturity and continuing development.

It is a digression, but the story of how he dealt with the problem he sensed as part of the historical nature of literature, the problem of everlasting anguish, is a rather famous one. It was extremely important for Sōseki, who was very well versed in Sino-Japanese studies and in the arts, to be able to cope with the problem of East-West culture. Writing in Meian, (Light and Dark), he said that, when he ended a morning exhausted by the portrayal of the scandalous scenes of the swarm of human egotists, he spent the afternoon in the portrayal of the Chinese Southern School of painting, and achieved spiritual catharsis. It is not possible to make any simple inferences with respect to Sōseki’s spiritual condition from this one fact. However, it can be stated that in his works he did not suggest a return to old Japan, historical Japan, or to the Japanese tradition. The main theme Sōseki was concerned with in his works dealt with human beings with modern egotism pursuing their fate to the very end. His later works can be said to have given emotional representation to elevated ideals. Sōseki, who was a man of letters and an intellectual, differed from those writers who merely based themselves on realism. What he attempted to do was not to adopt a method of depicting facts, but experiment with ideals in his writing. And yet, being a man of letters at the same time that he was an intellectual, Sōseki did not investigate concepts in an abstract fashion as a philosopher would; instead, he quested for living human beings as the stuff of his writing. It must be borne in mind that thought is based on feeling and, contrariwise, feeling is rooted in thought. To overlook
this would make much of Sōseki’s work uninteresting. As a matter of fact, much of the criticism of the naturalist writers was generally based on this point. The criticism of Sōseki’s work must be regarded from the standpoint of whether or not he succeeded in his attempt to experiment with concepts and with ideals. There are various differences but, nevertheless, it can be said that Sōseki was the same type of writer as Dostoevsky. It must be confessed, however, that Sōseki himself was not particularly fond of Dostoevsky. The question remains as to what extent did Sōseki’s concepts hinge on reality. The fragmented way we have just dealt with his thought about naturalism, his consciousness about society, his way of thinking about the problem of Japan and the West—can never be considered adequate. The process of dealing with thought in this fashion means not to look at the way it is organized, structured, or the delicacy with which it comes to life in Sōseki’s work, but only to deal with it analytically. It is exactly as if we do not understand living things in their living context; it is exactly like dissecting a corpse. And yet space does not permit a more extensive treatment of Sōseki’s work.

D. Sōseki’s individualism.

In 1913 Sōseki gave a lecture at the Gakushūin, (Peer’s School), entitled “Watakushi no Kojin-shugi,” (My Individualism). In talking about his former agony and how he was able to resolve this by setting his self up as a standard for his thought, he said:

At any rate, I feel that the anguish I once experienced has probably been experienced by yourselves at sometime or other. This is so because it is necessary for scholars, educated people, to spend their lives, or at the very least ten or twenty years of work, before they accomplish something. Yes, this, indeed, was the very path I should have traveled. I have finally come to realize this. Probably, when I make such a heartfelt statement, you are able to feel a sense of reassurance. Probably this kind of an admission serves to strengthen your self-confidence—which, in any event, is not easily broken—
and causes you to swell up with pride. It is quite possible that there are many among you who have already attained this level of understanding. And even if there are some who suffer because of fog or mist along the road they travel, I feel they too will find that any sacrifice is worth while for the sake of attaining this level of self-knowledge. These statements of mine as to how one frees one’s self from suffering are not made so that you can free yourselves for the sake of the state, or for the sake of your families, but solely for the sake of your own personal happiness.

This statement, by its almost excessive clarity, demonstrates how far removed Sōseki’s individualism was from ego-centrism. It was individualism in the best sense of the term.

Sōseki thought, in the first place, that in fulfilling one’s individual nature one must at the same time respect the individuality of others. He thought, secondly, that the authority one possessed should not blind one to the duties and obligations which always accompany authority. In the third place, when desiring to display one’s financial power one must also give due regard to its responsibilities. In other words, he felt that to the extent that a person manifested unethical behavior, to that extent, the development of his individuality, the exercise of his authority as well as the use of his financial power, were all without value. To freely enjoy these three things it was necessary for a person to be governed by the three ethical conditions upon which these were based. Sōseki’s idea of individualism, then, was the idea of freedom accompanied by a sense of duty and obligation. Alternatively, he spoke of his individualism as “based on moral principles” or “a doctrine of right and wrong from which the spirit of factionalism has been banished.” People governed by such a doctrine do not form cliques, nor do they pursue blindly political authority or financial power. Precisely for this reason, however, the negative aspect of Sōseki’s kind of individualism is the latency of an unimaginable loneliness. Sōseki had to endure such an isolation. There are some questions which remain to be settled. (1) Is there, ultimately, a tie between in-
dividualism and an individualism based on moral principles? (2) Is there an overall unity between an ethical utilitarianism and Sōseki’s principled individualism, (3) If such a unity exists, how are we to interpret the phrase which he used in his later years, “Sokuten kyoshi,” (Follow heaven, depart from self!).

To Sōseki, the writer has a feeling of responsibility to society; also, as an educator, he has this sense of responsibility. Therefore, while there were statements made by him which developed from this utilitarian viewpoint, these never were as simply disposed of as one might suppose from the speech quoted. Sōseki was well aware of this, and more than anything else his works substantiate this. Human egoism can never be simply cancelled by the requisites of social order.

Sōseki’s modernistic quest for the self, more particularly his conscious quest for self, really began after he wrote Sore Kara. It may be noted that the majority of the heroes in his works were upper class people, or at least people who were not concerned about money. These people did not, however, lead lives replete with physical richness, in the interest of preserving their egos they practiced asceticism within the scope of the personal wealth they possessed. Sōseki felt that to be able to pursue the ego in an unadulterated fashion it was necessary to construct a frame about it. This was the modern ego which formed the “culture”—bearing vehicle. One should not make the mistake, however, of thinking that Sōseki’s life and the lives of his heroes were one and the same. He spent more than twenty hours a week lecturing and not solely to support his immediate family, but also for the sake of his relatives. He placed his heroes in very fortunate circumstances in order to consider the possibilities of the pure and unadulterated ego.

The quotations we presented from the novel Sore Kara in reference to the hero, Daisuke, are extremely appropriate as illustrations of Sōseki’s philosophy of life and society. Daisuke was a person endowed with a superior intellect and possessed of an extremely sensitive nature. Formerly, he had been the type of man who loved to shed tears over his friends. Formerly,
Daisuke had been the type of person who out of a sense of chivalry towards his friend gallantly gave up his own secret love, Michiyo, who married his friend Hiraoka. However, as a consequence of the awakening of his ego he came to his senses. He changed from a person who lived according to the dictates of the old Japanese morality into one dominated by the new morals. He now became a typical disillusioned person. As a consequence of the domination over him of naturalistic morality, he now stood in opposition to the romantic morality of his father. His ego was protected by the security of the wealth his despised father so eagerly pursued. When he discarded his intelligent sense of discretion to live with his true love, it was necessary for him to steal the wife of his friend. It was then that he ended by rejecting the monetary protection of his father, and completely upset social relations and anticipated his ruin.

In the novel Mon, (The Gate), the hero Sōsuke takes his friend’s wife and the two of them live quietly, childlessly, hidden from the view of society. They are both people who as punishment for their love have been buried in social obscurity. One day, however, his friend suddenly appeared and without saying anything to his wife the suffering Sōsuke went to find peace of mind by meditation in a Zen temple. The gate of the temple was not open, however. The gate of the temple had an immovable rigidity about it. Nevertheless, Sōsuke had not the courage to return. “Sōsuke was not the man to pass through the gate. Nor, on the other hand, was he a man to leave without entering. He was an unhappy man who, standing rooted by the gate, had to wait for nightfall.” He was a man who had fallen into a spiritual hell, for whom there was no salvation, a man who had nothing to look forward to but his own death.

The hero, Sunaga, in the novel Higan Sugi Made, (Until After the Spring Equinox), was a man of extremely introverted character. He had graduated in jurisprudence with an outstanding record, but he did not have the self-confidence to make his way in the world; instead, he lived on his inheritance. He had a cousin called Chiyoko. His mother attempted to have him marry
her, but Chiyoko’s parents were opposed. Chiyoko was a girl possessed of pure feelings. When he married her, Sunaga was afraid that his own poor feelings would not stand up in the face of the strong light which radiated from her eyes. The lovely feelings she was endowed with, she presented unstintingly to her husband. Her husband upon receiving these was spiritually sustained. She had no other expectation of reward than that her husband would now be very active in the world. However, he was not able to do this. From this, there arose a basic unhappiness between the couple. When once Sunaga was called away to Kamakura, a man called Takaki appeared before Chiyoko. Sunaga was seized by uncontrollable jealousy and behaved with extreme displeasure. Embarrassed by his own behavior, he ran to Tokyo. Chiyoko said to him, “You are a coward. Why are you jealous if you don’t love me and don’t want me for a wife,” she said, weeping bitterly. Sunaga “suddenly felt the blood rush to his cheeks.” Without giving anything of himself, he was taking everything from her in an egoism of love. The egoism deep inside him meant that while closing himself against giving he kept himself open to fulfill his need for receiving. Kokoro and Meian were works Sōseki wrote in the period after 1912. He wanted to be ethically honest and to love, but his works instead came to be characterized by a deepening sense of disappointment over the inability to love. From the evidence presented, we can conclude that Sōseki’s characters who were in search of self never had their problems resolved by a utilitarian ethic. With his developing sense of disappointment there gradually clearly appeared in his mind the idea which we described earlier as “follow heaven, depart from self!” With the deepening of his consciousness of the baseness of human beings, this idea of conforming with heaven and quitting the self was probably symbolic of his pessimism.

In conclusion, there remain a few words to be said about Sōseki’s attitude to the State. This too was linked to his concept of individualism. He thought of his individualism as having both nationalist and cosmopolitan elements. To Sōseki, the
liberty enjoyed by the individual fluctuated in accord with the welfare of the State. He did not have the statist outlook of the Socialists; he definitely recognized that in the issue of State morality versus individual morality, the former was at a much lower level. The State “perpetrates frauds, shams, and trickery. It is an entirely absurd thing.” Therefore, it was natural for him to emphasize individualism possessed of a high moral sense in periods of national tranquility.

4. Mori Ōgai (1862-1922)

During the period from the Russo-Japanese War to the beginning of the reign of the Emperor Taisho, from 1905-1912, Ōgai was again active on the Japanese literary scene. This period was also one in which Ōgai savored the bitterness of life, it was a period of groping. It is true that Ōgai wrote some of his outstanding works, *Ita Sekusuarisu* (Vita Sexualis), and *Gan*, (The Wild Goose), at this time; nevertheless, one feels that he still had not reached his goal. He was “going down the slope of life, neither afraid of death nor longing for death,” and he drew support from Goethe, saying:

How are you to attain self-knowledge? Neither by observation nor by action will this be possible. Try to fulfill your duties and obligations! And in the end you will come to know your own worth, you will come to know what your duties and obligations are, you will come to understand these as the needs of the day. You must know that it is sufficient to make your goal accord with the needs of the day. It is not possible for you yourself to know what is sufficient. It is as if you were to find yourself at a point where you should at all costs not be. It is not possible, despite everything, to regard a gray bird as a blue bird. To do so is to be lost, to be a dreamer. In dreams one meets with blue birds.

In statements of this nature, Ōgai voiced his everlasting sense of unfulfillment, and he spent all his spare time reading books on literature and philosophy. In this period, however, his attitude had changed from the time when he had been ab-
sorbed in the study of Hartmann’s philosophy of the unconscious, when he had devoured every work he was able to acquire. Now his reading was more in the nature of the disinterested observer. He expressed his feelings, saying: “While I doff my hat respectfully to the worthy gentlemen I encounter, I do not feel like following in the footsteps of these people. I have met many teachers, but I have not yet encountered one master.”

In an informal talk held in 1909, Ōgai attempted to explain his position, saying:

The answer to the question as to what word sums up my feeling best would be the word resignation. My feeling of resignation is not confined to the arts; every aspect of society evokes this in me. Others may think I must surely be suffering to hold such an attitude, but I am surprisingly unconcerned. Certainly, there is some suggestion of faint-heartedness in an attitude of resignation, but I do not intend to make any special defense against this accusation. Despite these words, Ōgai’s “resignation” was not a heartfelt attitude. Actually, “resignation” covered an inner feeling of perpetual discontent. His resignation was completely different from that of Dr. Hanabusia’s father who “was content to concentrate his emotions on the dull daily routine of being a post-station doctor.” In other words, Ōgai’s resignation was not the true resignation of the father of Dr. Hanabusia, nor did he possess his self-sufficiency. His resignation was scarcely more than a camouflage. This must be made evident. He knew better than anyone the fact that nothing could be achieved with such mixed feelings. We must now trace Ōgai’s unrest and groping by analyzing some of his writings. Unfortunately, there is no writer as difficult to fathom. For the time being, we will attempt to examine his thought in the period from 1911-13 through his works Seinen, (Youth), and “Kano-yō-ni,” (As If).

The hero of Seinen, Koizumi Junichi, is a literary youth who has just come up from the country. His dark eyes radiate natural purity. With such innocent eyes nothing could deceive him. And, while he graduated from a country middle school
with an excellent record, instead of going to a higher school he was now studying French. He was not particularly interested in attaining higher educational degrees. Nor was he particularly interested in pursuing any vocation. The management of his household he entrusted to someone else, leaving himself sufficient funds. He cherished hopes of being creative.

A. Ōgai’s attitude toward Naturalism

Junichi, bearing a letter of introduction from his teacher, meets with a columnist for the Tokyo Shinbun, Ōishi. Ōishi writes the literary arts column on the newspaper, and happens also to be a writer of the naturalist school. As a matter of fact, he resembles Masamune Hakuchō. When Junichi visits him, Kondō Tokio, a writer for the Shinshichō, (New Currents), also happens to be present. Kondō would like to hear Ōishi’s opinions on modern thought.

"The critics have said that what you have written are true confessions. I submit to the seriousness of such confessions; they are close to those of St. Augustine or Jean Jacques Rousseau."

Ōishi replied:

How fortunate for me! I personally find it bothersome to read the writings of past or present men of letters. Apparently, St. Augustine wrote in his Confessions that he was a dissolute youth whose attitude underwent a complete change when he became a Christian. When he wrote his Confessions he had become a fanatic priest. Rousseau had children by his wife as well as other women, and since he did not have the wherewithal to raise these children, he had them placed in an orphan asylum. I believe he also mentions in his Confessions that once when he was at the Italian embassy he was brought to the residence of some spectacular beauty and was seized with such trembling that he was not able to do anything. Yes, Rousseau was by nature a really clever scoundrel! In any event, the people I write about do things in a slovenly way and are deserving of damnation. How is it possible to call such people outstanding?
Replied to this, Kondō said: "Yes, I feel they really can be called great. They have all earned damnation because of their introspection and self-examination. Their attitude is austere and dignified."

"Then you’re saying that anybody not worthy of damnation is not really austere or dignified?"

Well, there may be eccentrics who can’t even get to the point of being worthy of damnation and also people who, even if they are deserving, brag about it in a very ignorant way. The inner life of such scoundrels is extremely impoverished. They haven’t the slightest taste for art, and they can’t write anything resembling a novel. They don’t even have the personal resources for regrets—nor do they possess the depth necessary for confession. People like this cannot be said to possess solemnity or dignity.

"Are you saying, then, that there is no one with artistic taste or creative ability in literature who is not an eccentric or a braggart?"

"Nobody can say positively whether or not creativity or taste is divine. It is certain, however, that the object of criticism is not divine. The object in this case is man."

"Then men are all worthy of damnation?"

"I don’t like being ridiculed!"

The foregoing was an example of freshness in the 1910 period, when naturalism in Japan had arrived at the stage of skepticism and confession. Ōishi himself was fundamentally an undeceived individual. He knew well the significance and the limitations of his actions and his literary works; he regarded both with cold objectiveness. Kondō, however, worshipped with an almost religious fervor the personal confession, skepticism, and decadence into which naturalism had fallen. The naturalist movement was largely supported by devotees of this type. Kondō’s attitude was essentially the attitude of the literary-minded youths of that time.

Junichi, meeting Ōishi, thought very highly of him, and tended to belittle himself. Although he intended to destroy the
preconceptions and conventional attitudes he had, upon meeting Ōishi, he saw that the latter's destructiveness was far more thoroughgoing than his own. Junichi, however, did not think about what it was that Ōishi possessed. He did not think about the fact that naturalism possessed positive meaning.

As time went on, the management of the *Tokyo Shinbun* changed; the naturalist tendencies were completely swept away and replaced by academicism. As we said earlier, the fictional character, Ōishi, was modeled on Masamune Hakuchō. In 1910, the old editor of the *Yomiuri Shinbun* died and the new editor hated naturalism; Hakuchō was discharged from the paper. Junichi thought:

This is nothing but reaction and oppression. Why is the freedom of thought not permitted to develop to the point of really correcting abuses? From Ōishi's standpoint, there must certainly be reason for dissatisfaction. Won't this dissatisfaction now be converted to violent anger? And even if such is not the case, won't Ōishi's attitude now be changed into one of mordant sarcasm? I wonder what kind of things he will now write? No, I suspect that as usual he will continue to write the same crystal-clear sentences which are never deflected by anything they come in contact with. I suspect he will probably continue to write in his usual disinterested vein; he will say, 'Alas, my mind is empty, I feel unconcerned.' The literary arena is trivial, there is nothing but grumbling and bemoaning fate. It is in a state of debilitation. In such circumstances, it should be clear that violent counterfeelings cannot arise.

The criticism Junichi here directs against Ōishi can, in its entirety, be taken as Ōgai's criticism against naturalism. Ōgai had little of that concern with morals that Sōseki had, and he did not, therefore, regard the naturalist movement as a reflection of the modern naturalist morality as contrasted with the pre-modern romanticist morality. To Ōgai, naturalism was never more than a literary problem. In the *Ita Sekusuarisu* he wrote: "Meanwhile, what is called naturalism began. When
Kanai saw the works of this new school, he did not feel particularly upset. The works instead aroused his interest extraordinarily.” In other words, naturalism did not have the same creative shock value for Ōgai that it had for Sōseki.

B. The individual and the state.

We return once more to Seinen. Junichi picked up a French magazine from the table of the boarding house where he was staying. He read an article about the death of a famous artist. The latter lived in a mean little hut near snow-capped mountains; he hadn’t even a proper stove in his cold hut. When he was about to die, he had someone open the window and stared out at the snow-capped peaks. Junichi put the magazine down.

This is what art probably is. The Alp one should be painting is really modern society. At home I dreamed of plunging into the vortex of the city. Now, I am adrift. It’s good to be adrift . . . What would have happened if the artist in this article had not opened his window at all, had never gone outside his house? Living on the mountain would have been meaningless!

Junichi, coming out of his reverie, resolved that he had to depict the social scene. One day, he went with a friend called Seto to hear a lecture at the Youth Club. The lecturer was Hirata Fuseki, a thinly-veiled reference to Natsume Sōseki. The subject of his lecture was “Ibsen.”

The lecturer developed his theme, saying: Ibsen started out as a Norwegian—a minor writer in a small country; by dealing with social drama he became a ‘European Ibsen,’ a giant. Transplanted to Japan, he has once more become a dwarf. Whatever is brought to Japan seems to shrink! Nietzsche, Tolstoy, they too have been reduced in size. To recall the words of Nietzsche, it is at such a time that the world itself becomes small, and all things in it are reduced, and the last of mankind minces about with little steps. These last ones of the human race wink, saying they have found happiness. The Japanese have imported all kinds of doctrines, every sort of ‘ism,’ and amusing themselves with
these, also wink. Everything that falls into the hands of
the Japanese becomes a toy, what originally was frightening
is no longer a threat. Indeed, it's not all necessary to evoke
Yamaga Sokō, the Forty-Seven Rōnin, or the worthies of
Mito, and have them oppose a tiny Tolstoy or Ibsen!
It was in such words of scathing satire that Ōgai took to task
the nationalism of that period.

The speaker, Fuseki, becoming serious, stated that there
were two aspects in Ibsen’s individualism. First, he said, the
red thread running through Ibsen’s life work was his gradual
breaking of the shackles of custom, the prescription that the
individual had to live as an individual. Then, changing the
subject, he said, “In Peer Gynt Ibsen really showed in poetic
form one aspect of himself: his social aspect.” There was,
however, another aspect of Ibsen’s self, which,

Had this not been present, would have meant that he was
doing nothing but speaking for license. Ibsen was just not
that sort of person. There was in Ibsen a special social aspect
of his self which he was ever attempting to advance. This
was manifested in Brand. Why was Ibsen trying to discard
the rotted bonds of custom? It certainly wasn’t in order to
wallow in the mud; it was to acquire freedom. Ibsen wanted
to flap his wings against the wind, to fly high and far.

Zola’s Claude quested art, Ibsen’s Brand pursued the ideal.
Indeed, in the interest of this pursuit, he sacrificed wife and
child without a backward glance. He even ended by destroy-
ing himself. And yet, there are some who look with jaundiced
eye and feel that Brand was a satire! Brand’s ideal was ‘all
or nothing.’ The content of Ibsen’s demands was limited to
this ideal of Brand’s which emerged from his self, which
emerged from his will. The road which he was traveling was
a road opened by his self. Ethics existed for the purpose of
paying homage to himself, it was a personal ethics. This
was true of his religious faith as well. The word that sums
this up is autonomie. Nevertheless, Ibsen was not able to
give formal organization to this concept. He remained a
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person who quested, a modern man, a new man.

This was a splendid summation of Ibsen’s thought and, at the same time, it was a good approximation of Sōseki’s position too. In Sore Kara’s Daisuke there is embodied an individualism of this kind.

As he listened to Fuseki’s talk, Junichi felt a sense of agitation. It reminded him of something. This memory bothered him. At the meeting Junichi became acquainted with a man named Ōmura, and on the way home, while they were talking, he thought he knew what it was that was disturbing him. The lecturer had spoken of Ibsen as a new man. Junichi questioned what sort of person this new man would be. After all, the naturalists thought of themselves as new men. Was this new man, then, one who in the final analysis was free of morality, religion, and ideals? Indeed, what was there that was special about this new man? Was it the positivistic or the negativistic new man who was the true representative of these ideals? What would a positivistic new man be like? If this sort of person was to be a thoroughly destructive one, he would also be one who constructs. If he smashed, he would also rebuild. No matter how many times philosophies are set up, they are also torn down. The new man, similarly, whatever he constructed, would, of a certainty, become a captive of this. And yet, since his bonds would be new ones, they would seem different to him and he probably would not even feel them. If, on the contrary, he were a negative new man and lived tranquilly within the framework of his negativistic scepticism, what would be the result? No, that would be impossible. There is a contradiction between living tranquilly and possessing soul-searing doubts. The new man cannot be characterized by eternal doubts. He is a man who is eternally questing and eternally hoping.

The “discussion” that Ōmura and Junichi are having takes the form of monologues like the above. Ōgai, in Seinen, speaks of the “present attempt to subjugate individualism, which is like trying to force children who are awake to study in bed.”
He further said, 

Individualism is a Western concept, and therefore it does not have a concept of self-sacrifice. In the Orient, however, individualism becomes changed into 'family-ism,' the latter becomes the basis for statist and nationalism. Therefore, in the Orient it is possible to sacrifice one's self for the sake of one's lord and father. 

The question remains, what was Ogai's own attitude? He made a distinction between individualism and utilitarianism. Individualism, he felt, was self-seeking and altruistic. It goes without saying that Ogai's position was based on altruistic individualism. Ōgai has Ōmura speak as follows:

Utilitarianism is really representative of the bad aspect in Nietzsche. It is an example of the will to power, the will which thrives on overthrowing others to make one's self great. If everybody acted this way, the result would be anarchy. It goes without saying that this kind of individualism is evil. Altruistic individualism is completely different. We make a stout self-defense and, without flagging, we also make all life our concern. We render loyal service to our load. This service, however, we render in our capacity as citizens, not as the slavish retainers of a former age. We endeavor to be filial towards our parents. We do this, however, in our capacity as modern children and not as previous ages when it was even possible for parents to sell or kill children. In short, loyalty and filial piety give value to the entirety of the life which we have made our concern. Thereby, daily life too attains value. It is on this basis that we can be dedicated, can sacrifice and still retain our individualism. The highest affirmation of love is the love-suicide; the highest affirmation of loyalty is, similarly, to die in battle. When life in its universal aspect becomes our concern, individualism dies or, rather, is transformed into universalism. This is entirely different from the ordinary modern individualism which merely seeks death by rejecting life... 

In this fashion Ōgai was able to resolve the question of
individualism. A question remains, however. Did not Ōgai feel that there was some degree of separation between the sovereign and the State? Under feudalism, clearly, there could not arise in the relations between lord and retainer any contradiction in the nature of that between the sovereign and State. The modern State, however, is the "Leviathan." After the Russo-Japanese War, as was stated earlier, the functional unity between the State and the people was destroyed. The State itself, in its relations with the outside world, moved from its hitherto defensist position to a new positive position. The internal unrest was a consequence of the Marxist critique of imperialism, individualism, and naturalism. In a period of such great transformation, Ōgai’s personal resolution could never be the one accepted by everybody. Sōseki, as a citizen, for one, felt that State morality was on a much lower level than individual morality. It was quite natural that this would not be the conclusion of Ōgai, who was surgeon general for the Japanese army and a member of "General Yamagata’s brain trust." The work in which we can trace Ōgai’s spiritual turmoil is "Ka no yō ni," (As If).

This was published in January, 1912. This was immediately after the Great Treason Affair, and the executions of Kōtoku and the others were still fresh in the public mind. All sorts of doubts had arisen about the old concepts of authority. The Imperial House, the myths, had become targets of criticism. It was also a period in which blind conservatism, the xenophobic national morality movement, and the ultranationalist movement were all developing apace. In this work Ōgai attempted to make inquiry into the question of how to work out a suitable compromise with the new needs of the period. His hero is Hidemaro, the son of a viscount. After graduating from the Peers School, Hidemaro entered the university and graduated with an outstanding record in history. He intended to specialize in Japanese history as his life’s work. Nevertheless, saying he did not want to write at all, he picked as his graduation theme "King Kanishika and the Samgiti Sutra." The viscount's house-
hold was a wealthy one and immediately after graduation Hide-
maro went abroad to Germany to study. He entered the univer-
sity and did not specialize in any particular subject. It was felt
that later, when he became head of the household, that it would
be satisfactory just so long as he was a bulwark of the Imperial
House and worked in a manner suitable to his rank. This,
essentially, was the way his father thought. However, from
the time Hidemaro wrote his graduation theme he seemed to
become ill. It was not a physical illness; he was pale, his eyes
looked strange, and he became extremely anti-social. He seemed
troubled. When, however, it was determined that Hidemaro
should go abroad, he seemed to recover his spirits. He sent
letters from the various places he visited, including Berlin. In
these letters, he once wrote with special enthusiasm about the
work and the vigor of the theologian Adolph von Harnack. The
main points in this letter were as follows:

Politics is the task of uniting many disparate people.
Therefore, in political administration tremendous importance
must, even today, be placed on religion which still motivates
many. The religion of north and south are completely dif-
ferent and opposed, it is necessary, therefore, to manipulate
carefully the public mind. In foreign relations too, despite
an apparent loss of vigor, the Pope and the Catholic religion
are still deeply rooted and must also be taken into account.
German politics then must, without antagonizing the Catholic
south, push forward its plans for culture in the spirit of the
Protestant north. In all of this the monarch must maintain
a firm basis in religion. This firm basis exists for the Ger-
man monarch in Protestant theology. The man who today
best represents this Protestant theology is Harnack. Dr.
Harnack, however, does not in the least distort his theological
opinions in the interest of politics. The monarch himself
would not permit such a thing. Therein, I feel, lies the
strength of Germany. And Germany’s position in the world,
of which she may well be proud, rests on this. And even in
in the present, in an age when the Social-Democratic Party
is riding high, Kaiser Wilhelm II and his aides-de-camp make unprepared tours, they ride about all over Berlin without bodyguards. It might be well to compare this with conditions in Russia. The Greek Orthodox Church has been permitted to decay. Superficially, amiability is maintained, but quietly the masses are made fools of. This is the nature of Russian politics. If the time comes that these masses awaken, they will probably become the most extreme anarchists. Therefore, there is never a time that the Tsar goes out without being surrounded by plainclothesmen. Basically, if there is religious faith, theology is unnecessary. Even in Germany, the study of theology, with the exception of those who intend to become priests or pastors, is not necessary for those who are not members of religious groups. Theology is apparently not necessary for those great numbers of people who do not study and whose intellectual capacity is undeveloped. It is only useful for those who have become scholars. Yet, from the very outset, those who are scholars do not possess the 'faith' one associates with religionists. People of this type, educated people, people without faith, cannot simply respect God, cannot simply respect the Gospel. Thus, paralleling their lack of faith, they come to not recognize the necessity of religion. Such people are dangerous thinkers. Among them, there are those with no faith who pretend to believe and to acknowledge the necessity for religion. There are truly many like these. Yet, there are many among this group who have studied the history of the Protestant Church and doctrine, who have education and who are able to investigate the pure dogma of the Church as specialists. After this painstaking investigation, these specialists come to the conclusion that religion is necessary, though they themselves remain without faith. It is in something like this that we can recognize moderate thinkers. In Germany there are many who hold such a position, and this is the basis for my remark that Germany's strength is based on her theology.

Essentially, Hidemaro was praising Harnack's character in this
fashion.

It is with this letter that Ōgai's conceptions become clear. In this difficult area he felt that Japan's model should be Germany. He did not want Japan to be an authoritarian country like Imperial Russia. He felt, in the period when anti-national thought was raising its head, the necessity for building a state which could withstand the criticism of the intelligentsia. He studied religious dogma and church history. He came to feel that, on the basis of this, even someone without faith would find religion necessary. This problem of state and religion did not exist in such complicated form as in a state which had gone through various historical experiences in terms of the complicated "Christianity and the state pattern," which existed in the West. In Japan, however, there was the continuing problem of myth and state origin. This was especially true in Japan, which since the Restoration rested on State Shinto, on the fusion of the State and the Shinto religion. Criticism of the myth took place, and that myth and history were differentiated could not but have great influence on the position of the State. In Germany, no matter how painstakingly the history of Christianity was investigated, there was no danger to the position of the State. Basically, religion is one device to enable statesmen to rule. In Japan, however, to criticize the myths of the State means, ultimately, to criticize the very national polity itself. Ōgai was not able to mix myth and history foolishly the way some of the nationalists did. He could not do anything so unconscionable. Nevertheless, there was no possibility, given Japanese conditions at that time, of permitting criticism of the myths and of the national polity. It was on the basis of such intellectual torment that he created his hero, the young student of Japanese history, Hidemaro. Hidemaro called to mind Harnack's position and attempted, before writing Japanese history, to clarify the boundaries of myth and history. First, he would write on the corpus of doctrinal history of faith accompanying the myth structure, which he would tidy-up in scholarly fashion. To do this, he intended to write clearly on
the history of shrines and temples, which constituted the vehicle, in a sense, for dealing with the faith in a priestly fashion. He believed that thereby he would not do injury to the dogma or the institution of ancestor worship. However, surrounding circumstances did not permit of this. He could not but despair. At just this time Hidemaro happened across a book by the German philosopher, Hans Vaihinger, called *Die Philosophie des Als Ob*, (The Philosophy of As If).

It goes without saying that *Ka no Yō ni* is Ōgai's rendering of the phrase *Als Ob*, (As If). To Vaihinger, human knowledge and learning, when investigated to their very origins, do not rest on empirically verifiable fact. Rather, it is as if they are based on truth. For example, in mathematics we speak of points and lines. No matter how minutely we attempt to make a dot, it is a point—in the sense that a point in mathematics is something thought of as having definite position in space, but no size or shape. The same holds true for a line. No matter how finely drawn, a line remains the path of a moving point, thought of as having length but not breadth. In other words, lines and points do not exist. Yet, if we did not regard them as if they existed, we could not have a geometry. Similarly, in the spiritual sphere we speak of the existence of freedom, the immortality of the soul, and of duties and obligations. If we did not regard such things as if they existed, it would not be possible to establish ethical systems. The same holds true for what we regard as ideals. Vaihinger's position comes down to this: art, science, ethics, philosophy, and religion are all based on this as if concept.

In "*Ka No Yō Ni,*" Hidemaro says:

...were it not for the as if, science, art, and religion would not be possible. The core of all the life values is this as if. The ancients believed in the existence of a god or many gods in human form and bowed their heads before them. I too reverently bow my head before them, as if they really exist. My feeling of reverence is not a fervent one, but it is a pure one. I feel the same way about morality and, while I know
that it is not possible to set up a proof for duty, I become furious when I see how Ibsen, for example, deals with ghosts and apparitions in his plays. His type of destructiveness is perhaps unavoidable. But is there really nothing after this? While it is intangible, it is like something which is faintly perceived from the outside; and I feel as if inside it exists plainly in all its solemn magnificence. Human beings must always act as if they have duties and obligations. This is the way I intend to conduct myself. The question as to the fact of human descent from apes is, to the extent that attempts are made to prove this fact, a hypothesis which is somewhat different from proceeding as if human descent were a fact. In the final analysis, however, even the theory of evolution rests on this as if type of thinking. We can only think as if the species evolved. I regard human progress as advancing to a bright future. I intend to advance to this bright future in a moral fashion, while looking back as if there are ancestral spirits, while worshipping my ancestors as if I have obligations. If I do this, there would be no difference in fact between myself and the most ignorant submissive back-wood's peasant, except that I will not be unaware of what I am doing. Is there any thought as safe as this! God is not a fact. Duty and obligation are not facts. And yet, while we must recognize this, this feat of recognition leads to sulling God and to trampling duties and obligations underfoot. It is in this that danger lies. We must attempt to root out such dangers; actions, to be sure, and even thought in this vein must be stamped out. Of course, it is impossible to return to the period when people believed in paradise, when they believed that the sun moved around the earth. To do this would mean that you would have to destroy the universities and education, that you would have to plunge society into darkness, and fool the masses. This is impossible. There is thus no other way than my as if position of reverence.

This position, no matter how well thought out, was nothing but a compromise. It was natural for Ōgai, who also was some-
thing of a statesman. Yet this quality was always joined in him with his desire for intellectual self-discipline. While writing in this fashion, Ōgai was quite well aware of the uselessness of such a policy of compromise.

In the same year he wrote “Ka No Yo Ni,” General Nogi, the hero of the Russo-Japanese War, and his wife committed suicide in traditional fashion after the death of Emperor Meiji. Ōgai was shocked and felt as if his entire existence had been beaten flat. In the period immediately after the death of Nogi, his attitude toward life underwent a change. Ōgai, who had felt that the modern ego was dismembering the world and had consequently developed his as if philosophy as a sort of compromise with this ego, now utterly rejected this philosophy. He resolved to attempt to search reverently for the spiritual tradition buried within the Japanese Folk. Consequently, while he was still within the stream of the Taishō Period’s (1912-1925) optimistic liberalism, saying nothing, he busied himself with writing historical novels. And it was from this period that he left us with many writings on the forgotten Japanese folk-soul. He wrote while very much concerned with the decline of the people, in an age which had no sympathy or understanding of the tradition. We can say that Ōgai’s true resignation begins with this period. He finally reached the point he was fated to reach.
CHAPTER II

AFTER NATURALISM

1. From Naturalism to Neo-Idealism

Among the works of Kunkida Doppo there is a rather short sketch called Hirō, (Fatigue). This sketch is a description of an extremely busy man lying sprawled on the floor of his lodging, staring vacantly at the ceiling. He has spent a busy day receiving callers from early morning, sending telegrams, answering the phone, coming, going. He is a man in his middle years, the type who at that time was called a "merchant prince." Lying thus, and staring at the ceiling, "his broad powerful face showed signs of extreme fatigue." He was tired to the point of finding it a bother to undress. However, since the phone rang again, he sprang up, spoke into the mouthpiece in a vigorous voice; saying, "please come soon," to the other party, he hung up. Returning to the room once again, he threw himself down in a heap. Then, apparently thinking of something, he lifted his right hand and counted something off on his fingers. Suddenly, however, "he felt his hand drop to the floor, he began to snore loudly, and fell into a deep sleep." This is the substance of this short sketch of Doppo's. What it was that Doppo was intending, nor, indeed, why he wrote this sketch, it is difficult to conjecture. And yet, reading this sketch, we are able to evoke a sense of the blind alley up which the fervid exertions of the Japanese had led them by the year 1912.

It was now over fifty years since Perry had come to Japan; the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-05 had taken place. During this period the Japanese had assiduously adopted Western civilization and culture, and had exerted themselves mightily in the modernization of Japan. Furthermore, they had ex-
pended their entire strength in the war against Russia and had become one of the great powers of the world. What was the outcome of all this? Japan had overtaken the West, or at least seemed to have done so. The question remained, was this the true West that Japan was overtaking, or a mere shell? Did not indeed the fin de siècle currents flowing over Japan emerge from the shell of the West rather than from the West itself? Can we not also conclude that while Japan was absorbed in overtaking the West she utterly lost what was important to herself. Upon reflection, it would seem that there was a great void in Japan, that in this race to catch up she had ended by discarding her essence. Worst of all, Japan had thoroughly exhausted herself in gaining victory over Russia, and was now in a state of utter fatigue. What was the purpose of the exertions of the forty years of the Meiji Period? Had these become vain and meaningless? Did not the boredom and fatigue to which middle-age people are prone, in a sense, attack all Japan by the Meiji 40’s? Doppo had written in his short sketch that “the man’s hand fell to the ground, and he slept, his face like the face of a dead man.” Perhaps one may interpret this descriptive piece as being representative of Japan in the period after the Russo-Japanese War, or, at very least, as reflecting the intelligentsia. We have already spoken of the origins, nature, and significance of naturalism. However, when we reflect on conditions immediately after the Russo-Japanese War and the relationship between naturalism and the entirety of the Meiji period as these manifested themselves at this time, we are forced to conclude that the fatigue of the late Meiji period was deeply embedded in the very ground work of naturalism. We must conclude that this was the origin of the feeling of nothingness, of emptiness, which became general in naturalism.

Ishikawa Takuboku, in a letter written in February, 1908, gave expression to his feeling of emptiness, saying:

From the very outset, man stands alone. The unbearableleness of this loneliness leads him to build religious fantasies, leads him to have visions of glory, or wealth, or power. When
he senses the loneliness of life, this feeling of *I stand alone*, this is the finish, everything becomes useless. Nothingness! Emptiness! Man is really an empty scoundrel with an imperious bearing who stands before us. This is repellent, and yet, taken for what he is—empty—it can’t be helped. Oh! What pathos attends the disclosure of reality, the whole-hearted abandonment of inner ostentation! This pathos is not the kind of thing which is washed away by tears....I am cognizant of how deeply the ‘empty’ thought attending the rise of naturalism has bestirred human hearts. The only phrase that naturalism has been able to teach man is ‘suit yourself.’ There is neither good nor evil, beauty nor ugliness, only ‘bare facts.’ This is what we are left with—bare facts! Suit yourself! What lonely comfortless words! And yet there is no alternative. The possession of *absolute freedom* makes ‘emptiness’ implicit.

We can thus get an impression of how deeply engrained in naturalism was this feeling of emptiness. It is possible to interpret naturalism in this fashion, it contained at its core feelings of emptiness, sentiments regarding the meaningless-ness of life, and the absence of any values. We cannot but conclude that naturalism was, in Japan, a type of *nihilism*. Interestingly enough, it was at this time in Japan that the word nihilist became current. There was not, however, an exact correspondence between nihilism and naturalism. We must see precisely how naturalism distinguished itself from nihilism.

Not only did naturalism not evolve into nihilism, but after an unexpectedly swift rise which reached its peak in 1909, it declined even more rapidly and was soon replaced by other intellectual tendencies. Part of the reason that naturalism did not become synonymous with nihilism lies in the individualist and socialist tendencies after 1897, which in a sense nurtured naturalism. For example, the individualism and instinctivism of Chogyū, which demanded the realization or liberation of the individual, and advocated such things as the affirmation of instinct, has been regarded by some among the naturalists as
the forerunner of naturalism. And, in general, there were extremely strong elements in naturalism of the demand for self-realization or self-liberation. The Japanese up to the Sino-Japanese War (1894-95) were largely educated to be useful servants of the new state which had been erected by their fathers and elder brothers. For these people, the State or Japan was the highest form of existence and authority. However, this became transformed; individualism arose and made the self the ultimate goal of existence. Individualism required that the individual be regarded as the highest source of authority. It set itself in rebellion against all authority outside the self. There is thus a possible interpretation which suggests that naturalism developed from this type of "individualism." This is not quite like nihilism.

Another effect of the Sino-Japanese War was that at the same time it caused the maturation of capitalism in Japan it also lead to the development of lower class society and encouraged the developing Socialist movement. Another developmental process exists in connection with the change in the concept of the ideal human being. At the beginning, the type of bravos who played a part in the Restoration were idealized. In the next phase, the idealized type was the person charged with "administering the State and seeing to the welfare of the Realm." And, finally, in the period of the Sino-Japanese War and subsequently, there appeared the "genius" as an ideal type, and this latter phase was essentially the idealization of the "great man." With the establishment of the Socialist movement and the awareness of the rights of the lower classes, the common man, or, better, the ordinary man, came into his own. In a sense, it is possible to think of the development of the "ordinary man" as an ideal type. Socialism grew within the framework of this doctrine of "ordinary man" and differed in its outlook from naturalism. In the same way that individualism attempted to rebel against the State and against all authority, socialism cultivated a revolutionary destructive fervor against traditional norms and institutions. This was because there were implicit in
the development of Japanese naturalism both socialism and individualism. Despite the fact that naturalism comprised various destructive and negative tendencies, it had a positive aspect which prevented it from becoming outright nihilism. This then is part of the reason why naturalism did not become synonymous with nihilism.

There is, however, another reason why this was so. Partly, this is in the "facts" which were emphasized by naturalism, and partly, within the many-sided and obscure concept of "nature" which was stressed. If we examine the first part of this statement, it is certain that naturalism made light of moral standards for good and evil, as well as aesthetic standard for beauty and ugliness, and only sought the "truth of life in plain and unvarnished facts." Therefore, at first glance, naturalism appeared to be frightfully destructive, and the only ideal was truth, the truth of life. Naturalism sought a "truth" which would transcend good and evil, beauty and ugliness. The only thing that was important, and that naturalism wanted to preserve at all cost, was the distinction between truth and falsity. It did not doubt, or subject to questioning, the ideal of truth or the authority of truth. Up to this point we can say that naturalism was probably developing into nihilism. To be sure, there may have been doubts about truth itself, but of course, there did not appear any attempts at suppression of these doubts. Basically, naturalism exerted itself to keep from rejecting the word truth.

Now we have to examine the latter half of the statement made above concerning the many-sidedness of the concept "nature" as used by the naturalists. We attempted to substitute the word nature for the word truth, and in the word truth we can already recognize two aspects. On the one hand, there is a subjective sincerity as well as a sense of seriousness of purpose. This is basically an attitude of earnestness towards one's self and towards life. On the other hand, truth has within it a pure objectivism not adulterated by subjectivism. Plain depiction, objective depiction, represents this tendency to unvarnished
truth. This is the first aspect of the many-sided concept of nature. Alternatively, the word substituted for nature was the phrase *unvarnished truth*, the depiction of things *just as they are*. What does it mean to present things *just as they are*? This too is a many-sided concept. Is, for example, the discarding of artificiality, “unvarnished”? Is commonplaceness, which consequently comprises lies and artificiality, is this then “unvarnished”? Should we, then, in the interest of presenting the bare fact reject things containing history and tradition? The most pure and simple things contain aspects which have to be rejected on the basis of this dictum. On the contrary, it is probably simple fiction which, paradoxically, can be free of artificiality and lies.

Is it possible for us to conceive of any complete actuality free of history and tradition? Furthermore, what we call nature seemingly is unrelated to value but, as part of the many-sidedness of this concept, is apparently related to value. If, for example, we examine such words as instinct or impulse, we see that by virtue of the fact that these only exist in nature, and by virtue of the fact that nature is the basis of human life, that these alone should be revered. Furthermore, another aspect of the problem is related to the special characteristics of Japan and the West.

The “nature” upon which the modern science of the West is based is a mechanistic nature and, accordingly, a rational nature. “Nature” in the Orient is fatalistic, mystical, and irrational. The mechanistic nature of the West can be controlled and analyzed. On the other hand, “nature” as conceived in the Orient controls us, forces us ultimately to reject our egos, and to resign ourselves to fate. The foregoing represents but a small part of all the possibilities which we can find by a careful analysis of the vague concept of nature contained in Japanese naturalism. Thus, as we have seen, there was reason for the disintegration of naturalism and for the fact that it could not but give way before many different tendencies.

Thus, under naturalism, people were repeatedly faced with
questions as to the nature of man and life. It is in this that the achievement of naturalism lies. Unfortunately, while naturalism was able to pose questions, it could not answer them. Some people moved on to humanism, some to aestheticism, and some to symbolism. Also, some people became interested in socialism and some rediscovered special significance in the traditions of Japan's past. Some withdrew into an attitude of resignation; and some advocated, as Sōseki did, "follow heaven, abandon self." There were also some who established reality as an ideal.

2. Ōdo's Experimental Idealism

What is the reason that there was never any development in Japan of American and English streams of thought? It is not that the Japanese were never utilitarian or practical. The fact remains that Anglo-American thought did not sink its roots in Japan. In a certain sense, a bad sense, the Japanese can be considered excessively utilitarian and practical. Yet, as doctrines, utilitarianism and pragmatism were not popular. It must be concluded that experimentalism was not particularly cultivated. On the contrary, sensationalism and impressionism became popular. Also, it was in contrast to Anglo-American philosophies that the philosophy of idealism became popular. We must attempt to see why this was so. Possibly the explanation for this might be found in the fact that a national character which runs to extremes of passion and coldness, a nation easily aroused to fever pitch and just as easily pacified, would be dissatisfied with such an everyday ordinary philosophy as empiricism. If we posit such a national character, it may be possible to explain the foregoing questions.

If we think of Japanese society, which lived for long under the oppression of a feudal system, we will find a tendency to rapid progress and, contrariwise, a tendency to submit to oppression. In such a society, there will be a tendency to blind conservatism. There will neither be moderate progressivism nor dynamic conservatism. Possibly another reason might be found in the fact that the Japanese do not appreciate a type of thought
which attempts to fuse learning or scholarship or science with life rather than keep these separate. In any event, there are many such reasons, and the fact remains that in Japan an idealism combined with pragmatism did not much develop, and did not draw the attention of the intellectuals.

In 1911, Ōdo published a book called *Shosai Kara Gaitō e*, (From the Study to the Street). Sōseki reviewed this work as follows:

Among our rather impoverished literary critics, only the learned Tanaka Ōdo has unstintingly given his energy, spirit, scholarship, and learning, to present us with a magnificent book. In view of the fact that an ordinary person has not the time, the inclination, or the money to make the elaborate preparations that Ōdo does, it is apparent that the scholar Ōdo is a man of great leisure. He goes to extremes and uses language which praises himself and denigrates others in exactly the same fashion as a feudal lord being rude to towns- men, but we must conclude that, though ludicrous, he is never base.

What Sōseki had pointed out before coming to this conclusion about Ōdo was that in Ōdo’s view there was established a grand concept of the social as well as psychological part played by government and the individual, and ideals and the individual. And yet he felt that behind this magnificent edifice there was very little substance. It was merely a shiny theory which had not been tested in the real world.

This was an essentially correct criticism and adequately covered Ōdo’s shortcomings as well as his strong points. What Ōdo meant by his “From the Study to the Streets” was to base the learning of the study on the practice of the streets, or to base the practice of the street on the research of the study. In this way he thought to unite theory and practice. Ōdo believed, in distinction to Matthew Arnold who taught that literature was the critique of life, that philosophy was the critique of life. It was within this concept that he attempted to find the social function of philosophy. The next work which Ōdo
published in 1912 was a collection of critical essays entitled *Tetsujin Shugi*, (The Beliefs of a Philosopher). He felt that the worthy man oriented towards social practice had to be a pragmatic theoretical philosopher. His own beliefs were neither directed at flattering the desires of the masses as in democracy, nor were they the aristocratic slighting of these desires. He recognized the desires of the masses and was not remote from life, but he believed it was necessary to vitalize the ideals which arose from the center of life itself, and to bring these into harmony with the needs of the masses. His critical method was to expound philosophy as a criticism of life, and, consequently, philosophy had a social function. When he discussed morality, although he was critical of the morality of naturalism and the temporary revival of Confucian morality at this time, he used in his discussion such great concepts as the difference between instinct and impulse, or the relation between the ideal and the real. Here, as Ōséki pointed out, “The entrance was broad but not extensive or deep,” Ōdo’s method was nothing but a *tour de force*.

Ōdo described his position as one of experimental idealism, and said that his position had four characteristics. The first, he called a “natural” characteristic. By this he meant the natural fact of the human lust for life, which was established experimentally and, in this sense, signified the rejection of supernatural, mystical, metaphysical existence. Secondly, Ōdo spoke of a “developmental” factor. The instinct of animals is predetermined and is nothing more than a factual datum as to the adjustment the animal makes to its environment. Human impulse is indeterminate, and is consequently based on the method man uses to solve the problem of adjusting to his environment. Therefore, suffering is plentiful and human life includes development. This tendency to develop can be called the human trend to the ideal. This means that human experience can be regarded as being dynamic. Thirdly, Ōdo spoke of an “organic” factor. The development of this kind of human desire is always accomplished through a clash of contradictions; at bottom there
is an organic unity, and through this clash of contradictions man aspires to attain a higher and greater unity. Finally, Ōdo spoke of a "functional" factor. All values or ideals are, perforce, societal functions, and this functional factor possessed by man contains an "index value" of the manifestation of tendencies and the resolving of problems. This in essence, is really Dewey's pragmatism or instrumentalism, and Ōdo did not make any especially original contribution to this. As a matter of fact, Ōdo was not very original as a philosopher. Nevertheless, in even the simplest of his critical articles this type of philosophizing was ever-present. Sōseki, commented mockingly on the extraordinary complexity of Ōdo's writing even with regard to the simplest of issues.

Ōdo, as a pragmatist-critic, however, was an extremely rare phenomenon in Japan. Unfortunately we cannot go into his writing in detail. We will instead examine how he confronted naturalism at that time. He dealt with literary problems in some detail and wrote many lengthy critical essays on such subjects as Natsume Sōseki's "Philosophical Foundations of Literature," and on Shimamura Hōgetsu's views on naturalism. Sōseki wrote regarding Ōdo's criticism:

Ōdo has devoted a hundred and sixty-six pages to a criticism of my work. I feel deeply honored...and while he seems to have trodden me underfoot, I have no feeling of having been stepped on. The force of Ōdo's argument is similar to the attitude of an official at the birth-registry office who, while ignoring the fact of a birth, only writes a formal report in compliance with official procedure, at great length and in profuse detail, as if he had never received an official notice at all.

The main focus of Sōseki's argument was as follows. It is all to the good if, as its chief emphasis, a work of art sets up truth as an ideal. This does not mean, however, that there ought not to be works of art which present beauty as their chief ideal. The present tendency is only to value truth, and there is much criticism which assumes that work which has no truth is useless.
It is like ignoring the whole because of some prejudice against a part. Ōdo was not concerned with whether the aesthetic ideal or truth as an ideal should have primacy in literature. And for this reason Sōseki did not feel criticized to the degree that Ōdo intended.

Hōgetsu felt a similar sense of dissatisfaction with Ōdo. In his essay “Kaigi to Kokuhaku”, (Skepticism and Confession), he said in effect that pragmatism as a philosophy was extremely close to his own position. The only trouble was that it was extremely lacking in remorse over yesterday and anxiety over tomorrow. From this position, Hōgetsu came to feel close to an almost religious type of resignation. In Ōdo’s criticisms this type of sensitiveness was lacking.

Besides the two criticisms mentioned above, which dealt with Sōseki’s Philosophical Foundations of Literature and Shimamura Hōgetsu’s Naturalism, Ōdo also wrote on Iwano Hömei’s philosophy of Life and Art. This criticism was particularly effective. Here we are able to see his attitude towards naturalism.

Ōdo’s criticism of Hömei comprised three points. First, he criticized Hömei’s view that life contained no ideals, was incapable of resolution, was only blind impulse and suffering, and that reality was not idealistic. He said that Hömei’s attitude of stressing reality, a reality which does not comprise ideals, is nothing but a highly abstract reality. As opposed to this, there must be a concrete reality which does contain ideals. If one asks why this is so, it is because human life is a composite of desires and ideals. What is called living, is a process of continual resolution of problems and, perforce, requires ideals as the driving force in this continual problem solving. “To my way of looking, living itself is a resolution. By not resolving the problem of suffering, it is not possible to continue living in any significant sense of the term. In this sense, then, a ‘life’ of unresolved suffering is a contradiction in terms.”

The second point in Ōdo’s criticism of Hömei was directed against his so-called “momentism”—an attitude which rejected
past and future and placed paramount importance on living for the moment, an attitude which lead ultimately to the Japanese Decadence. Also, he criticized Hōmei’s concept of the "unity of the spirit and the flesh." Hōmei had written, "Art which embodies momentism is not merely a part of life, or just a means to life, it is the unified spiritual and material entirety of life as well as the stuff of life." Hōmei felt that the division of labor in modern life had somehow diminished man, and the split between spirit and flesh had somehow brought life into a state of degeneracy. As against this, Hōmei called for the type of unity of mind and body which had existed for the ancients; he demanded the same kind of instantaneous grasping of all phenomena. It was in this sense that he sought the unity of life. Ōdo, however, directed his criticism against this. His position was that unity of mind and body was all to the good; however, since our daily life itself represented a concrete unity of mind and body, there was no necessity for seeking this in the life of the ancients. He felt that because there had been little of reflection and suffering in the life of the ancients, there also, correspondingly, had been no fervor or avidity in this life. And, despite Hōmei, no matter how much momentary fervor there is in life, as long as this remains episodic, of only a momentary nature, it leads in practice to the separation of mind and body, to confusion. Hōmei ignored the fact that human life is qualitatively one but has distinctions in its functions, or interaction. He ignored the structure, the composition, of life. Hōmei, by thinking of human activities as a simple inseparable whole, ended by thinking of these mechanically rather than functionally.

The third and final point in Ōdo’s criticism was directed at Hōmei’s concept of individualism. He opposed the view that the only serious function of human beings was the eternal drive to satisfy personal desires—the view that the moment anti-individualist fraternal elements were present, this single-minded earnest drive was lost. In this connection Ōdo said that, granting that human life functions by striving for self-satisfaction,
this drive for self-satisfaction contains altruistic as well as selfish elements. Altruism is not simply the opposite side of selfishness, rather, the human race is structured in terms of one moral concept. It is not, as in the words of Hōmei, that, "The universe is nothing but the arena containing the footprints of the strong, that is to say, the universe is synonymous with the existence of the mighty." Life is not just established on the basis of elements of might, it also contains moral elements. Hōmei's statement regarding the satisfaction of desires can only be considered a partial truth.

These were the chief points in Ōdo's criticism of Hōmei. By examining these, we can understand Ōdo's philosophy of experimental idealism, or his concrete—as distinct from abstract—idealism. His position was based on experience, or empiricism, but he felt that the latter, taken dynamically, functionally, developmentally, contained idealistic elements and tended towards structural unity. In short, he was advocating a type of neo-idealism as against naturalism. Ōdo's critique of civilization and the arts presented a rather fresh impression at that time. From our present day position, however, his views seem surprisingly moderate. This is especially so when we analyze his view of history and his view of the State.

Ōdo revered Edmund Burke and Walter Bagehot. He adopted Bagehot's distinction between the Age of Nation-making and the Age of Discussion. History in this view was a progression from the former to the latter. Ōdo also expounded Burke's concept of Expediency, agreeing with the attempt to harmonize the customs and traditions of the past with the stimuli attacking these in the present: "I am in agreement with the argument put forth by Edmund Burke," he said. He said further that the present is the continuation of the past or, in a sense, a correction of the past, in this sense, "a partial renovation has much significance, a complete revolution has, on this account, no meaning." Also, he stated, "In distinction to the great amount of what is conserved, there is the little amount of what is renovated."
"What in reality has become decrepit is not to be concealed, but what has the possibility of being renovated or reconstructed is not something which can be exposed." This concept, too, when seen in the light of Dewey's work, is not a particularly novel one. The virtue of Ōdo's thought was that it was an antidote for the tendency of the Japanese to fall into extremes of absolutism or revolution. In contrast to this, Ōdo continually advocated reform and relativism.

When William James died, Ōdo wrote a very careful critique. His position, however, was more of a Deweyan one, and it was James' pragmatism rather than his empiricism that he adopted. In history, Ōdo gave formal recognition to tradition, but he made no attempt to interpret the content of the Japanese or Oriental tradition. In contrast, Nishida Kitarō rejected James' pragmatism and he vitalized pure empiricism. It was on the basis of this pure empiricism that Nishida deeply cherished the Zen aspect of the Oriental tradition.


Kurata Momozō (1891-1943), wrote once about the time he first happened across Nishida Kitarō's Zen no Kenkyū. He was then a student in the First Higher School in Tokyo and was moved deeply by this work.

One day I was wandering home aimlessly from school and I happened to go into a bookstore. I bought a book, the title of which fascinated me, although the author's name was one I had never heard of... This was the Zen no Kenkyū. Without feeling one way or another, I began to read the introduction, and after a while my eyes became riveted to the text. ... The individual does not exist prior to experience; by experiencing, the individual exists. As a consequence of the idea that more important than individual differences there is experience as an underlying basis, it has become possible to become free of all theories of the dominance of the ego and selfishness. These concepts were expressed very distinctly in Nishida's work. These few words almost scorched my eyes
when I read them. I felt as if my heart stopped beating. I was neither happy nor unhappy but felt myself gripped by a trance-like tension and could not make the effort to read any further. I shut the book and sat at my desk transfixed. The tears ran down my cheeks.

Despite the obviously exaggerated emotionalism of Momozō, this passage nevertheless presents an accurate picture of Momozō as a young man. The significance of this is that the feelings of the young Momozō were very typical of the artistic and scholarly world in Japan at that time.

We have attempted to trace the nature of Japanese intellectual circles in the period after 1898. A typical example at that time was the critical writing of the fervent Takayama Chogyū. The period was also characterized by Ryōsen’s “God-seeing Experience”; Kanzō’s prophetic admonitions, too, were heard at this time. This was also a period in which the naturalist movement, centering on the problem of life, was a subject for debate and controversy. Agony, skepticism, were popular expressions at this time: the question of suicide was eagerly debated. In this atmosphere students, nay, intellectuals, were conspicuous for the surge and storminess of their emotions. Nevertheless, the period was not characterized by any deep contemplation of the problems of life. A real philosophy had not yet come to life. The new German philosophy, especially that derived from the neo-Kantian school, was just being introduced systematically by Kuwaki Genyoku and Tomonaga Sanjurō. This new philosophy, however, was as yet nothing more than introduction. Ōdo’s pragmatism was a brave attempt, but his position in which everything was reduced to being a function of society was a weak one. It did not go into the deeper aspects of life in any thorough-going manner. Thus Nishida’s Enquiry Concerning Good, which contained deep feeling but at the same time was dominated by a thorough-going theoretical approach, was bound to excite the type of emotional response Momozō manifested when it suddenly appeared at this time. This book was published in January, 1911, and in an
entry in Nishida's diary for Sunday, September 8, 1912, he wrote: "Visited by Kurata Momozō, First Higher School student, this mornig." Presumably this has some connection with the statement quoted above from Momozō. In the work from which we cited, Momozō spoke also of the fact that the author of the *Enquiry Concerning Good* was completely unknown to him. Also, in 1910, the philosopher Amano Teiyu heard Nishida's lectures at Kyoto University for the first time. He wrote about his impressions as follows:

When we were at Kyoto University, Dr. Nishida was first introduced to us and became a member of the Faculty of Literature at the University. We had never heard of him before, and when we first saw this very melancholy-looking philosopher on the lectern we sensed immediately that there was something unusual about him. Yet, who would have expected that this man would establish in later years a famous philosophy which bears his name. It is really a case of 'the stone which was discarded by the builder hath become a cornerstone!'"

This again is an example of how relatively unknown Nishida was at the time.

Nishida was born in 1870. This was the third year of the Meiji period. In the period discussed above, the period in which he was relatively unknown, Nishida was already over forty years old. He graduated from Tokyo University in 1894 as a special student. Nishida graduated from the university two years before the so-called Talented Band which comprised such luminaries as Takayama Chogyū, Anezaki Chōfū, and Kuwaki Genyoku. After graduation Nishida lived very simply as a Higher School teacher in Kanazawa. He was absorbed in research and quietistic Zen studies. Kuwaki and others, immediately after graduation, became very active and held the public limelight. In his diary the following is noted in an entry for July 3, 1905:

Was impressed when I read Spencer's biography. I feel it is not unlikely that I can become a scholar like him...I hear
that James has changed over to philosophical study. When a person like James studies philosophy, I believe this to be of interest.

On the 19th, he wrote:
I am not a psychologist or a sociologist. I merely want to become a student of life...Zen to me is music, art, activity—I have no need for anything else to provide solace for me. ...Were my heart as pure and whole as a child's, nothing in the world would make me happier.

It was probably at this time that he first began to have self-confidence, that he began to believe in his ability as a scholar. It was at this time, while teaching in the Kanazawa Higher School that he produced his Enquiry Concerning Good. It is to this work that we now must direct our attention.

The position of the Enquiry was based on pure empiricism. Nishida defined this term as follows.
To experience means to know reality as it is. It is a knowledge which comes by utterly discarding one's own constructs and following facts. The word pure in this case means a condition of experiencing without coloring the experience. Usually, even those who speak of experiencing have permitted some element of thought to color fact. Thus, when we speak of pure experience we mean experience to which not the slightest intellectual judgments have been added. An example of this would be experiencing color or sound. In that instant before an evaluation of this color or sound takes place, before we can think about what it is we are seeing or hearing, while it is still outside us, in a sense, we are having a pure experience. In other words, pure experience is the same thing as direct experience. At the moment one is directly experiencing something, there is neither subject nor object; cognition and its object are one. This is the purest form of experience.

In order to clarify the nature of this kind of pure experience, Nishida borrowed heavily from James' psychology. It is also obvious that Nishida was much influenced by James' thought about the stream of consciousness. However, it was not
Nishida's intention to confine himself to psychological analysis, rather he wanted to grasp true existence, or real existence, metaphysically. Nishida once spoke about how much thought he devoted when he was a young student at the Kanazawa Higher School to the underlying concept of his Enquiry. He said that one of his close friends was an advocate of the materialist position, and that he himself had once thought this position a proper one. However, he soon found that he was not able to agree with this. Upon this, he frequently engaged in debate; and one evening when the sun was just setting he was walking the streets of Kanazawa and a thought suddenly occurred to him. The homes of Kanazawa were receiving the rays of the setting sun, and the people were busily passing by. Seeing this, he was prompted to think that this scene—just as it was—was real experience. Therefore, the concept of material essence held by the materialists was an abstraction which derived from thinking about this scene, and it was consequently a secondary concept. True existence is not in the background of experience but within the immediate experience felt or seen. Of course, at that time he did not have such clear awareness of this; but at a later period he felt that this experience was something he grasped immediately, and he said later that this became the basis of his Enquiry.

In fact, Nishida wrote in the introduction to the first edition of Enquiry:

One morning the philosopher Gustav Fechner was resting on a bench in Leipzig. It was a sunny day in spring and the pasture he was staring at was full of the fragrance of flowers, the song of birds; butterflies flitted about. Fechner said that his absorption in the simple truth of this beautiful day was the exact opposite of the colorless, soundless, natural scientific approach. I don't know what I have been influenced by, but I immediately felt that existence had to be this kind of plain reality. The so-called material world is nothing more than something stemming from this existence. I can still remember how absorbed I was in such thought while yet a Higher School
student in Kanazawa. And it was the thought of that period which has become the basis of this book.

Nishida made use of inadequate expressions like "the phenomenon of consciousness is the only reality." It was because of the influence of James' psychology that he used these rather ambiguous statements of the monism of consciousness and the theory of immanence. Nishida's position, as we have already seen, was based on the concept of pure empiricism, and this position transcended his former position of the conflict of subject and object. It was a non-subjectivist position based on the unity of subject and object, and it was a non-psychological position which attempted to make true reality immediate rather than secondary. In this sense Nishida's position resembled the intuitionism in Zen. True reality lay in the transcending of the artificial constructs of the ego, in discarding the ego. It was this concept which had tremendously stimulated Momozō, whom we mentioned above. The concept that Momozō derived from Nishida's philosophy, that experience does not exist as a function or derivative of the individual, but rather the individual exists as a function of experience, made a powerful impression upon him. Nishida further said:

Pure experience is able to transcend the individual. Expressed in this fashion it sounds very strange, but because experience comprehends the individual in time and space, time and space are above the individual. Experience does not exist by reason of the existence of the individual, rather the individual exists by reason of experience. Individual experience is a special case, is limited experience within the scope of experience in general.

Consequently it can be said, experience, as conceived in Ōdo's experimental idealism, was based on Dewey's concept of direct experience. James himself said that his own concept of pure empiricism was close to Schelling's concept of Identität. In Nishida's case, his pure empiricism started with James' psychology, but it ultimately was closer to Zen philosophy.

If we think of Nishida's thought as being related only to
James’, we cannot adequately interpret Nishida’s concept of pure empiricism. Nishida, drawing on Hegel, said:

Hegel asserted with extreme vigor that the essence of speculation was not abstract. On the contrary, if we take the essence of speculation in its concrete sense, it is almost the same as what I mean by pure empiricism. Pure empiricism is speculation. When we examine concrete thought or speculation, what we call a general concept is not the same as an abstraction from a class of similar phenomena. It is a unified concept based on concrete facts. Hegel too conceived of the general as the spirit residing in the concrete. Since, however, my concept of pure empiricism has been developed organizationally, the unity functioning at its base must be the concept of the general as such. The development of experience is the progress of thought. This means the facts of pure empiricism are what I myself make real.

Usually experience is of a fragmented nature, and has neither unity nor development but is something passively presented. Nishida, however, thought such experience to be dead experience. It was not the experience of live truth; it was, on the contrary, nothing more than a product of abstraction based on speculation and reflection. Live true unvarnished experience resembles the condition of a person hanging on the edge of a cliff who is able to rise above the usual opposition between the subjective and the objective and become as one with the cliff. True live experience then, is functional, developmental, structural, and unified. The general is the developmental progress of the specific in this sense. General pure empiricism is not a particular. It transcends the particular. It comprises all the particulars and the relationship among them. In this sense the general signifies the development of the concrete. This last point—the concrete universal—is extremely close to Hegel’s “concept” (begriff). The theory of empiricism avoids rationalism. As such, it does not attain to the thorough-going realness of pure empiricism. Nishida, on the basis of conceiving experience functionally, developmentally, and organizationally,
built his position of pure empiricism from within German idealism.

Therefore, we can say that in his Enquiry he attempted to combine James' pure empiricism and Hegel's concept of the general. Underlying Nishida's thought was the Zen concept of undifferentiated—with respect to subject and object—experience. Another way of stating this would be to say that his thought was based on Zen philosophy, and in order to grasp this in a modern philosophical sense he borrowed James' pure empiricism and Hegel's concept of the general. We now turn our attention to the special characteristics of Nishida's Enquiry and to the points in it which strongly impressed readers.

In his diary, Nishida mentioned that he was neither a psychologist nor a sociologist, but rather a student of life. His intention was depth rather than breadth. In the highest sense, Nishida's philosophy is a philosophy of life. The problem which plagued him was how ought one to live. And he devoted much sincere speculation to this question.

The fellow who speculates is like an animal eating dry grass in a green meadow, and is probably mocked by Mephisto. There are philosophers who like Hegel have said that, he is punished who thinks philosophically. I feel that this kind of agony is unavoidable once a person has eaten of the forbidden fruit.

The foregoing was written by Nishida. In his philosophy he attempted to join Western philosophy to Japanese life and not merely to introduce Western philosophy, or to give a critique of civilization. The fact that he presented the Japanese with new and deep areas for speculation made his philosophy extremely interesting. Western philosophy was not an intellectual pastime nor an object for curiosity. On the contrary, Nishida's Enquiry was a supreme effort, the first of its kind in Japan, and on this account we must deal with it. It was the first work in Japan which brought Western philosophy to life.

The above was one of the characteristics of Nishida's philosophy. Actually it was a description of his attitude
towards philosophy. We have now to find what characterized his philosophical speculation itself. We must especially determine with what points in Western thought he was concerned. Moreover, we must find what it is in Nishida’s thought that excites our curiosity and attracts our interest. He said: “I want to become a student of life,” and he called his book *An Enquiry Concerning Good*. This meant that as it stood his book dealt with ethics. Nishida’s ethical position was based on the doctrine of self-realization and activism. At that time this was an extremely novel position. He also said that what was necessary for true good was a powerful will like that of Ibsen’s hero Brandt. Thus he gave due consideration to new doctrines and teachings. Nevertheless, the characteristic element in Nishida’s thought does not lie in this. From the standpoint of modernity, it was Ōdo who was the more up-to-date of the two.

In searching for the unique element in Nishida’s thought, we must realize that his concern was not simply directed towards modern Europe. Nishida, the “student of life,” was not concerned just with the life of modern man. He felt that both Western man and Oriental man were burdened with sin and afflictions, were at bottom religious; both were similarly troubled over how they ought to live. When regarded thus, the ancient, medieval, and modern European as well as Japanese were similarly troubled; they were moved by the same deep life experiences and strove for what the Christians call “salvation” and the Buddhists call “deliverance.” This common human striving drew Nishida’s attention, and his great contribution was that he was able to transmit this feeling of his about this special aspect of the West. This is the characteristic element of his thought. He said, for example, that academically it is possible to explain good in various ways. Essentially, however, good means to devote one’s self to self-knowledge and thereby to destroy the false self and restore to life the true self. Good is at the very roots of the universe; it illuminates Providence and is able to comprehend the force of the unity of subject
and object in pure experience. "There is a story to the effect
that when Pope Benedict XI requested a demonstration of
Giotto’s artistic ability the latter drew a circle. We too must
be able to attain morally to the perfection of Giotto’s circle.”
Nishida drew on Jakob Böhme when he said that man sees God
through fluttering eyes. He also drew on Nicholas of Cusa
when he said that God was the negation of all. He quoted
Oscar Wilde to the effect that Christ loved the criminal as the
person closest to human perfection, and did not have it as his
object to change an interesting bandit into a boring honest man.
In all of these, Nishida found the sincere cry of humanity, which
could even be felt by Orientals. He said, “Real beauty, good,
and truth must be personal in nature.” Thus, Nishida grasped
the profound spirit of the West as a result of his metaphysical
and religious needs. It was by comprehending the spirit of the
West that he was able to revive the spirit of the East which
had fallen into decay and was asleep.

We cannot deal with Nishida’s philosophy other than in
this cursory fashion. Suffice it to say that from 1925 to 1945
his philosophy became ever more magnificent and profound.
Nishida was almost of the same age group as Sōseki and his
contribution to solving the problem of East and West was just
as important. It was expressed in as original a form as the
contributions made by Rohan, Ōgai, and Sōseki. Probably
the exertions of Japan from the Meiji Restoration until the
middle of the Taishō period (1912-1925) assumed a similar
shape. It was in the Shōwa period (1926- ) that all these
exertions ended in collapse.
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