

Georgia State University

ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University

History Dissertations

Department of History

Spring 5-7-2011

Finding their Place in the World: Meiji Intellectuals and the Japanese Construction of an East-West Binary, 1868-1912

Masako N. Racel
Georgia State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/history_diss



Part of the [History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Racel, Masako N., "Finding their Place in the World: Meiji Intellectuals and the Japanese Construction of an East-West Binary, 1868-1912." Thesis, Georgia State University, 2011.
doi: <https://doi.org/10.57709/1955569>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of History at ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in History Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gsu.edu.

FINDING THEIR PLACE IN THE WORLD:
MEIJI INTELLECTUALS AND THE JAPANESE CONSTRUCTION OF
AN EAST-WEST BINARY
1868-1912

BY MASAOKA NOHARA RACEL

Under the Direction of Douglas R. Reynolds

ABSTRACT

The Meiji era (1868-1912) in Japanese history was characterized by the extensive adoption of Western institutions, technology, and customs. The dramatic changes that took place caused the era's intellectuals to ponder Japan's position within the larger global context. The East-West binary was a particularly important part of the discourse as the intellectuals analyzed and criticized the current state of affairs and offered their visions of Japan's future. This dissertation examines five Meiji intellectuals who had very different orientations and agendas: Fukuzawa Yukichi, an influential philosopher and political theorist; Shimoda Utako, a pioneer of women's education; Uchimura Kanzō, a Christian leader; Okakura Kakuzō, an art critic; and Kōtoku Shūsui, a socialist. Also considered here are related concepts such as "civilization (*bunmei*)," "barbarism," and "imperialism." Close examination of the five intellectuals' use of the East-West binary reveals that, despite their varied goals, they all placed Japan as the leader of the Eastern

world. Collectively, Meiji intellectuals' use of the East-West binary elevated both East and West, while largely deemphasizing the middle part of Eurasia and "South," such as Africa and South America.

INDEX WORDS: Japan, Meiji, Tōyō, Seiyō, *Bunmei*, *Bunmei kaika*, Fukuzawa Yukichi, Shimoda Utako, Uchimura Kanzō, Okakura Kakuzō, Okakura Tenshin, Kōtoku Shūsui

FINDING THEIR PLACE IN THE WORLD:
MEIJI INTELLECTUALS AND THE JAPANESE CONSTRUCTION OF
AN EAST-WEST BINARY
1868-1912

by
MASAKO NOHARA RACEL

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in the College of Arts and Sciences
Georgia State University
2011

Copyright by
Masako Nohara Racel
2011

FINDING THEIR PLACE IN THE WORLD:
MEIJI INTELLECTUALS AND THE JAPANESE CONSTRUCTION OF
AN EAST-WEST BINARY
1868-1912

by
MASAKO NOHARA RACEL

Committee Chair: Douglas R. Reynolds

Committee: Denis Gainty

Ian C. Fletcher

Christine Skwiot

Jared Poley

Electronic Version Approved:

Office of Graduate Studies

College of Arts and Sciences

Georgia State University

May 2011

DEDICATION

For my father, Nohara Shigehiro (1938-2003).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation would not have been completed without support I received from many people and institutions to whom thanks are due. My heartfelt thanks go to my adviser, Dr. Douglas Reynolds. Throughout my time at Georgia State University, Dr. Reynolds has always been my greatest advocate, ordering some books for GSU library so that I have an access to some important secondary sources, and even convincing the department not to cancel to Modern East Asia course because I desperately needed to it. He has always shown his faith in me and my project, and his encouragement and positive attitude has been invaluable. He has generously shared his great knowledge and insight of both Chinese and Japanese history.

I also owe great debts to my dissertation committee members, Denis Gainty, Ian Fletcher, Jared Poley, and Christine Skwiot. I feel very fortunate to have gained Dr. Gainty, a world historian and Meiji specialist, as a member of my committee during my last year at Georgia State University. With his great knowledge of Japanese history, he has offered me a great deal of constructive criticism that I greatly appreciate. Dr. Fletcher was truly instrumental in choosing the five figures to be examined in this dissertation. The inclusion of Shimoda Utako in my study, was a result of his suggestion to look into women's perspective of the events after reading an earlier version of my dissertation proposal. Dr. Poley provided me with valuable advice on intellectual and world history. Dr. Skwiot, with her background on transnational history, has challenged me to think of important world history questions and how they relate to my work, for which I am very grateful. Additionally, I would like to thank Dr. David Sehat for providing me an opportunity to study American intellectual history. The two seminars I took with Dr. Stephen Rapp were also instrumental in determining my dissertation topic by introducing such books as

Martin Lewis and Kären Wigen's *The Myth of Continents* and Michael Adas' *Machines as the Measure of Men*, both of which helped inspire my project.

I am also thankful of fellow graduate students at GSU, especially the members of Trans-Empire Research Cluster (TERC): Diana Honey, Clif Stratton, Andy Reisinger, Supad Ghose, Shannon Bontrager, Karen Huggin, Beth Spencer and Denise Turner. The TERC meetings provided me an opportunity to share my work in a casual environment. Special thanks go to Ian and Yael Fletcher who generously hosted a number of the group's meetings.

My wonderful colleagues at Kennesaw State University have been also very supportive of me and cheered me along as they watched my progress. Howard Shealy, the Chair of the Department of History and Philosophy, and Tom Keene, interim chair, have provided me much needed guidance in my career path. Special thanks go to Susan Rouse and David Parker, the assistant department chairs, who have been very flexible in making accommodations to my teaching schedule while I was taking classes at Georgia State University. I am forever grateful that Dean Richard Vengroff, who is very attentive to the needs of faculty members, granted me a much needed reduced teaching load. A very special thank you goes to Stephen Bartlett, my dear friend, who volunteered to read and edit a number of chapters in this dissertation. I would also like to thank my students at Kennesaw State University, for my love of teaching has kept me focused on my goal.

This project would not have been possible without the services provided by libraries in the United States and Japan. I am especially indebted to Amy Thompson, and Chris Sharpe, and the other staff of KSU Interlibrary Service through whom I obtained many of my Japanese language materials. I was honored that Jissen Women's University allowed me to see their

Shimoda Utako collection and I am also grateful to the National Diet Library of Japan and the numerous Japanese universities that generously share valuable documents by digitizing them and making them available to researchers on the internet.

I also owe multitude of gratitude to my family in Japan and the US. My mother and father raised me in a relaxed environment as far as schoolwork was concerned (no *juku*, the prep-school for me) and allowed me to pursue my own dream. Neither of them had an opportunity to go to college, but they valued my happiness and fully supported my decision even though they were sometimes criticized for sending their daughter to foreign land. My father worked in a dairy factory for over forty years, while my mother took on numerous different jobs to support me and my brother. I dedicate this dissertation to my father who passed away in 2003, two years before I started the Ph.D. program. I am also grateful for my mother-in-law and father-in-law for their love and support. Finally, a very special thank you goes to my husband, Jeff. Not only emotional support he has provided all these years, he has been my sounding board to bounce off ideas. He also spent countless hours editing numerous versions of manuscripts, offered valuable advice, and helped me to express what I wanted to express. It is he to whom I offer my biggest and sincerest gratitude as I would have not been able to do this without his love, support and understanding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 1: JAPANESE PERCEPTIONS OF THE OUTSIDE WORLD BEFORE THE MEIJI ERA	22
CHAPTER 2: FUKUZAWA YUKICHI (1835-1901): ONTO "CIVILIZATION"	72
CHAPTER 3: SHIMODA UTAKO (1854-1936): STRONG WOMEN, STRONG NATION	106
CHAPTER 4: UCHIMURA KANZŌ (1861-1930): CHRISTIAN CIVILIZATION IN JAPAN	154
CHAPTER 5: OKAKURA KAKUZŌ (1863-1913): EAST AND WEST MEET IN ART	198
CHAPTER 6: KŌTOKU SHŪSUI (1871-1911): A SOCIALIST CRITIQUE	238
CHAPTER 7: COMPARISONS, REFLECTIONS, AND LEGACIES	271
BIBLIOGRAPHY	292
GLOSSARY	308

INTRODUCTION

"If we were to compare East and West today, the West is like a flower in full bloom, while the East is like a flower [past its prime and] dropping. Among the latter countries, Japan alone. . . is like a bud that is about to bloom. . . ." ¹ This statement was made in 1906 by Shimoda Utako 下田歌子 (1854-1936), a woman who devoted her life to Japanese women's education. For intellectuals of the Meiji era, the East-West binary, such as posited here by Shimoda, constituted an important element in their discourse. This concept was used to advance their visions of Japan's future, it was used as a way to criticize Japanese society, and it was used to self-congratulate Japan on its various achievements. The Meiji era (1868-1912), generally considered the beginning of modern "Westernized" Japan, witnessed the extensive adoption of Western institutions, technology, and customs. Many Japanese celebrated Westernization by calling it "*bunmei kaika* 文明開化" or "civilization and enlightenment." In a period not far removed from the Tokugawa past, Meiji intellectuals were keenly aware of changes taking place during their lifetimes, and tried to place their significance not only within the framework of Japanese history but also of world history. While the general public perceived *bunmei kaika* as merely the adoption of Western food and attire, intellectuals pondered the greater meaning of "civilization," and explored many interpretations and explanations of its impact and potential upon their nation and the world. The East-West binary played a central part in discussions of

¹ Shimoda Utako, "*Tōyō joshi kyōiku no shōrai* 東洋女子教育の将来 [The Future of Female Education in the East]," *Nihon Fujin*, 15 March 1906, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū: shiryōhen* 下田歌子著作集 資料編 [The Collected Works of Shimoda Utako], edited by Itagaki Hiroko 板垣弘子 (Tokyo: Jissen Joshi Gakuen, 1998), vol. 6, 458-463. Translated from "今の有様は東洋と西洋を二ツに分けると、西洋は今盛りの花の様な有様であつて、東洋は殆ど散り方の花の様な有様でございます。其中で單り. . . 日本が荅を方に開いて出る花の様な情態で. . . ."

"civilization" and Japan's role in the world affairs. The Meiji era was a period of paradigm shift. As the term *bunmei* came into vogue, the concept of the "civilization" shifted from being defined in terms of Confucian decorum to something new and different as intellectuals sought to define and refine its meaning. Before the Meiji era, Japanese called Westerners "barbarians (*ban* 蛮, *yi* 夷)," since they failed to observe proper Confucian etiquette expected of "civilized" persons. After 1868, however, Westerners who had oftentimes been referred to as "barbarians" into the late 1860s, were now hired as experts and guides that would lead Japan to modern civilization. This new association of civilization with the West sparked lively discussions among Japan's intellectuals about the nature of Eastern and Western societies. As Japanese searched for their identity during the massive changes and upheavals of the Meiji period, the East-West binary concept played a major part in the development of the various frameworks and theories used by intellectuals as they struggled to make sense of how the world was changing and the best course for their nation to take to weather the storm and come out ahead.

This dissertation explores the various ways in which five Japanese intellectuals of the Meiji era, Fukuzawa Yukichi 福澤諭吉(1835-1901), Shimoda Utako 下田歌子(1854-1936), Uchimura Kanzō 内村鑑三 (1861-1930), Okakura Kakuzō 岡倉覚三 (1863-1913), and Kōtoku Shūsui 幸徳秋水(1871-1911) perceived the East-West binary and related concepts such as civilization and barbarism. The manner in which Japanese intellectuals perceived the Orient (Tōyō 東洋, Eastern Ocean) and the Occident (Seiyō 西洋, Western Ocean) was fluid during this formative era, with individuals holding, expressing, and advocating significantly different points of view. The word choices for East and West varied among different authors, suggesting subtle

nuances of meaning. For example, the terms "East" and "West" are usually rendered as Tōyō and Seiyō in contemporary Japanese, but authors during the Meiji era also used terms such as Taitō 泰東 (Extreme East) and Taisei 泰西 (Extreme West) as well. The geographical boundaries of the terms, East and West as well as the conceptual meanings of Eastern and Western civilization also varied among intellectuals depending upon their generation, their level of education, their professional pursuits, and the specific historical moment of their they pronounced events.

Several important questions are addressed. What geographic areas are included in the terms, East and West by various individuals? What kinds of characteristics and qualities are associated with the East and West? Were the associations based on actual observations or do they demonstrate simply the projection of a "binary opposite"? Why was the relational concept of East-West so important to these Japanese intellectuals? What areas are excluded from the East-West discourse? Why are some geographic areas not discussed and what does their exclusion mean? How did the *discourse* of these intellectuals create "knowledge" or authoritative views (in the Foucauldian sense of power/knowledge)? How did Japanese discourses affect Japan's relations with other countries of Asia, especially China and Korea? How did the ideas of these intellectuals ultimately contribute to the emergence of a militant Japan during the 1930s and the notion of a "Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere?" By exploring the possible answers to these questions I hope to provide a more complex and nuanced understanding of the Meiji era and its importance to modern Japan that extends beyond the cursory assessment of the period as a time of "Westernization."

*

*

*

A prominent scholar of Japanese history, Carol Gluck, writes in a 1997 essay that one of the "entrapping" legacies of Meiji Japan's self representations:

comes in the form of polarities, the familiar binary frames that divide all things into two essentialized and opposing forces. The conspicuous example of this metaphorical Manichaeism is of course the dichotomy of East and West. Since acquiring civilization entailed Euro-Americanization (*ōbeika*), the "West" embodied the standard of modernity, which in turn posed a challenge of defining the "East" along a new axis of identity.²

Despite such prominence placed by the Meiji intellectuals and the lasting effects of such thinking upon Japanese society, no studies have systematically examined the Meiji Japanese conceptualization of Eastern and Western civilizations. There are, rather, studies that deal with related topics such as 1) Western notions of civilization, and Western perceptions of non-Europeans, 2) Asian views of East or West, and 3) interactions between Japanese and Westerners.

The Myth of the Continents by Martin Lewis and Kären Wigen fits the first category that explores the Western notions of civilization and Western perceptions of non-Europeans. Lewis and Wigen demonstrate the European origins of metageographical categories such as continents (especially identifying Europe as a continent), the East and West, and the Orient and Occident. Lewis and Wigen argue that these geographical categories are essentially Eurocentric concepts designed to elevate Europe to continental status, when in fact Europe is only a small part of the Eurasian landmass. They trace the history of the word "Asia" to the ancient Greeks and argue that the meaning of "Asia" or the "East" shifted eastward over time from Anatolia, to Persia, then to India, and finally to China and Japan. It is interesting to note that one of the authors, Kären E. Wigen, is a Japanese history specialist, but *The Myth of Continents* fails to recognize the fact that

² Carol Gluck, "Meiji For Our Time," in Helen Hardacre and Adam L. Kern, ed., *New Directions in the Study of Meiji Japan* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1997), 13.

the people of Asia, including the Japanese, came to accept the same geographical categories as the Europeans.³

Edward Said's classic work, *Orientalism*, also explores Western (French, British, and American) conceptualizations of the Orient, although his "Orient" refers mainly to the Arab-Islamic "Near East." He traces its origin during the medieval era, but his main focus is on modern Orientalism, starting in the eighteenth century, when the study of the "Orient" emerged as a distinct academic discipline. He argues that the Western understanding of the Orient was not based on an empirical study of the Arab-Islamic "Near East." Rather, it was the result of biased interpretations of the region in which the Orient came to represent everything opposite of the Occident. Furthermore, Said argues that this Western conceptualization of the Orient helped Europeans to justify the subjugation of those in the Orient by persons of the Occident during the age of imperialism.⁴

Michael Adas's *Machines As the Measure of Men: Science, Technology, and Ideologies of Western Dominance* takes a comparative approach to the manner in which Europe understood the peoples and cultures of Asia and Africa. He argues that after the Industrial Revolution Europeans came to regard tools, machines, and other technological developments as the means by which to measure civilizations. Using these criteria the Europeans of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries determined that both Asians and Africans were inferior to Europeans, but

³ Martin Lewis and Kären Wigen, *The Myth of the Continents: A Critique of Metageography* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997).

⁴ Edward Said, *Orientalism*, 25th Anniversary Edition (New York: Vintage, 2004 [1979]).

Asians were more "advanced" or "civilized" than Africans because of their technological achievements.⁵

Bruce Mazlish's *Civilization and Its Contents* traces the history of the word "civilization." He argues that the term "civilization" as a noun (rather than as a verb "to civilize" or a pronoun "civilized") can be traced to eighteenth-century France. Mazlish explains that the concept of "civilization" really took off during the nineteenth century in the context of the Age of Imperialism.⁶ Mazlish's focus is the term "civilization" in European languages, and therefore his discussion is within the framework of Western societies, but he devotes one chapter to discussing non-European societies' adoptions of "civilization" or the process he calls "accivilization." Not surprisingly, post-Perry Japan is featured as one of the societies that he perceived as going through the "accivilization" process. Mazlish recognizes Japanese attempt to preserve their own identity by being very selective in adopting parts of Western civilization, but ultimately he comes to the conclusion that Japan "copied" European civilization and became part of "European civilization."⁷ Such a view seems to be overly simplistic and somewhat Eurocentric. The present work's case studies of five prominent Meiji intellectuals reveals that Japanese intellectuals had no standard definition of "civilization," and the manner in which they appropriated Western concepts was far more complex than the simplistic abstraction proposed by Mazlish.

⁵ Michael Adas, *Machines As the Measure of Men: Science, Technology, and Ideologies of Western Dominance* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1989).

⁶ Bruce Mazlish, *Civilization and Its Contents* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2004).

⁷ Mazlish, *Civilization and Its Contents*, 100-106. The word "copying" appears on page 107.

The second category of existing scholarship deals with Asian perceptions of East and West. Obviously inspired by Said's *Orientalism*, Ian Buruma and Avishai Margalit's *Occidentalism* discusses the manner in which "enemies" of the West understood and depicted the West. Unlike Said, this book does not concern itself with the creation of "knowledge" through scholarly discourse; instead it categorizes the views of those hostile to Western society into specific patterns or frames of reference. For example, the "enemies" of the West identify the West as lacking a soul or spirituality, allowing Westerners an advantage in rationality and scientific achievement. These groups associate the West with greed and immorality in contrast to the spirituality and morality of the "East." Buruma and Margalit define "the dehumanizing picture of the West painted by its enemies" as "Occidentalism." They do not focus on one particular place or time period and use a variety of examples from Japan, China, India, the Middle East, Russia, and even Germany (since Germans defined themselves using the French as a foil). Since Buruma and Margalit are exclusively concerned with hostile views of the West, examples from Japan are limited to the World War II era (such as kamikaze pilots). Since Japan is one of many examples that Buruma and Margalit use, their discussion is not well-substantiated with historical evidence, and does not constitute a major case study.⁸

Stefan Tanaka's *Japan's Orient: Rendering Pasts into History* explores the works of several prominent Japanese "Oriental" historians or *Tōyōshi gakusha* (Japanese specialists in East Asian history) from the early twentieth century, such as Shiratori Kurakichi 白鳥倉吉 (1865-1942) and Naitō Konan 内藤 湖南 (1866-1934). Influenced by Michel Foucault's notion

⁸ Ian Buruma and Avishai Margalit, *Occidentalism: The West in the Eyes of Its Enemies* (New York: Penguin, 2004).

of "discourse" and inspired by Said's *Orientalism*, Tanaka argues that these prominent historians created an authoritative version of East Asian history that placed Japan in the position of leader of East Asia. According to Tanaka, these Japanese historians were influenced by nineteenth-century German historicism, especially that of Leopold von Ranke (for example, Shiratori was a student of Ludwig Wiess, who had been trained by Ranke), and they approached the study of history in a very scientific manner. This emphasis on "research" and treating history like a "science" brought prestige and an aura of authenticity to the prominent historians' works. Since Shiratori taught at the very prestigious Tokyo Imperial University, his views came to be widely accepted as the authoritative version of East Asia history. According to Tanaka, Shiratori's scholarly discourse influenced the way Japan defined its relationship with both the West and the East (mainly China).⁹

Outside the time frame of my study but relevant to the larger theme is John D. Dower's *War Without Mercy: Race and Power in the Pacific War* that examines the American and Japanese depictions of each other during World War II. Using a wide variety of sources, such as war propaganda posters, magazine covers, cartoons, and movies, this book focuses mainly on the force of racism in the conflict. Dower shows how racial stereotyping in propaganda dehumanized the enemy and contributed to the many cases of inhumane treatment and despicable atrocities committed by both sides during the war. While the book is very insightful,

⁹ Stefan Tanaka, *Japan's Orient: Rendering Pasts into History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993).

its scope is limited to World War II and fails to explore in any depth the development of the very effective stereotypes that were well established long before 1941.¹⁰

Sushila Narsimhan's *Japanese Perceptions of China in the Nineteenth Century: Influence of Fukuzawa Yukichi* is perhaps one of the most relevant works to my argument.¹¹ Although her main focus is the Meiji era, she provides important background information by examining Japanese perceptions of China during the Tokugawa era. Narsimhan sees continuity rather than a drastic shift in the Meiji era's perception of China, for some Japanese as early as the Tokugawa Period were already looking for a model of civilization different from the Chinese version that they had traditionally respected. Her main interest is Fukuzawa Yukichi's influence on how Japanese perceived China. Originally written as a Ph.D. dissertation at the University of Delhi (1995), Narsimhan's work was completed before the many controversies about authorship surrounding Fukuzawa's *zenshū* (complete works) came to light.¹² One of my case studies is Fukuzawa Yukichi, but I will use only those writings where his authorship is indisputable. My analysis will differ in some respects from Narsimhan since I will be examining Fukuzawa's understanding of both Eastern and Western civilizations and not just China.

Urs Matthias Zachmann's *China and Japan in the Late Meiji Period: China Policy and the Japanese Discourse on National Identity, 1895-1904* explores Japanese attitudes toward Late Qing China by examining various Japanese newspapers. According to Zachmann, the Japanese

¹⁰ John W. Dower, *War Without Mercy: Race and Power in the Pacific War* (New York: Pantheon, 1986).

¹¹ Sushila Narsimhan, *Japanese Perceptions of China in the Nineteenth Century: Influence of Fukuzawa Yukichi* (New Delhi: Phoenix Publishing House, 1999).

¹² Sushila Narsimhan, *Japanese Perceptions of China in the Nineteenth Century: Influence of Fukuzawa Yukichi* (Ph.D Dissertation, University of Delhi, 1995).

considered the Chinese to be an equal and somewhat worthy enemy at the start of the Sino-Japanese War (1894-95), but by its conclusion the Japanese began seeing themselves as "civilized" in a Western sense, and as the proper leader of East Asia. They expressed somewhat paternalistic views that they needed to help China. Japan perceived China to be incapable of carrying out reforms by itself after the Emperor Guanxu's failed attempt in 1898. From their new vantage point, by the time the Boxer Rebellion broke out, the Japanese had stopped viewing China as a rival or even a sovereign state, since Japan was among the several "foreign" powers that helped to suppress the rebellion.¹³

Several academic studies address Japan's conceptualization of the East, especially in relation to Pan-Asian thought, such as Sven Saaler and J. Victor Koschmann's edited volume, *Pan-Asianism in Modern Japanese History: Colonialism, Regionalism and Borders*; Cemil Aydin's *The Politics of Anti-Westernism in Asia : Visions of World Order in Pan-Islamic and Pan-Asian Thought*, and Brij Tankha's edited volume, *Okakura Tenshin and Pan-Asianism: Shadows of the Past*.¹⁴ These works provide important analyses of Pan-Asian thinking of the kind that became so important in the post-Meiji era. My study will contribute to this field of scholarship by examining Meiji intellectual understandings of East and West, which helped to create the foundations for Pan-Asian thought among Japanese.

¹³ Urs Matthias Zachmann, *China and Japan in the Late Meiji Period: China Policy and the Japanese Discourse on National Identity, 1895-1904* (London: Routledge, 2009).

¹⁴ Sven Saaler and J. Victor Koschmann, ed., *Pan-Asianism in Modern Japanese History: Colonialism, Regionalism, and Borders* (London: Routledge, 2007); Cemil Aydin, *The Politics of Anti-Westernism in Asia : Visions of World Order in Pan-Islamic and Pan-Asian Thought* (New York : Columbia University Press, 2007); Brij Tankha, ed., *Okakura Tenshin and Pan-Asianism: Shadows of the Past* (Folkestone: Global Oriental, 2009).

The third category of scholarship deals with the interaction between Japanese and Westerners as well as Western societies and culture. Numerous studies focus on bilateral relationships between Japan and foreign states. British and Japanese relations have been studied in works such as Hugh Cortazzi, and Gordon Daniels's *Britain and Japan, 1859-1991: Themes and Personalities*, and Ian Hill Nish, James Hoare, and Hugh Cortazzi's *Britain & Japan: Biographical Portraits*.¹⁵ Essay collections such as *Mutual Images: Essays in American Japanese Relations* edited by Akira Iriye cover the perceptions that Japan and America share of each other.¹⁶ French-Japanese connections are explored in works such as Kobayashi Yoshiaki's 小林良彰 *Meiji Ishin to Furansu Kakumei* 明治維新とフランス革命 and Kawano Kenji's 河野健二 *Furansu Kakumei to Meiji Ishin* フランス革命と明治維新 [Both titles can be translated as *The Meiji Restoration and the French Revolution*].¹⁷ *A Hidden Fire: Russian and Japanese Cultural Encounters, 1868-1926*, edited by J. Thomas Rimer, is a collection of essays that includes Togawa Tsuguo's "Japanese View of Russia Before and After the Meiji Restoration" and Mochizuki Tetsuo's "Japanese Perceptions of Russian Literature in the Meiji and Taisho Eras."¹⁸

¹⁵ Hugh Cortazzi and Gordon Daniels, *Britain and Japan, 1859-1991: Themes and Personalities* (London: Routledge, 1992); Ian Hill Nish, James Hoare, and Hugh Cortazzi, *Britain and Japan: Biographical Portraits* (Folkestone: Japan Library, 1994).

¹⁶ Akira Iriye, ed., *Mutual Images: Essays in American-Japanese Relations*. vol. 7 of *Harvard studies in American-East Asian Relations* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975).

¹⁷ Kobayashi Yoshiaki 小林良彰, *Meiji Ishin to Furansu Kakumei* . 明治維新とフランス革命 (Tokyo: San'ichi Shobō, 1988); Kawano Kenji 河野健二, *Furansu Kakumei to Meiji Ishin* フランス革命と明治維新 (Tokyo: Nihon Hōsō Shuppan Kyōkai, 1966).

¹⁸ J. Thomas Rimer, ed., *A Hidden Fire: Russian and Japanese Cultural Encounters, 1868-1926* (Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press, 1995).

A number of historians and writers have explored the influences of individual Western thinkers on Japan such as "Herbert Spencer in Early Meiji Japan" (1954) by Nagai Michio, "Comte, Mill, and the Thought of Nishi Amane in Meiji Japan" (1968) by Thomas R. H. Havens and "The Case of Baba Tatsui: Western Enlightenment, Social Change and the Early Meiji Intellectual" by Eugene Soviak(1963).¹⁹ Ike Nobutaka takes a broader approach in his article "Western Influences on the Meiji Restoration."²⁰ George Sansom wrote what is considered the classic monograph on this subject, *The Western World and Japan* (1968). And Watanabe Masao has compiled a useful collection of essays in *The Japanese and Western Science* (1990).²¹

Japan's Love-Hate Relationship with the West is a collection of previously published essays and conference papers by Sukehiro Hirakawa, a professor emeritus of the University of Tokyo. Though organized into sections such as "Japan's Love-Hate Relationship with China," "Japan's Turn to the West," "Return to the East," and "Japanese Writers between East and West," this study is far from a systematic study of the East-West binary. Hirakawa was a comparative cultural historian and many of his essays deal with literary figures.²²

None of the above works examines Japanese conceptions of an East-West binary in the nineteenth century, nor do any works use case studies of individual thinkers as a means of

¹⁹ Nagai Michio, "Herbert Spencer in Early Meiji Japan," *The Far Eastern Quarterly* 14, no. 1 (November 1954): 55-64; Thomas R. H. Havens, "Comte, Mill, and the Thought of Nishi Amane in Meiji Japan," *The Journal of Asian Studies* 27, no. 2 (February 1968): 217-228; Eugene Soviak, "The Case of Baba Tatsui. Western Enlightenment, Social Change and the Early Meiji Intellectual," *Monumenta Nipponica* 18, no. 1/4 (1963): 191-235.

²⁰ Ike Nobutaka, "Western Influences on the Meiji Restoration," *The Pacific Historical Review* 17, no. 1 (February 1948): 1-10.

²¹ Watanabe Masao, *The Japanese and Western Science* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990).

²² Hirakawa Sukehiro, *Japan's Love-Hate Relationship with the West* (Kent: Global Oriental, 2005).

comparison. The existing scholarship seems to focus on negative rather than positive views of "the other." Buruma and Margalit's *Occidentalism*, Tanaka's *Japan's Orient*, and Dower's *War Without Mercy* reveal a significant interest in a militarist Japan, especially of the 1930s and 1940s, but far less attention has been paid to the Meiji period when Japanese perceptions of "the other" were much more varied and ambiguous. Many Meiji intellectuals addressed the conception of "Self" (*jikoku* 自国, own country) and "Other" (*gaikoku* 外国 *ikoku* 異国, foreign) as natural constructs. Amidst the threat of Western imperialism and the fad for all things "Western," some sought to identify Japan with the West (such as during the years 1895-1904 of Zachmann's study), while others sought to ground Japan in the domain of Eastern civilization. The East-West binary served as a reference point and framework in the search for a Japanese identity during the Meiji era. By presenting several case studies, I wish to demonstrate the variety of ways that Japanese intellectuals engaged the concepts of Eastern and Western civilizations.

* * *

What follows are five case studies of Meiji intellectuals who utilized the East-West binary to advance their visions of Japan's future. These individuals have been chosen to demonstrate the complexity and richness of the Meiji intellectual atmosphere. While the views of only five people by no means represent the full range of Japanese understanding of the East-West binary, they do present a wide spectrum of the intellectual diversity and varying viewpoints that existed during this tumultuous period of change. All of the selected intellectuals lived between 1835 and 1936, were more or less interconnected, and they sometimes commented on each other's opinions or actions. Preceding the five case studies is a chapter devoted to pre-

Meiji Japanese conceptualizations of the world to help provide a framework from which to better understand the intellectual landscape in which these individuals existed. Chapter One consists of two major parts: the first section deals with the Japanese worldview before the arrival of Europeans in the sixteenth century. The Japanese worldview of this period was characterized by two overlapping spatial concepts: Ka-I 華夷 (the center surrounded by barbarians) model derived from China, and the Three-Land (Japan, China and India) model (*sangoku sekai kan* 三国世界観) derived from Buddhism. The second half of the Chapter One deals with the period between 1542 and 1868, during which the traditional worldview was reformulated because of the encounter with Europeans. The early usages of the terms such as Seiyō and Tōyō (Western and Eastern oceans) as well as Japanese perceptions of "Europe" and "China" will be also examined.

Chapter Two focuses on Fukuzawa Yukichi (1835-1901), the oldest of the five case study figures, who lived the first half of his life under the Tokugawa regime and the latter half in the Meiji era. By living during both periods, Fukuzawa provides a perspective that begins with the old Tokugawa worldview but then provides a bridge into the changes and upheavals that characterize the Meiji period. Having been among the first Japanese to visit the United States and Europe in the late Tokugawa era, Fukuzawa saw a need for change and began advocating the study of the English language and popularized the term "*bunmei* (civilization)." Fukuzawa became a very well-known figure in Japan as the author of *Seiyō jijō* 西洋事情 [Conditions of the West] as well as the founder of Keiō University and the *Jiji Shinpō* 時事新報 [Current Events] newspaper. His accomplishments earned him the popular nickname of "the sage of Mita." Fukuzawa became one of the foremost advocates of Westernization because he believed

its adoption was necessary for Japan to retain its independence in the face of Western encroachment. For Fukuzawa, the West represented the highest stage of modern civilization, while China and Confucianism represented the antithesis of the West. He equated the West with a spirit of independence and progress, while reflecting that Confucianism was a regressive and degenerating ideology that looked into the past for inspiration while encouraging Japanese to hold onto a servile mentality. For him, turning to Westernization was a matter of Japan's survival: catch up with the West and survive, or cling to the past and perish.

Chapter Three examines Shimoda Utako (1854-1936), an influential Japanese woman who was involved in the establishment of numerous women's associations and schools, such as the Patriotic Women's Association and the Jissen Women's School. She was known as a nationalistic woman who promoted the virtues of the "good wife and wise mother" in order to enrich and strengthen Japan. As one of the few Japanese women who travelled to Europe and North America (1893-1895) in the late nineteenth century, and as a pioneer of Japanese women's education, Shimoda reflected on the differences and similarities between Western and Eastern women in her books and magazine articles. A classic binary thinker, she viewed the world as consisting of binary opposites: East and West, men and women, and old and new, etc. Shimoda saw a sharp contrast between Western and Eastern women, but she saw much that Eastern women could learn from the Western women. She found Western women to be physically stronger and more socially dignified than Eastern women, whom she considered physically weak, slavish, and lacking a major role within their societies. Shimoda fully accepted the Victorian notion of separate spheres for men and women, and argued that it was within the home that women could truly make contributions to the nation by being a good wife and wise mother. She

combined the Eastern notion of diffidence in society and the Western Victorian notion of an "Angel in the House" and motherhood to build the nation in order to create a new ideal womanhood for Eastern women.

The fourth chapter focuses on Uchimura Kanzō (1861-1930) who is generally considered the greatest Japanese Christian leader of the late nineteenth to early twentieth century. As a Christian, Uchimura saw a divine design in world geography and history with a clear separation between the Eastern and Western worlds by the Pamirs, with each having its own distinct history. He identified the Western realm to be the area where "civilization" had developed, while he saw the Eastern realm to be characterized by stagnation. Uchimura perceived civilization as marching westward according to God's providence from West Asia to Europe and then from Europe to North America. He believed that Japan would become the latest destination of the civilization, and that from Japan, civilization would be brought to the rest of the Eastern world. However, Uchimura became very critical of Japanese society because he felt that the Japanese people had adopted a form of civilization that was divorced from its Christian soul. Uchimura was also very critical of modern Western civilization since he believed it had become completely corrupted, and he saw it as Japan's destiny to purify Christianity back to its original form as promoted by Jesus, Peter, and Paul. He promoted a form of Non-Church Christianity that would be solely dependent upon reading the Bible. Uchimura's vision demonstrates an interesting contradiction where he saw Japan's need to adopt the concepts of Western civilization, but at the same time he believed much of these concepts had become corrupted. He saw it was Japan's Christian duty to restore the concepts of civilization and return a newly purified version of civilization back to the West.

The fifth chapter examines the perspectives of the famous art critic, Okakura Kakuzō (1863-1913). Best remembered for his famous words, "Asia is One," Okakura is usually considered the foremost Pan-Asian thinker from Japan, but such views appear to have developed mainly during the Second World War when Japan was trying to justify its actions by proclaiming the establishment of the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere. While there are connections between Okakura and Bengali intellectuals seeking Indian independence, the extent of his involvement was limited to a few years he spent in India and regardless of his sympathy to their cause, he appeared to be more committed as an art critic than a pan-Asian political activist. Indeed, Okakura's understanding of the East and West was fundamentally shaped by his study of both Eastern and Western art and their respective histories. Though not explicitly stated, like Uchimura, Okakura rationalized the division of Eastern and Western civilizations around the Pamirs and the Indus River. He perceived a commonality between the arts of India, China, Korea, and Japan that bound them together and separated them from the other great artistic tradition that existed in the lands beyond the Indus; Persia, Arabia, and Europe. Okakura's discussions tended to focus on the extremities of Eastern and Western civilizations with a very narrow focus on East Asia and Western Europe, possibly generating more of a contrast that may have been found in regions of closer geographic relation. In art, he saw two clearly contrasting traditions with the Eastern arts and society expressing individualism and freedom, while the Western arts, especially those of the industrial era, devoid of spirit and lacking individuality. Living during the period in which Japan was in the throes of a Westernization frenzy, Okakura struggled to promote the appreciation and preservation of Eastern artistic heritage since such traditions appeared to be on the verge of extinction.

Chapter Six is a case study of Kōtoku Shūsui (1871-1911). Best known as an anarchist-socialist who was executed for conspiring to assassinate the Meiji Emperor, Kōtoku was one of the earliest Japanese to embrace socialism. Using his career as a journalist and author, Kōtoku worked as a social activist to educate the Japanese people on the concepts of socialism. He was responsible for translating the *Communist Manifesto* into Japanese while also authoring numerous articles and books, including *Imperialism: The Monster of the Twentieth Century* (1901). As a socialist, the East-West binary did not play as significant a role for Kōtoku as other binaries, such as the divisions between the strong and the weak, the exploiter and the exploited, and the colonizer and the colonized. For him, East and West existed as loose geo-cultural entities, but he did not observe strong cultural or political differences between the two. Kōtoku defined civilization as a state where all the people of the world would enjoy "liberty, equality, and universal love," and recognized his fellow socialist revolutionaries, regardless of nationality or ethnic identity, to be working toward the same common goal. Thus, an East-West binary that emphasized cultural differences was irrelevant to Kōtoku. In the midst of the "Far Eastern Crisis" of the late nineteenth century, Kōtoku perceived Tōyō (the East, by which he meant East Asia) to be a geographical entity and he hoped that Japan would assume the role of regional peacekeeper, but he became increasingly disappointed with Japan's foreign policy. By the outbreak of the Russo-Japanese War, he had become one of the greatest anti-war advocates and even published an open letter to his Russian comrades. After the Russian Revolution of 1905, Kōtoku became more hopeful for the future, adopting a vision of the future where revolution could take place in the East and West at the same time. He envisioned the revolution starting from two centers, Russia from which the revolution would spread to the West, and China which

would carry the revolution to the East. For Kōtoku, the East and West were not opposing entities but simply represented two halves of the world where socialist revolutionaries worked toward the shared goal of bringing about liberty, equality, and universal love for all humankind.

The final chapter brings together all five individuals and compares their views about civilization and the East-West binary. It further examines their collective legacies upon Japanese society, including their impact on World War II thinking and formulation of the concept of a Greater East-Asia Co-prosperity Sphere. This study reveals that, despite their varied orientations and visions, all five intellectuals positioned Japan as leader of the Eastern world. Moreover, collectively, their use of the East-West binary elevated both East and West, while marginalizing middle Eurasia (between East and West) and the South (outside East and West) such as Africa and South America.

* * *

As has been presented, these five intellectuals had a diverse spectrum of views and interpretations of civilization and the usage of the East-West binary. Each of them was a public figure well-known to the Japanese people and in some cases to each other. For example, Uchimura Kanzō and Kōtoku Shūsui were colleagues when they both worked for the *Yorozu Chōhō* newspaper. Uchimura wrote the preface of Kōtoku's *Imperialism: The Monster of the Twentieth Century* (1901), and they worked together in the anti-war movement, even though they differed in their views of religion with Uchimura being a Christian and Kōtoku being an atheist. While occasionally finding common cause, this was not always the case as can be deduced from Kōtoku's treatise repudiating Christianity, though he did not criticize Uchimura directly. Uchimura was particularly critical of Fukuzawa Yukichi and repeatedly criticized "the sage of

Mita." Kōtoku's newspaper, the *Heimin Shinbun* 平民新聞 (Common People's Newspaper), printed scandalous account of Shimoda Utako, whom it accused of being involved with important political leaders of the day. Being ostensibly only an art critic, Okakura Kakuzō was able to somewhat distance himself from much of the political and public debate, but he implicitly critiqued Fukuzawa for his westernization policies.

All five figures had the opportunity to go overseas and visit the United States, with Fukazawa, Shimoda, and Okakura also visiting Europe and observing "Asia" en route. Okakura and Shimoda spent some time in China with Okakura also staying for a while in India. All of them had a Confucian education at some point and were able to read Japanese as well as written classical Chinese. Familiarity with English was also common among all with Okakura and Uchimura being particularly proficient in English, even writing books and articles in English. Most of them (except Fukuzawa) had fairly close non-Japanese acquaintances, including at least one Westerner. Their direct exposure to the world outside of Japan and their ability to communicate with foreign people placed them in a rare position to reflect on the differences between Japan and the rest of the world. With the exception of Kōtoku, the group as a whole had an ambivalent attitude toward the West seeing it as "the Other" while they worked via their own agendas to do what they felt was right for Japan.

Meiji Japan faced a crucial crossroads where the choices made would determine the nation's fate within the changing political atmosphere created by Westernization and encroaching colonization into Asia. The nation's scholars and intellectuals struggled with how best to deal with the situation, with some promoting the adoption of Westernization as a means of "fighting fire with fire." Others felt the need to protect their own Japanese and Asian heritage

and called for a more gradual approach where only the best practices from the West would be adopted while still retaining the core values of what it is to be Japanese. Another group based their philosophies on religion or socialism as a means of determining the best course of action for their nation. The individuals in these case studies provide a wide spectrum of these divergent views but also offer the opportunity to see how all their opinions and ideas influenced Japan's social and political consciousness and ultimately worked to develop a new sense of national identity within the greater world political and economic structure.

CHAPTER 1

JAPANESE PERCEPTIONS OF THE OUTSIDE WORLD BEFORE THE MEIJI ERA

PART I: BEFORE 1500 IN LITERARY WORKS AND MAPS

In 607, Prince Shōtoku (574-644CE) sent a group of envoys to Sui dynasty China (581-618CE) seeking to establish diplomatic relations between Japan and China. The envoys took a letter of the Prince to the Emperor that stated: "The Son of Heaven of the Land of the Rising Sun sends a letter to the Son of Heaven of the Land of the Setting Sun. I hope you are doing well."¹ Sui Yangdi (r. 604-617), known as one of the most tyrannical figures in Chinese history, was displeased. Not only did the "letter of the barbarians" (Ch. *manyi shu*, Jp. *ban'i sho* 蠻夷書) refer to China as the Land of the Setting Sun, but the prince also used the traditional title of the Chinese Emperor, Son of Heaven (Ch. *tianzi*, Jp. *tenshi* 天子), for both the title of the Japanese and Chinese ruler, in effect, placing them on equal status. This simple episode well illustrates the differences between Chinese and Japanese perceptions of the world. The Chinese believed their country to be the center of the world, *Zhongguo* 中國 meaning the Middle Kingdom, surrounded by barbarians in all four directions. The Japanese, on the other hand, being located between the vast Pacific Ocean on one side and the Eurasian landmass on the other, developed a

¹ In *Suishu* 隋書 (Jp. *Zuisho*, c. 630CE) [History of the Sui Dynasty] scroll 81, section 46, on Land of Wa, Eastern Barbarians 東夷倭國 <http://www.geocities.jp/intelljp/cn-history/zui/wa.htm> (accessed in December 2010). Translated from the original Chinese "日出處天子致書日沒處天子無恙." Prince Shōtoku was the regent of Empress Suiko (r. 536-628CE), who was his aunt. He was a crown prince, but never had a chance to become Emperor. A partial English translation of the same document can be found in Wm Theodore de Bary, Donald Keene, George Tanabe, and Paul Varley, eds, *Sources of Japanese Tradition*, vol. 1. *From Earliest Times to 1600*, 2nd ed. (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), 10-11. See also Edwin O. Reischauer, *Ennin's Travels in T'ang China* (New York: The Donald Press Company, 1955), 42-47.

worldview that placed them at the eastern periphery of the world. The envoys clearly identified China as the country that lay to "the west of the ocean (*haixi*海西)." For Japanese, the wider world existed only to the west of their homeland.

When Prince Shōtoku sent his envoys to China, Japan was undergoing a major transformation from a clan-based society to a state-based society, centered on the figure of the Emperor. In order to strengthen the emerging Japanese state and increase the authority of the Emperor, Prince Shōtoku sought to establish formal diplomatic relations with China, the greatest power in East Asia. Despite the inauspicious beginning, the Japanese were able to establish a connection with China that would influence Japanese society for centuries to come. Between 607 and 894, twenty-one separate envoy groups traveled to China to pay tribute to the Chinese court under the Sui and Tang (618-907) dynasties. Informal interaction continued even after the Japanese decided to stop sending envoy missions in 894 due to China's deteriorating political and social conditions. Between 1404 and 1548, Japan reentered into a tributary relationship with Ming China. The envoy missions served an important political purpose, but they were also the vehicle for cultural exchange that brought many new concepts and beliefs to the Japanese people. The flow of cultural information was filtered through China, the only "foreign land" that the Japanese had direct contact with. Through that, Japan was also exposed to the wider world which allowed it to learn about Buddhism and more indirectly about India where Buddhism had originated. The flow of ideas not only enriched Japan's culture, but it also influenced the Japanese people's spiritual and geographic worldview. This section explores Japanese concepts of the world through literary works and maps.

The Ka-I and Three-Land View

Interaction with China and the introduction of Buddhism resulted in the Japanese embracing two overlapping and intertwined worldviews; Ka-I, a worldview based on the Chinese model, and a Three-Land View (*sangoku sekai kan*) based on Buddhism. The Ka-I (Ch. Hua-Yi) model was a traditional Chinese worldview that placed China at the center.² According to this view, China was *Hua / Ka* 華, the flower, the best place, the place of prosperity, and the place of splendor, which is surrounded by barbarians at each of its four corners. The four groups of barbarians are traditionally identified by the Chinese to be the *Beidi* 北狄 (Jp. *Hokuteki*, Northern Barbarians), *Nanman* 南蠻 (Jp. *Nanban*, Southern Barbarians), *Dongyi* 東夷 (Jp. *Tō'i*; Eastern Barbarians), and *Xirong* 西戎 (Jp. *Seijū*, Western Barbarians). One may note that the Chinese used different characters to indicate the word "barbarians" depending upon which directions they came from. In the early stage of Japan's interaction with China in the seventh century, the Japanese appeared to have accepted their designation as the Eastern barbarians. *Suishu*, the official history book of the Sui dynasty, records a Japanese ambassador stating (perhaps with a built-in Chinese bias): "I hear that across the western sea is Great Sui, the country of ritual and justice (*liyi* 禮義); therefore, I pay a tribute. I am a barbarian (*Yiren* 夷人), living far away in the sea, and have not heard of the ritual and justice" ³ Here, the measurements of being a non-barbarian or "civilized" (for lack of better word; at this point, the

² Narsimhan, *Japanese Perceptions of China*, 1-2; Tessa Morris-Suzuki, *Re-Inventing Japan: Time, Space Nation* (New York: M.E. Sharpe, 1998), 15.

³ *Suishu*, scroll 81, section 46. Translated from the original Chinese, 我聞海西有大隋，禮義之國，故遣朝貢。我夷人，僻在海隅，不聞禮義. . . .

word *bunmei* did not exist) were *li*禮 (ritual) and *yi*義 (justice), both classic Confucian terms.

The term *li* (*rei* in Japanese), is commonly translated as "ritual," "propriety," "etiquette," and "decorum," and was especially important in providing a guideline for proper behavior for the emerging Japanese court culture. Prince Shōtoku's *Seventeen Article Constitution*, issued in 604 stated:

- IV. The ministers and functionaries must act on the basis of decorum [*li* 禮], for the basis of governing the people consists of decorum. If the superiors do not behave with decorum, offenses will ensue. If the ministers behave with decorum, there will be no confusion about ranks. If the people behave with decorum, the nation will be governed well of its own.⁴

For Prince Shōtoku, adoption of the Confucian notion of the ritual propriety was a necessary step to advance Japan toward "civilization."

As the Japanese elites developed sophisticated culture inspired by the Chinese example, Japanese came to divide themselves into various categories based on geographic location and perceived level of sophistication. Those living on the Western side of Japan, closer to China and "civilization," felt that they were more "civilized" than their brethren living in the eastern (including Kantō plains, where present day Tokyo can be found) and northeastern (area north of Tokyo) sections of the country that they considered to be frontier wilderness. Eastern Japanese came to be known as Azumabito 東人, and were considered to be part of the Japanese race, but

⁴ Prince Shōtoku, "Seventeen Article Constitution," in David J. Lu, *Japan: A Documentary History*, vol. 1 (New York: M.E. Sharpe, 2005), 24. The original document was written in Chinese, and recorded in *Nihonshoki*, Chapter 22 [Under Empress Suiko]. The Original text reads 四曰,群臣百寮,以禮為本。其治民之本,要在乎禮。上不禮而下非齊,下無禮以必有罪。是以,群臣有禮,位次不亂;百姓有禮,國家自治。 The text can be found at http://miko.org/~uraki/kuon/furu/text/syoki/syoki22_1.htm#sk22_05 (accessed in December 2010).

they were also viewed as unsophisticated frontiersmen.⁵ The people who inhabited northern Honshū (the Tōhoku region) who subsisted on hunting and gathering were referred to as Ezo蝦夷 or Emishi蝦夷 (different ways of reading 蝦夷) or Ebisu夷, all of which meant "barbarian." The "barbarians" of this time period are thought to be ancestors of the modern Ainu and non-Ainu populations who had different cultures, lifestyles, and physical characteristics from mainstream Japanese.⁶ Note that Japanese applied the same Chinese character *yi* 夷 (Jp, *i*) to these northerners as Chinese used for eastern barbarians like Japanese. This transference of the term *yi* indicates an early Japanese attempt to appropriate one aspect of this Chinese Ka-I worldview. The center of concentric circles had expanded to include some Japanese into the categories of "civilized." In a way, before the eventual dominance of the warrior class and subsequent rise to power of the eastern region of Japan, there existed an imagined hierarchy of peoples in the minds of the Japanese aristocracy that consisted of Chinese who had *li*, the Japanese aristocracy who also possessed *li*, followed by the unsophisticated Easterners, and finally the barbarians living in the north.

Along with the Chinese based Ka-I perspective, the Japanese also developed a worldview based on Buddhism. Known as the Three-Land View, the Japanese perceived a world consisting

⁵ The Easterners, Azumabito, were oftentimes recruited as soldiers. See George Sansom, *A History of Japan to 1334* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1958), 105.

⁶ Hanihara Kazuro, "Emishi, Ezo and Ainu: An Anthropological Perspective," *Japan Review* 1 (1990): 35-48. According to Hanihara, "Emishi" and "Ezo" in ancient and medieval Japan were not necessarily the ancestors of Japan's modern Ainu, because these terms included non-Ainu peoples. It was only during the Tokugawa era (1603-1868) that these terms came to be identified clearly with the Ainu.

of three countries: Japan, China and India.⁷ This tripartite view can be seen in several literary works as well as world maps produced prior to the arrival of Europeans in the sixteenth century. The most significant in the literary genre is the *Konjaku monogatari* 今昔物語集 or *Anthology of Tales from the Past*, a collection of about one thousands tales compiled around the twelfth century. The *Konjaku Tales* are organized into three major sections; tales from India (*Tenjiku* 天竺), China (*Shintan* 震旦), and Japan (Honchō 本朝). Of the thirty-one chapters in the *Konjaku Tales* (3 chapters are missing), the first five chapters, containing 187 stories, are devoted entirely to tales from India. These five chapters are by far the most extensive coverage of India seen in premodern Japanese literature.⁸ Other major literary works such as *The Tale of the Bamboo Cutter* [*Taketori monogatari* 竹取物語, c. 8-9th century], *The Tale of the Heike* [*Heike Monogatari* 平家物語, 13th century], and *Taiheiki* 太平記, all briefly mention India as part of the known world, and the word "Tenjiku" (India) is frequently found together with "Shintan" (China) and Japan.⁹ For example, in *The Tale of the Heike*, there is this comment

⁷ Maeda Masayuki 前田 雅之, *Konjaku monogatari no sekai kōsō* 今昔物語集の世界構想 [Worldview of the Konjaku Tales] (Tokyo: Kazama Shoin, 1999), 120-121, 212.

⁸ Ikegami Jun'ichi 池上 洵一, ed. *Konjaku monogatari* 今昔物語集 [Anthology of Tales from the Past], 4 vols. (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2001); *The Konjaku Tales: Indian Section*, 2 vols. translated by Yoshiko Kurata Dykstra (Tokyo: Sanseido, 1986). Some stories from the Konjaku Tales are also translated into English by Marian Ury, *Tales of Times Now Past: Sixty-Two Tales from a Medieval Japanese Collection* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 1979).

⁹ A beautiful illustrated bilingual edition of *The Tale of the Bamboo Cutter* is available from Kōdansha International. *The Tale of the Bamboo Cutter / Taketori Monogatari*, English translation by Donald Keene and modern Japanese translation by Kawabata Yasunari (Tokyo: Kodansha International, 1998). The classical Japanese edition is available at the University of Virginia site at <http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/japanese/taketori/AnoTake.html> (accessed in December 2010). *The Tale of the Bamboo Cutter*, written around the late 8th or early 9th century CE, seemed to capture the popular notion of India as a far-away land surrounded by legends. Known as the earliest "tale" or *monogatari* in Japanese history, the account presents the story of a bamboo cutter that finds a baby girl inside of a glowing bamboo. The girl grows up to become a stunningly beautiful woman to which many eligible men propose marriage. Not intending to get married, as she was sent from the moon and was expected to return, she requested

uttered by a warrior: "Don't let a thought of retreat enter your heads, men! In China, India and our own country of Japan, even a peerless commander or warrior is helpless if his luck has run out."¹⁰ Here, India is mentioned in passing without further explanation making it appear that the author expected the reader to be readily familiar with India as a country. The expression *sangoku* or "three countries"—"India, China, and Japan"—simply meant "the world" to Japanese before the arrival of Europeans.

The Three-Land View can also be seen in "The Map of the Five Provinces of India" stored at the Hōryūji Temple. Dated from 1364, it is the oldest known Japanese world map and is most likely based on a Chinese Buddhist map.¹¹ In the middle is a landmass shaped like an inverted egg, with the northern land area being wider than the southern area and the entire continent surrounded by water and a sprinkling of islands. The southern half of the landmass is labeled "Tenjiku 天竺," the term used by the Japanese (and Chinese) to refer to India. Tenjiku is

each bachelor to bring her items that were seemingly impossible to obtain. Two of the items were the stone begging-bowl that the original Buddha had used and a "robe made of fire-rat fur." The first item, the one and only begging bowl used by Buddha, could only be found in India. A prince faked a trip to India to find the bowl by disappearing for three years and then returned with an old bowl "pitch black with soot" that he had taken from a temple in Japan. The other item, a "robe made of fire-rat fur" was said to be available in China (唐土 Morokoshi), but the Minister of the Right who was assigned the task of finding the item decided to ask a Chinese merchant to locate it for him instead of doing it himself. The Chinese merchant replied, "Robes made from the furs of fire-rats are not obtainable in my country," but he thought he could find it in India. Sure enough, when the Chinese merchant returned to Japan, he brought with him a beautiful fur robe. However, when it was thrown in a fire, it burned completely, proving that it was not the authentic fire-rat fur she requested. These two episodes particularly well illustrate that Japanese saw India as a land beyond China, and therefore out of their reach.

¹⁰ Helen Craig McCullough, *The Tale of the Heike* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988), 374. In original Japanese the order is India, China, and Japan 天竺震旦にも、日本吾朝にも. . . . The Japanese version can be obtained at the University of Virginia site <http://etext.virginia.edu/japanese/heike/heike.html> (accessed in December 2010).

¹¹ "Five Provinces of India" (1364) in Oda Takeo 織田武雄, Muroga Nobuo 室賀信夫, and Umino Kazutaka 海野一隆. *Nihon kochizu taisei: sekaizu hen* 日本古地図大成. 世界図編 [The World in Japanese Maps until the Mid-19th Century] vol. 1 (Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1975), 11. The map can be found in Asahi Shinbun 朝日新聞 ed., *Saiyūki no Shiruku Rōdo : Sanzō Hōshi no michi* 西遊記のシルクロード:三蔵法師の道[*The Silk Road and the World of Xuanzang*] (Osaka: Asahi Shinbun, 1999), 46-47.

divided into five provinces or regions: Northern Tenjiku (*kita Tenjiku* 北天竺), Southern Tenjiku (*minami Tenjiku* 南天竺), Eastern Tenjiku (*higashi Tenjiku* 東天竺), Western Tenjiku (*nishi Tenjiku* 西天竺) and Central Tenjiku (*naka Tenjiku* 中天竺). The map actually shows "Persia," but it is shown as part of the Western province of India. Two of the Japanese home islands, Shikoku 四國 and 九國Kukoku (today's Kyushu), appear in the northeast corner of the map. The map also shows China to the southwest of Japan and labels it both Dai Tō koku 大唐國 (Great Tang) and Shintankoku 晨旦國 / 震旦國.¹² Since the Japanese had almost a three hundred year relationship with Tang Dynasty (618CE and 907CE) they continued to identify the country as "Tang," even when the map was made well after the fall of the Tang Dynasty.¹³ The other term for China used on the map, *Shintan* 晨旦 / 震旦, was derived from the Sanskrit term referring to China based on the name of the "Qin" dynasty (pronounce by the Japanese as *Shin*).

The map highlights the travel route of the famous seventh century Chinese pilgrim Xuanzang with a red line originating in Chang'an 長安 and meandering throughout India. Xuanzang and his travels were of importance since he is credited with bringing Buddhist scriptures to China.¹⁴ Buddhist map-making concepts typified by a swirling body of water at the

¹² The author was not able to identify which of the two characters—晨 or 震—this particular map uses. 震旦 is used in *Konjaku Tales* and *The Tale of the Heike*. 晨旦 is shown on a map that appears to be a 1749 copy of the Hōryūji map. The newer map is in possession of the Kobe City Museum and can be seen in Asahi Shinbun ed., *Saiyūki no Shiruku Rōdo : Sanzō Hōshi no michi*, 45. There is another map produced in c.1692 that is almost identical to the Hōryūji map, and reproduced in Oda, etc, *Nihon kochizu taisei: sekaizu hen*, 12-13. In the 1692 copy, the term China is labeled as "Shinakoku 支那国" which derives from a European name for China.

¹³ China was oftentimes simply referred to as Tang 唐 (Tō in the Japanese pronunciation) or one of its variants, such as *Kara* 唐, *Tōzan* 唐山 or *Morokoshi* 唐土.

¹⁴ For more information on Xuanzang, see Sally Hovey Wriggins, *The Silk Road Journey with Xuanzang*, Revised edition (Bolder, CO: Westview Press, 2004).

center of the map and the unmistakable single continent view are also present. The map indicates that the Japanese were well aware of the vast continent that lay to their west, while placing themselves at the northeastern periphery. Similar maps from China do not always include Japan or show other islands along with Japan to the east of the continent, indicating that this particular map is a visual representation of the distinctively Japanese Three-Land View with China, India, and Japan all included.¹⁵

Of the two areas that represented "foreign" lands on such maps, educated Japanese maintained a vast knowledge about China. The most intimate connections with China took place between the seventh and ninth centuries, when Japan regularly sent tributes to the Sui and Tang dynasties. These tribute missions allowed a tremendous amount of information to pass from China to Japan. The scale of the missions expanded over time with those taking place during the eighth and ninth centuries typically including 500-600 members each (usually including officials, students, and monks). The length of time the envoys stayed in China varied, but some, such as the famous Chief Ambassador, Kibi no Makibi 吉備 真備 (695–775), stayed as long as 20 years. The envoys, monks, and students typically returned to Japan with vast libraries of books. By the ninth century, it is said that the Japanese court had access to approximately one third of all the books available in China.¹⁶ Written Chinese became the primary language of the literati and

¹⁵ Several examples of Buddhist maps made in China can be found explanatory notes provided in Oda, etc., *Nihon kochizu taisei: sekaizu hen*, vol. .2, 3-5.

¹⁶ W.G Beasley, *The Japanese Experience: A Short History of Japan* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 48-51; George Sansom, *The Western World and Japan, The Western World and Japan: A Study in the Interaction of European and Asiatic Cultures* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1968 [1950]), 133-136; Charlotte von Verschuer, "Official Missions to Tang China and Information Technology," in The Nara International Foundation, *The Silk Roads Nara International Symposium 2001: Soaring Over the Silk Road: Japanese Envoys to the Sui and Tang* (Nara, Japan: The Nara International Foundation, 2001).

official records were written in Chinese.¹⁷ The study of the written Chinese language became an integral part of the education that all Japanese elites were expected to master. Since the Japanese had access to Chinese documents and books, their understanding of Chinese history was quite extensive, allowing them to make references and allusions in their own works to China's past with the expectation that a literate reader would understand what was inferred.

The Japanese elites also consumed goods that came directly or indirectly from China. Among the many products that were identified as "Chinese," or "of Kara" [Japanese reading of the term, Tang 唐] included textiles and clothing (*Kara koromo* 唐衣, *Kara aya* 唐綾, etc), paper (*Kara no kami* 唐の紙), chests (*Kara hitsu* 唐櫃) and umbrellas (*Kara kasa* 唐笠), all of which were luxury items enjoyed by the social elite.¹⁸ "Chinese" objects for court ladies represented something expensive and beautiful. A common expression "*Kara meku*" 唐めく, which can be translated into "of Chinese" or "Tang flavor" implied sophistication.¹⁹ The Japanese obsession with Chinese products continued even after the decline of the nobility and the rise of the warriors.

¹⁷ Most Japanese did not speak Chinese, but educated Japanese men were able to read and write in Chinese. Known as Kanbun, the Japanese learned to read Chinese by altering words order, since the grammatical constructions of Japanese and Chinese languages are so different.

¹⁸ The term "*Kara koromo*" also appears quite often in poetry, in contrast to *fuji koromo*, which meant rough, coarse cloths.

¹⁹ The term "*Kara meku*" and its variation was used in *The Tale of Genji* at least 7 times. Sei Shōnagon, the author of *The Pillow Book* [*Makura no sōshi* 枕草紙] used the term combined with "*okashi*" ["interesting" or "sophisticated"] as in *Kara mikite okashi* 唐めきてをかし two times, which can be translated "Tang style and pleasantly sophisticated." Several English translations of *The Tale of Genji* are available, including by Edward G. Seidensticker (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992), and by Royall Tyler (New York: Penguin Classics, 2002). The Japanese version can be found at the University of Virginia e-text collection at <http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/japanese/genji/index.html> (accessed in December, 2010). An English translation of *The Pillow Book* is done by Ivan Morris, *The Pillow Book of Sei Shōnagon* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1992). The Japanese version can be found at University of Virginia site at <http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/japanese/sei/makura/SeiMaku.html> (accessed in December, 2010).

By the fourteenth century, the volume of goods imported from China had become so great that a writer, Yoshida Kenkō (吉田兼好 c. 1283- c.1350) commented in his essay *Tsurezuregusa* 徒然草 that Chinese products, with the exception of medicines, were basically useless and it was unwise for Chinese ships to make such dangerous voyages in order to bring "useless products" to Japan.²⁰

In sharp contrast, India's place in the Japanese mind was not so much as a physical country with which one could travel or develop trade and commerce, as it was a spiritual place whose presence had to be recognized in order to provide a foundation for the Buddhist faith. All the stories from India in the *Konjaku Tales* are Buddhist tales pertaining to the story of the historical Buddha, his previous incarnations, and his immediate disciples. Nothing of contemporary India was known, nor was information not pertaining to Buddhism available to Japanese. The lack of information concerning India relegated it in Japanese eyes to a land made mostly of myths existing outside of time and space.

Korea

As a result of Japan's connections to China and the introduction of Buddhism, the Japanese came to understand the world as consisting of three lands. One particularly obvious and puzzling omission is Korea, Japan's closest neighbor. Clearly the Japanese were aware of the existence of Korea across the Sea of Japan. It is possible that Korea was generally

²⁰ Yoshida Kenkō 吉田兼好, *Tsurezuregusa* 徒然草. Chapter 120. Paraphrased by the author from the section that reads: 唐の物は、薬の外は、なくとも事缺くまじ。書どもは、此の國に多く廣まりぬれば、書きも寫してん。唐土舟のたやすからぬ道に、無用の物どものみ取りつみて、所狭く渡しもてくる、いとおろかなり。 Japanese text available at <http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/japanese/tsure/YosTsur.html>

overshadowed by China, much larger and more prominent neighbor. There are only a few references to Korea found in premodern Japanese literature. In contrast to their extensive familiarity with Chinese history, most Japanese appeared to have possessed only limited knowledge of Korean history. *The Tale of the Heike*, which contains numerous references to Chinese history, makes no substantive references to Korean history. Where Korea is mentioned, the comments are vague and without specific details. For example, Minamoto no Yoshitsune makes a comment such as "I shall not return to the capital without destroying them, even if it means going as far as Kikai-ga Shima, Korea, India, or China."²¹ Other references to Korea indicate a lack of understanding of Korean history since several of the Korean kingdoms mentioned, such as Silla 新羅, and Paekche 百濟, no longer existed when the tale was written.²²

Although the Japanese were aware of the existence of Korea, and may even have considered it a part of the civilized world, it appears to have had little prominence when considering the wider world. Regardless of other nations that Japanese may have been aware of, they clearly decided to adopt a worldview made up of only India, China, and Japan. This view is consistent with the Buddhist maps of the world and the organization and structure of the *Konjaku Tales*.²³ It is possible that Korea's long and involved history with China left many Japanese with a feeling that Korea was not distinct enough from China to warrant separate

²¹ McCullough trans, *The Tale of the Heike*, 358. Kikai-ga Shima, literally means an island of demons, was an island in south of Japan where the criminals were sent.

²² *The Tale of the Heike*, in Chapter 7, section "*Fukuhara ochi* 福原落" [The Flight from Fukuhara], and Chapter 8, section "*Dazaifu ochi* 太宰府落" [the Flight from the Dazaifu]. These sections mentions of Silla 新羅, Paekche 百濟, Kōryō 高麗, and Khitan 契丹.

²³ Maeda, *Konjaku monogatari shu no sekai kōsō*, 368-369.

mention or study. It may also be that most Japanese did not feel that Korea was "civilized" enough to be included as a separate entity, since the Chinese regarded Koreans to be Eastern Barbarians. Without additional detailed information, it is not possible to determine why Korea warranted so little attention from the Japanese.

Considering the lack of information on Korea, and scanty information available on India, it becomes apparent that China represented the ultimate "foreign" land to the Japanese. The Japanese were well aware of differences between what was "native" to Japanese and what was of "foreign" or Chinese origin. Japanese items were identified to be "of *Wa* 和" (most likely derived from the ancient Chinese designation of Japan as *Wa* 倭 or possibly taken from the second character for Yamato 大和, whose alternative reading is *Wa*) while Chinese products and concepts are identified to be "of *Kan* 漢 (Ch. Han) or "of *Tō* 唐(also read "*Kara*"; Ch. Tang). Chinese narrative writing (*Kanbun* 漢文), Chinese poems (*Kanshi* 漢詩), and Chinese paper (*Karakami* 唐紙) were contrasted to Japanese narrative writing (*Wabun* 和文), Japanese poems (*Waka* 和歌) and Japanese paper (*Washi* 和紙). In short, although the Japanese were well aware of China's influences upon their society they were by no means assimilated into Chinese society and actively maintained an identity that kept their culture distinct from that of their powerful neighbor.

PART II: AFTER 1500, CHIEFLY IN MAPS AND GEOGRAPHICAL WORKS UNDER EUROPEAN INFLUENCE

In 1543, a ship carrying Portuguese castaways reached Tanegashima, a small island south of Kyūshū. The Portuguese introduced firearms which quickly became sought-after items in a country that was going through a period of intense civil war among its great warlords. Five years later, a Jesuit missionary, Francis Xavier, arrived in Kagoshima, accompanied by a Japanese man whom he met at Malacca. Other Jesuit missionaries followed, finding the Japanese receptive, even if Japanese interest was related more to political and economic benefits from trade and commerce. Trade between Japan and Portugal flourished, especially after the Ming dynasty in 1548 decided to end the tributary relationship it maintained with Japan. The Portuguese took over the role as middleman through which Japan could continue to acquire goods from China.²⁴ Spaniards, Dutch, and English merchants all began to take part in the trade with Japan by the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. By this time Japan's civil war era was finally coming to an end, and Japan was moving back to a unified centralized state.

Some Japanese leaders at the time courted European powers as they sought allies and advantages over their enemies, but as the wars faded, perceptions of foreigners began to change. The major leaders of the period, Toyotomi Hideyoshi (1536-1598) and Tokugawa Ieyasu (1543-1616) had actively sought foreign trade with Europeans, but they began to see a shifting political

²⁴ Ashikaga Shogunate entered the tributary relationship with the Ming dynasty in 1404. Yanai Kenji 箭内健次, "Nihon to Seiyō bunka no deai 日本と西洋文化の出会い [Japanese Encounter with the Western Civilization]," in Numata Jirō 沼田次郎 ed., *Nihon to Seiyō* 日本と西洋 [Japan and the West], vol. 6 of *Tōzai bunmei no kōryū* 東西文明の交流 [Interactions of the Eastern and Western Civilizations] (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1971), 31-34; Nakata Yasunao 中田易直, "Jyūshichi seiki shotō no taigai kōsho: bōeiki no seiki hiraku 十七世紀初頭の対外交渉：貿易の世紀ひらく [Diplomatic Negotiations of the Early Seventeenth Century: The Opening of the Century of Trades]," in Numata, *Nihon to Seiyō*, 97-126.

environment where the new foreign religion of Christianity was upsetting traditional Japanese institutions and customs. They became suspicious of the Catholic missionaries and viewed Japanese Christians whose numbers were steadily increasing from around 150,000 in 1581 to around 700,000 in 1610, as a major political threat. Hideyoshi and Ieyasu increasingly adopted an anti-Catholic stance while still trying to maintain a commercial relationship with Europeans. Their successors, tired of persistent illegal infiltrations of missionaries and no longer facing the pressures of war, chose to cut much of their ties to the Europeans. Between 1631 and 1641, the Tokugawa Shogunate, which now controlled all of Japan, issued a series of orders tightening the restrictions on foreign affairs. By 1640, Japan entered an era of relative seclusion, where formal diplomatic relationships were only maintained with Korea and Ryūkyū, and trade tightly regulated with only the Dutch and Chinese being allowed to maintain trade and shipping via Deshima, a small artificial island in Nagasaki specifically created for this purpose.²⁵ The Dutch were allowed to continue coming to Japan since they were uninterested in missionary activities. From their merchant's office at Deshima, the Dutch captains were required to periodically pay a visit to the Shogun.²⁶ Thus, under this supposed period of seclusion, Japan maintained its connections to both China and Europe while "Dutch Learning" through imported Dutch books became a well established school during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, along with the Confucian and National Learning schools.

²⁵ Narsimhan, *Japanese Perceptions of China*, 3; Ronald Toby, *State and Diplomacy in Early Modern Japan: Asia in Development of the Tokugawa Bakufu* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), 14-15.

²⁶ Dutch Captain was required to visit Shogun every year between 1633-1790. After 1790, the Dutch captain was required to visit once in five years. This was similar to system called *sankin kōtai* or alternate attendance system where Daimyo were required to maintain one residence in Edo (where wife and children lived, serving as hostages) and another residence at his own domain, and attend the two residences alternatively.

Contact with Europeans caused a breakdown of the Three-Land View, as well as reformulation of the Ka-I perspective to include new "barbarians," as the Japanese became aware of the existence of Europeans and the darker skinned people (from India or Africa) who accompanied them. European-made maps and globes, based on their exploration of the world were introduced to Japan allowing some to begin learning of the existence of five continents: Asia, Europe, Africa, the Americas, and an unknown southern continent. In the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, folded screens depicting the five continents became popular among the Japanese social elites with many of the screens painted with a world map on one side and a map of the Japanese Isles on the other. Some of the screens include writing in Latin alphabets even though the maps were made by Japanese. Many of the maps place Afro-Eurasia on the right and the Americas on the left, but from the early seventeenth century, maps that placed the Americas on right and Afro-Eurasia on left started to make their appearance. Some of the more elaborate maps included pictures of world cities, while others depicted peoples of the world, usually in male-female pairs wearing traditional outfits.²⁷

Other map makers rejected the European model, and continued to use the Buddhist model; yet the Three-Land View was shattered as Japanese map makers were forced to recognize the existence of people beyond India. One of the most popular maps, originally printed in 1710, was "Nansen bushū bankoku shōka no zu 南瞻部洲万国掌菓之図 [A Pocket Map of the World]" by Rōkashi 浪華子.²⁸ This map is clearly based on the Buddhist conceptualization of

²⁷ Several examples of folded screen maps can be found in Oda, etc, *Nihon kochizu taisei: sekaizu hen*, 67-115.

²⁸ Rōkashi 浪華子, "Nansen bushū bankoku shōka no zu 南瞻部洲万国掌菓之図" [A Pocket Map of the world] (1710) in Oda, etc, *Nihon kochizu taisei: sekaizu hen*, 20-21. It can be also seen at Waseda University

the world, with its unmistakable swirling river. The outline of the continent is no longer a neat inverted egg shape, but it still maintains the idea of one large continent that is wide at the north and narrow at the south. Japan is depicted as the largest of the island-groups on the map, and interestingly, there are some countries depicted east of Japan. Europe appears in the northwest corner as a series of islands, with countries such as Holland, England, Italy clearly identified. South American countries, such as Brazil 伯西兒 and Peru 孛露, appear on the map as islands south of Japan. The existence of smaller and often simplified versions of this map, such as Kabō Hyōzō's 花坊兵藏 "Nan'en budai shokoku shūran no zu 南閻浮提諸国集覽之図 [A Map of Various Countries of the World]" (1744), and the "Bankoku shōka no zu 万国掌菓之図 [Pocket Map of the World]" by an unknown mapmaker (1850s-1860s), indicates the persistence of the traditional Buddhist geographical conceptualization even after European contact had provided a much different view of the world.²⁹

Tōyō and Seiyō in Pre-Meiji Maps

The Japanese terms equivalent to East and West are Tōyō 東洋 and Seiyō 西洋. These terms literally mean "Eastern Ocean" and "Western Ocean," thus rather than pointing out specific lands or cultural zones, they may have originally meant bodies of water. Traditionally, the

website http://archive.wul.waseda.ac.jp/kosho/bunko08/bunko08_c0364/bunko08_c0364.html (Accessed in December 2010). Nansen Bushu was the name of the one and only continent recognized in Buddhism. The mapmaker, Rōkashi, was also known as Naniwashi (alternative reading for above character) or Hōtan 鳳潭, a Zen Buddhist monk who founded the Kegan Temple 華嚴寺 in Kyoto.

²⁹ Kabō Hyōzō's 花坊兵藏, "Nan'en budai shokoku shūran no zu 南閻浮提諸国集覽之図 [A Map of Various Countries of the World]" (1744) and "Bankoku shōka no zu 万国掌菓之図 [Pocket Map of the World]" by an unknown mapmaker (1850s-1860s) can be found in Oda, etc, *Nihon kochizu taisei: sekaizu hen*, 22-23. These two maps can be seen at Kyoto University Library Muroga Collection site at <http://edb.kulib.kyoto-u.ac.jp/exhibit/muroga/bukkyo.html#5-8> (Accessed in December 2010).

Japanese (and Chinese) recognized the "four seas (*shikai*四海)" that surrounded the one large continent; the East, West, North and South Seas, though rather than referring to specific bodies of water, the term *shikai*, or Four Seas was used to mean the entire world. The exact origin of the terms *Tōyō* and *Seiyō* cannot be ascertained, but many world maps produced between c.1600-c.1860 contain related terminology such as *Dai Tōyō*大東洋(Greater Eastern Ocean), *Shō Tōyō*小東洋 (Lesser Eastern Ocean), *Dai Seiyō* 大西洋 (Greater Western Ocean), *Shō Seiyō*小西洋 (Lesser Western Ocean). It is possible that some of the terms may have originated from a map produced by the Jesuit missionary, Matteo Ricci (1552-1610), who created a detailed map of the world using all Chinese characters. Ricci's map, completed in 1604, was the first truly accessible map to the Japanese that provided a great deal of geographical information, therefore leaving a significant influence upon future Japanese cartography. The map Ricci drew labeled a part of the Pacific ocean near California as the "Greater Eastern Ocean (*Dai Tōyō*)," while the label "Lesser Eastern Ocean (*Shō Tōyō*)" appeared to the right of Japan. The label for the "Greater Western Ocean (*Dai Seiyō*)" appeared on the Atlantic to the left of the Iberian Peninsula, while the label "Lesser Western Ocean (*Shō Seiyō*)" was placed to the left of India.³⁰ There are numerous other world maps made prior to the Meiji era that have practically identical labeling of these four bodies of water. Many of these pre-Meiji maps were clearly influenced by Ricci's work as they not only mimic much of his terminology, but they usually also exhibit his

³⁰Matteo Ricci, "Kunyu wanguo quantu (Jp. Konyo bankoku zenzu) 坤輿万国全図 [The Map of the World]" (1604), can be seen at Kyoto University Library website <http://edb.kulib.kyoto-u.ac.jp/exhibit/maps/map001/image/index.html> Many Japanese made maps based on Ricci's map can be found in Oda, etc, *Nihon kochizu taisei: sekaizu hen*, 137-164.

characteristic oval shape (with top and bottom straight line) and the placement of the Americas to the right and of Afro-Eurasia to the left.

While Ricci's map was influential, not everyone used the same terms for the various ocean and locations or placed them in the same part of their maps. Some of the maps placed the label *Dai Seiyō* to the left of Europe and *Dai Tōyō* to the right of North America, thus calling the Atlantic both western and eastern oceans. These same types of maps usually call the Indian Ocean the "Lesser Western Ocean" (*Shō Seiyō*, essentially same designation as Ricci's map) while they label the Pacific as the "Lesser Eastern Ocean" (*Shō Tōyō*).³¹ In a map produced c.1850 for popular use, Japan was depicted in a disproportionately large manner with the "Lesser Eastern Ocean" to the its right and the "Lesser Western Ocean" directly south of Kyūshū and Shikoku, right above the *Megaranica* 墨瓦蠟泥加 or Magellanica, a large southern continent.³² Japanese maps based on the work of Dutch cartographer, Joan Blaeu (1596-1673) show two hemispheres and use "Greater Western Ocean (*Dai Seiyō*)" for the Atlantic and "Greater Eastern Ocean" (*Dai Tōyō*) for the Pacific. These maps drop the designations for the Lesser Western and Eastern Oceans (*Shō Seiyō* and *Shō Tōyō*) altogether. Other maps based on Blaeu's work used new terms, such as *Atara kai* 亜太蠟海, a Japanese attempt to write "Atlantic", and *Taihei kai* 太平海, meaning "Great Peaceful Sea," the translation of the Pacific."³³

³¹ Shibukawa Shunkai 渋川春海, "Sekaizu 世界図" (c.1698), Harame Sadakiyo 原目貞清, "Yōchizu 輿地図" (1720), Mihashi Chōkaku 三橋釣客, "Chikyū ichiran zu 地球一覽図"(1783), in Oda, etc, *Nihon kochizu taisei: sekaizu hen*, 153-159.

³² Eijudō 栄寿堂, "Bankoku jinbutsu no zu 万国人物之図" (c. 1850) in Oda, etc, *Nihon kochizu taisei: sekaizu hen*, 240-241.

³³ Examples of maps based on Dutch maps can be found in Oda, etc, *Nihon kochizu taisei: sekaizu hen*, 170-226.

While the labels "Greater Eastern Ocean," "Lesser Eastern Ocean" and "Lesser Western Ocean" were somewhat shifting and inconsistent, the use of the term "Greater Western Ocean," *Dai Seiyō* remained consistent located in the Atlantic to the left of the Iberian Peninsula. Indeed, in contemporary Japanese language, the Atlantic is still called the "*Tai Seiyō* 大西洋," an alternative reading of the same characters *Dai Seiyō*, while the terms for the other oceans have been dropped from modern usage. This labeling system may have consolidated the Japanese identification of Europe with "Seiyō." Over time the Japanese recognized the vast lands that lay to the west of their homeland, including China, India, and Europe, but ultimately Europe came to be represented the terms; "the West" or the "Far West" (Taisei 泰西 or "extreme west") due to its proximity to the Great Western Ocean.

The Europeans, Europe and Seiyō

When Europeans (Portuguese merchants and Jesuit missionaries who were mostly Portuguese, Spaniards, and Italians) started to arrive in the sixteenth century, the Japanese were not sure exactly where they came from but they did automatically assume the Europeans were "barbarians" since they came from outside the center of their Ka-I based worldview. The story of the first encounter between the Japanese and Portuguese is recorded in a document called *Teppōki* 鉄砲記 [Records of Firearms] written by Nampo Bunshi 南浦文之 about 1606. According to *Teppōki*, a foreign ship with "strange" (*kikai* 奇怪) looking people on board landed on Tanegashima in 1543. A Chinese member of the ship's crew was able to communicate with the Japanese by writing responses back and forth using Chinese characters. Answering the Japanese question as to where these people came from, the Chinese answered that they are

"barbarian merchants of the southwest [*seinan banshu no kako* 西南蛮種の賈胡]." Here two traditional terms for "barbarians," *ban* 蛮 and "*ko* 胡" were used by this Chinese. The man proceeded to explain that the barbarians (Portuguese) "roughly distinguished between ruler and subject [粗君臣の義を知る]," but they were illiterate and lacked table manners.³⁴ The standard used here was a Sino-centric Confucian one where the Chinese and Japanese shared a common written language and basic Confucian precepts of propriety while the barbarians did not. The explanation that they came from the southwest seemed to fit the Japanese geographical understanding that placed themselves at the northeastern corner of their world.

Trade was established between Japan and Portugal and the Japanese came to call the Portuguese (and later the Spanish) the Nanbanjin 南蛮人, applying the term used by the Chinese to refer to southern barbarians (Ch. *Nanman* 南蛮). Jesuit missionaries began to make appearances with the merchant traders, starting with the arrival of Francis Xavier and his companions in 1549.³⁵ Initially, the Japanese regarded Christianity as a sect of Buddhism, and thought the missionaries came from India (which was not necessary inaccurate since their base of operation in Asia was Goa). When Xavier presented an official letter from the Portuguese Governor of Goa to Lord Ōuchi Yoshitaka 大内義隆 (1507-1551), the Lord of Suō 周防

³⁴ Nampo Bunshi 南浦文之, *Teppōki* 鉄砲記, [Records of Firearms], excerpts available at http://www.eonet.ne.jp/~chushingura/p_nihonsi/siryo/0501_0550/0543.htm English translation is included in Olof G Lidin, *Tanegashima: The Arrival of Europe in Japan* (Copenhagen: NIAS, 2002). The detailed discussion of the introduction of the firearms can be found Arima Seiho 有馬成甫, *Kahō no kigen to sono denryū* 火砲の起原とその傳流 [The Origin of Firearms and its Spread] (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1962).

³⁵ For more information on Catholicism in Japan see, Neil S. Fujita, *Japan's Encounter with Christianity* (New York: Paulist Press, 1991); C. R. Boxer, *The Christian Century in Japan, 1549-1650* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1951); J. F. Moran, *The Japanese and the Jesuits: Alessandro Valignano in Sixteenth-century Japan* (London and New York: Routledge, 1993); and Sansom, *The Western World and Japan*.

(Yamaguchi), he also sent thirteen gifts, including such items as a clock, glassware, and spectacles. The Ōuchi family recorded the items as gifts of Tenjikujin 天竺仁 or the people of Tenjiku.³⁶ As discussed earlier, "Tenjiku" was the name given to the land that lay to the southwest of Japan, long recognized to be the birthplace of the Buddha. The permit to engage in missionary activities in Yamaguchi that Father Torres obtained in 1552 authorized the monks (*sō* 僧) from the western region (*sei'iki* 西域) who came to spread the *Buppō* 仏法 or Buddhist law to build temples.³⁷ This mistaken application of a Buddhist identity to the Christian missionaries may be attributed to the fact the translators (such as Anjiro, the Japanese who met Xavier in Malacca) relied on Buddhist terminology at the beginning to try and explain Christianity to the Japanese.³⁸ It also appears that these misconceptions were strengthened because the Japanese had only a very vague concept of where Europe was located and mainly relied on the fact that the missionaries came from somewhere to the southwest when trying to understand how they fit into the greater world. This confusion and the general assumptions make it apparent that the Japanese were still operating under the old worldview in which the world consisted only of Japan, China, and India in the early 1550s.

³⁶ Wakita Haruko 脇田晴子, *Sengoku Daimyō* 戦国大名 [Daimyo of the Warring Era], Vol. 7 of *Taikei Nihon no rekishi* 大系日本の歴史 (Tokyo: Shōgakusan, 1993), 370.

³⁷ The permit was granted by Ōuchi Yoshinaga 大内義長 (c. 1532-1557) who succeeded Ōuchi Yoshitaka (d. 1551). Interestingly the document was reprinted in Coimbra in 1570 in Japanese and in Portuguese translation. Yanai, "Nihon to Seiyō bunka no deai," in Numata, *Nihon to Seiyō*, 41.

³⁸ For example, when the Jesuits started proselytizing, they choose to translate God into "Dainichi," or "Great Sun," the Japanese version of Bodhisattva Vairocana. Xavier soon realized the problem of associating God with Dainichi and decided to use the Latin "Deus." In the early stages, European missionaries spent significant effort to differentiate Christianity from Buddhism, oftentimes engaging in debates with Buddhist monks. Fujita, *Japan's Encounter with Christianity*, 27-31.

During the latter half of the sixteenth century, many more Jesuit missionaries came to Japan, including Luís Fróis (1532-1597), Gneccchi-Soldo Organtino (1532-1609) and Alessandro Valignano (1539 -1606). Generally, the Jesuits directed their appeals to the higher echelons of Japanese society in hopes that the lower class would follow their leaders into accepting Christianity.³⁹ Although Buddhist monks were oftentimes hostile to the missionaries, the overall atmosphere of the time was favorable to the Jesuits since Oda Nobunaga織田信長(1534-1582), the most powerful daimyo from the 1560s to his death in 1582, took a friendly stance toward them.⁴⁰ Nobunaga even provided funds and land to build a Christian church in Kyoto, commonly known as the Nanbanji or "Southern Barbarian Temple."⁴¹ Catholicism grew so quickly that by 1581 there were 75 Fathers (Padres) and Brothers (Irmãos) residing in Japan, with 150,000 adherents and 200 churches scattered all over Japan.⁴² As Christianity spread it became known as Kirishitan切支丹/吉利支丹 and the padres were called *bateren*伴天連. Both

³⁹ Fujita, *Japan's Encounter with Christianity*, 39-107. Luis Frois spent the years between 1562 and 1597 in Japan, and wrote *Historia do Japão*. Gneccchi-Soldo Organtino was in Japan from 1570 to 1609. Organtino was granted the right to build the Church of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, commonly known as Nanbanji, "Southern Barbarian Temple," in Kyoto. The Nanbanji was completed in 1576 but was destroyed by fire in 1582, and the only surviving piece, a church bell imported from Portugal can be seen in Shunkō-in (春光院), a Zen Buddhist Temple in Kyoto. Alessandro Valignano visited Japan three times: 1579 -1582, 1590-1592, and 1598-1603. He organized the trip of four Japanese youths to Europe. The Jesuits compiled the account of Japanese Envoys' trip to Europe in Latin as Duarte de Sande, *De missione legatorum Iaponensium ad Romanam curiam, rebusq; in Europa, ac toto itinere animaduersis dialogus ex ephemeride ipsorum legatorum collectus, & in sermonem latinum versus ab Eduardo de Sande Sacerdote societatis Iesv* (Tokyo: Toyo Bunko, 1935). A Japanese translation is available as *De Sande Tenshō ken'ō shisetsu ki* デ・サンデ天正遣欧使節記, translated by Izui Hisanosuke 泉井 久之助, etc. (Tokyo: Yūshōdō Shoten, 1969). For more information on Japanese Christian Youth Mission to Europe, see Matsuda Kiichi 松田毅一, *Tenshō ken'ō shisetsu* 天正遣欧使節 (Tokyo: Chōbunsha, 1991); Hamada Kōsaku 濱田耕作, *Kirishitan bunka* キリシタン文化 [Kirishitan Culture], vol. 5 of *Hamada Kōsaku chosakushu*, 濱田耕作著作集 [Collected Works of Hamada Kōsaku] (Kyoto: Dōhōsha, 1991).

⁴⁰ Oda Nobunaga is known as one of three unifiers of Japan. He came to be recognized as one of the most powerful daimyo at the Battle of Okehazama in 1560. He is also famous for his use of rifles in the Battle of Nagashino in 1575.

⁴² Yanai, "Nihon to Seiyō bunka no deai," in Numata, *Nihon to Seiyō*, 61.

of these terms were Japanese renderings of European words helping to clarify the differences between Christianity and Buddhism.

Japan came into contact with the Spanish during Nobunaga's successor, Toyotomi Hideyoshi's 豊臣秀吉 (1536-1598) time.⁴³ After the effective unification of Japan, Hideyoshi dreamt of extending his control beyond Japan and in 1591 sent a letter to the Philippines demanding its submission.⁴⁴ Hideyoshi's letter resulted in the opening of communications between Spain and Japan and as a result, Spanish merchants and Franciscan missionaries started to make their appearance on Japanese shores. Hideyoshi's attitude toward the Nanbanjin was pragmatic. He was interested in trading with the Portuguese and Spaniards, but he was also suspicious of their ambitions toward Japan. He adopted an anti-Christian stance twice; the 1587 expulsion order of the *bateren* (never strictly enforced) and the 1597 execution at Nagasaki of twenty-six Christians (twenty Japanese, four Spaniards, one Mexican and one Indian). Both of these events targeted only Christians since Hideyoshi wished to continue trade with the Iberian powers.⁴⁵

In the Spring of 1600, a Dutch shipwreck, the *De Liefde*, drifted ashore at Bungo豊後 (in Kyūshū). Of the 110 crewmen on the ship only 24 survived, including some English sailors along with the Dutch. The Japanese realized that the Dutch and English were different forms of Barbarians from ones they had previously encountered. Tokugawa Ieyasu (1543-1615), one of

⁴³ Hideyoshi held the positions of Imperial Regent (*Kampaku* 関白, 1585-1591) and Chancellor of the Realm (*Dajō daijin* 太政大臣, 1587-1598).

⁴⁴ One year later, Hideyoshi sent invading forces to Korea, 1592-93, which he repeated in 1597.

⁴⁵ Fujita, *Japan's Encounter with Christianity*, 108-146; Mary Elizabeth Berry, *Hideyoshi* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard, 1982), 87-93, 133, 225-226.

the most powerful daimyo at the time and soon to be ruler of Japan, heard about the shipwreck and requested an audience with the ship's captain, Jacob Quaeckernaek at Osaka castle. Quaeckernaek was too weak to attend the audience and instead sent his chief navigator, William Adams (1564-1620), an Englishman, as his representative. Ieyasu was very impressed by Adams's knowledge of the world and decided to keep him as his retainer in the capacity of his foreign policy adviser. Ieyasu granted Adams a residence in Edo as well as a fief at Miura 三浦, and he became known to Japanese as Miura Anjin 三浦按針.⁴⁶

Ieyasu was very interested in developing foreign trade and welcomed the new opportunities presented by the arrival of the *Kōmō* 紅毛 or Red Hairs, as the Dutch and Englishmen came to be known. In 1601, Ieyasu instituted a licensing system whereby he issued *shuinjō* 朱印状 (red stamped permits) to ships authorized to carry out trade with Japan. After becoming Shogun in 1603, Ieyasu created the *itowappu* 糸割符 system which authorized Japanese merchants to form a silk thread guild. The new guild allowed selected merchants the ability to monopolize the importation and distribution of silk in return for an agreement that they sell thread to the bakufu at cost.⁴⁷ When the *itowappu* system was instituted in 1604, the main foreign merchants bringing goods from China to Japan were still the Portuguese. Ieyasu wished to expand trade with the Netherlands and England, especially after learning that the Protestant nations were not interested in missionary activities. In 1605 Ieyasu sent Jacob Quaeckernaek to

⁴⁶ Nakata, "Jyūshichi seiki shotō no taigai kōsho," in Numata, *Nihon to Seiyō*, 127-129. William Adams is the model of John Blackthorne in James Clavell's novel, *Shogun* (1975). After his arrival, Adams was never allowed to leave Japan, and spent rest of his life in there.

⁴⁷ Nakata, "Jyūshichi seiki shotō no taigai kōsho," in Numata, *Nihon to Seiyō*, 97-126.

Patani (in today's Malaysia) with copies of the *shuinjō* trade letters and documents written by Adams explaining to the leaders of the Netherlands and England that the Shogun wish to open trade between their nations and Japan. Responding to the request, two Dutch ships entered the port of Hirado in 1609 and were followed by the arrival of the first English ship in 1613. Both the Netherlands and England established merchant offices in Hirado, although Ieyasu actually wished to have them establish their offices at Uruga, near the entrance of Tokyo Bay, so that he could keep a close eye on them.⁴⁸

As the Dutch and English established firm trade relations with Japan, the importance of Christian missionaries as an element of facilitating trade diminished dramatically. The Tokugawa Shogunate also found Christians, numbering about 700,000 as of 1610, had become a major political threat and a destabilizing force, especially in the southern region of the country. In 1612, and again in 1613, the Shogunate issued edicts expelling all Christian missionaries and banning Japanese from practicing Christianity. Since most of the missionaries were Portuguese or Spaniards, this decreased the numbers of "southern barbarians" in Japan considerably. When more sustained persecution of Christians began, many Christians fled abroad or became *Kakure Kirishitan* 隠れキリシタン or Hidden Christians. These changes were the start of the Shogunate's move toward so-called isolationism or *sakoku* 鎖国.⁴⁹ In 1616, the second Tokugawa Shogun, Hidetada 秀忠 (r. 1605-1623), not only reissued the ban on Christianity, he also decided to restrict foreign trade to be limited to the two ports of Hirado and Nagasaki to

⁴⁸ Nakata, "Jyūshichi seiki shotō no taigai kōsho," in Numata, *Nihon to Seiyō*, 112-136; Conrad Totman, *Early Modern Japan* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 73-79.

⁴⁹ The term *sakoku*, meaning "close country" or isolationism was coined much later.

preserve more control over the foreign traders and to help prevent the infiltration of missionaries. Persecution of Christians intensified under the third Tokugawa Shogun, Iemitsu 家光 (r. 1623-1651), and by 1624, he decided to cut ties with Spain completely. In 1626, Iemitsu prohibited Portuguese and Spaniards from taking up residence within Japan. The bakufu even banned the importation of Christian books in 1630. This ban was primarily aimed at Chinese language materials, since there were many Chinese translations of Western books that included Christian material.⁵⁰

Between 1631 and 1641, the Tokugawa Shogunate issued a series of orders tightening restrictions on foreign affairs. Some of the regulations included reiterating the ban on Christianity, banning Japanese from leaving Japan, banning overseas Japanese from returning to Japan, and banning the exportation of weapons. An artificial island called Deshima was designed and built outside of Nagasaki in 1636, solely for the purpose of conducting foreign trade. In 1639, after a massive peasant rebellion led by a Christian youth, Amakusa Shiro 天草四郎 (c.1621-1638) took place in Shimabara (in Kyushu) between 1637-1638, the bakufu barred Portuguese from entering Japan. Technically, the bakufu also banned English from entering Japan on the basis that the English royal family was connected to that of Spain, but this had little practical effect since the English had abandoned trade with Japan in 1623 because of its unprofitability. The Dutch merchant's office was moved from Hirado to Deshima in 1641. All

⁵⁰ Katagiri Kazuo 片桐一男, "Sakokuka no kaigai chishiki 鎖国下の海外知識 [Knowledge of the Outside World During Sakoku]" in Shōgakukan 小学館, *Nihon kara mita ikoku 日本からみた異国* (Tokyo: Shōgakukan, 1978), 147-148.

Dutch sailors and personnel were restricted to the confines of Deshima, the only exception being when the Dutch Captain was required to periodically pay a visit to the Shogun.⁵¹

Hence, Japan was "closed," but this did not mean that Japanese interest in foreign lands had diminished. On the contrary, not only did world maps for elites and commoners alike continue to be produced, but several geography books were written during the era of seclusion. The geographical works published during the Edo era indicate that Japanese were still operating within the Ka-I geographic model rather than the larger continental model used by Europeans. For example, Nishikawa Joken 西川如見 (1648-1724), an astronomer and geographer in Nagasaki, published the *Ka-I tsūshōkō* 華夷通商考 (2 *kan* 卷 or chapter-length volumes) in 1695, and a revised and expanded version, the *Zōho Ka-I tsūshōkō* 増補華夷通商考 (5 *kan*) in 1708.⁵² The revised edition of the book consists of five volumes, two of which are devoted to *Ka* or the center and the other three to *gaikoku* 外國 or "outside countries" and *gai'i* 外夷, "outside barbarians." Here, Nishikawa clearly identifies *Ka* as *Chūka* 中華 or *Tōdo* 唐土 [China], and he provides detailed information on fifteen provinces of China. *Gaikoku* consists of Korea (*Chosen* 朝鮮), Ryukyu 琉球, Taiwan 大宛, Tonkin 東京, and Giao Chi 交趾 (in Northern Vietnam). The *Gaikoku* are identified to be "areas outside of China, that follow China's order, use Chinese

⁵¹ Dutch Captain was required to visit the Shogun every year between 1633-1790. After 1790, the Dutch Captain was required to visit once in five years. This was similar to system called Sankin Kōtai or alternate attendance where daimyo were required to maintain a residence in Edo (where wife and children lived, serving as hostages) and another residence in his own domain, and resided the two residences in alternate years.

⁵² The digitized version of *Zōho Ka-I tsūshōkō* is available at Waseda University Library http://archive.wul.waseda.ac.jp/kosho/i13/i13_00581/. A discussion of Nishikawa's *Ka-I tsūshōkō* and *Zōho Ka-I tsūshōkō* can be found in Ayusawa Shintaro 鮎沢信太郎 and Nobuo Muroga 室賀信夫, *Sakoku jidai no sekai chirigaku* 鎖国時代の世界地理学[A Study of World Geography During the Era of Seclusion], (Tokyo: Hara Shobō, 1980), 1-23; Satō Masasuke 佐藤昌介, "Tsūshi to ikoku 通詞と異国 [Translators and Foreign Lands]" in Shōgakukan, *Nihon kara mita ikoku*, 106-111.

writing and are familiar with the three teachings [Confucianism, Buddhism and Daoism]."⁵³ *Gai'i* on the other hand, includes such areas as Cambodia, Malacca, Java and the Netherlands, essentially areas that do not use Chinese writing and are not familiar with the three teachings, although this is never specifically addressed within the book. Nishikawa's classification as *gaikoku* and *gai'i* are also based on an area's relationship with Japan as well as China. Areas that did not have relations with China or Japan were not considered part of either *gaikoku* or *gai'i*, and were placed under special categories such as "lands where access is forbidden to Japan" or the "appendix" which deals with countries of *i-teki-jū-ban* 夷狄戎蠻 ("barbarians") that Nishikawa had learned about from the Chinese or Dutch.⁵⁴ England and Espania (Spain and Portugal) appear in "lands where access is forbidden to Japan" while Italy and France as well as Egypt, Monomotapa (i.e. Zimbabwe), Arabia, Dwarf's land, etc. appear in the appendix. Interestingly, Nishikawa notes that Espania was actually located to the west of Japan and China, though their people were still known as Nanban or "southern barbarians" among the Japanese, correcting the earlier misconception.⁵⁵

Nishikawa included a simplified map of the world (similar to Matteo Ricci's oval, with the Americas on the right and Afro-Eurasia on the left), that includes a label for "European countries," but Europe as an entity did not constitute an organizational category within the

⁵³ Nishikawa, *Zōho Ka-I tsūshōkō*, vol.3, 1.

⁵⁴ Nishikawa, *Zōho Ka-I tsūshōkō*, vol. 5, 2. The term *i-teki-jū-ban* 夷狄戎蠻 is taken from "barbarians of the four directions" traditionally recognized by Chinese: *Dongyi* 東夷 (Jp. *Tō'i*, Eastern Barbarians), *Beidi* 北狄 (Jp. *Hokuteki*, Northern Barbarians), *Xirong* 西戎 (Jp. *Seijū*, Western Barbarians) and *Nanman* 南蠻 (Jp. *Nanban*, Southern Barbarians).

⁵⁵ Nishikawa, *Zōho Ka-I tsūshōkō*, vol. 4, 28.

volumes.⁵⁶ It is believed that Nishikawa had access to Giulios Aleni's *Zhi Fang Wai Ji* 職方外紀 (1623), a geography book written by an Italian Jesuit missionary in Chinese.⁵⁷ Aleni's book was organized by continents, but Nishikawa clearly rejected the European continent-based model in favor of the Ka-I model. Since Nishikawa's work was intended to provide information on areas outside of Japan, it does not contain a section specifically on Japan, though it seems to imply that Japan is part of Ka.

Several books written in the early decades of the eighteenth century use the term *Seiyō*, the most famous being Arai Hakuseki's 新井白石 *Seiyō kibun* 西洋紀聞 [Record of Things Heard from the West] published in 1715.⁵⁸ Arai, a scholar in service of the Shogun, wrote the book based on his interviews with Giovanni Battista Sidotti (1668–1714), an Italian Jesuit who was caught entering Japan illegally. In this book, Arai refers to Sidotti variously as *seijin* 西人 [the western person], *daiseijin* 大西人 [person of the "greater west" or "far west"], and *seiyōjin* 西洋人 [person of the Western Ocean or westerner]. At first glance, the usage of the term "west" may

⁵⁶ The simplified world map can be found in volume 3 of *Zōho Ka-I tsūshōkō*.

⁵⁷ Katagiri, "Sakokuka no Kaigai Chishiki" in Shōgakukan, *Nihon kara mita ikoku*, 150.

⁵⁸ The Chinese equivalents of *Seiyō* [Western Ocean] and *Tōyō* [Eastern Ocean] are *Xiyang* 西洋 and *Dongyang* 東洋 may have been around much longer. For example, there was book called *Dong Xi yang kao* 東西洋考 [An Examination of Eastern and Western Oceans] by Zhang Xie 張燮 published in 1617. In this book, the countries of the "Eastern Ocean" include islands in eastern section of Southeast Asia (such as Luzon, the Philippines) and the "Western Ocean" means western part of Southeast Asia, such as Champa, Cambodia, and Siam, etc. Japanese and the Dutch 紅毛番 were considered to have lived outside of the Eastern or Western Oceans and treated under the "outside section" 外紀 of the book. Some part of *Dong Xi yang kao* (Chapters from 5-8) are available at <http://ia311003.us.archive.org/1/items/06046705.cn/06046705.cn.pdf>

appear to be consistent with the modern usage, but upon examination of Arai's other works, it becomes clear that his understanding of Seiyō was considerably different from today's usage.⁵⁹

In his *Gaikoku tsūshin jiryaku* 外国通信事略 [Reports on Foreign Contacts] produced around 1711, Arai provides an appendix that deals with the "Principal products of China and foreign countries." The piece is organized into two main sections: "China (Chūgoku) and Gaikoku Seiyō 外国西洋 (literally "outside countries of the Western Ocean"). Included in Gaikoku Seiyō were ten countries such as Tonkin 東京, Champa 占城, Taiwan 東寧, Cambodia 柬埔寨, Siam 暹羅, Jakarta 咬溜吧, the Netherlands (Aranda 阿蘭陀) etc. The Netherlands is the only European country mentioned under Gaikoku Seiyō. Interestingly, Arai identifies Jakarta to be "in Java," "a large island in Seiyō," "where the Dutch general resides." Arai also distinguishes Gaikoku Seiyō from the "countries of Seiyō where the Dutch trade," which include Malabar, Bengal, Malacca, Timor, Ceylon, Sumatra, Borneo, Germany, Muscovy, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, etc. Evidently, Arai's organizational principal is similar to Nishikawa's in that it is essentially based on Ka-I model. The countries identified as "outside countries" were those that Japan was connected to through trade directly or indirectly via China. Once again, China and Japan appear to be Ka or the Center. It is also apparent that for Arai, the term Seiyō did not equate with "Europe," but it was simply a designation of the lands that lay to the west of Japan and China.⁶⁰

⁵⁹ Arai, Hakuseki 新井白石, *Seiyō kibun* 西洋紀聞 [The Record of Things Heard from the West] (1715) in *Arai Hakuseki zenshū* [The Complete Works of Arai Hakuseki] vol. 4. (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Hanshichi, 1905), 741-791.

⁶⁰ Arai Hakuseki, *Gaikoku tsūshin jiryaku* 外国通信事略 [Reports on Foreign Contacts] (1711), a part of *Gojiryaku* 五事略 [Five Reports] in *Arai Hakuseki zenshū*, vol. 3, 642-657.

The term Seiyō also appears in Terajima Ryōan's 寺島良安 illustrated encyclopedia, *Wa-Kan sansai zue* 倭漢三才圖會 published c.1712- 1716. Modeled after the Chinese Work *Sancai tuhui* 三才圖會 by Wang Qi's 王圻 published in 1609, more than a century earlier, Terajima's work is heavily dependent upon Chinese sources, including the *Saikai Tuhui*. Consisting of one hundred and five *kan* 卷 or chapter-length sections, the *Wa-Kan sansai zue* was a truly comprehensive work that covered many different areas of interest, including astronomy, biology, medicine, material, cultures, etc.⁶¹ Terajima devoted a significant portion of his encyclopedia to geography and history; two *kan* on the people of the world, three on Chinese geography, seventeen on Japan, and one on the geography of East Asia. Though Terajima includes a simplified world map that appears to have been based on Matteo Ricci's map (55 *kan*; the same map in Wang Qi's *Saikai Tuhui*),⁶² Terajima's regional maps are based upon traditional Buddhist maps which depicts the world as having one large continent in the middle. Africa, the Americas, and Australia (more commonly known as "Magellania" at this time) did not appear anywhere on the maps. Europe appears to the northwest of West Tenjiku (India) on the map and is labeled "teki no zu" 狄の圖 [Map of Teki], with teki being the traditional term used for northern barbarians. In the section on Europe, labels such as *Oranda* (Holland), *Ingeresu* (England), and

⁶¹ Terajima Ryōan 寺島良安, *Wa-Kan sansai zue* 倭漢三才図会 (1672-1716). Digitized version is available at Kyūshū University website: <http://record.museum.kyushu-u.ac.jp/Wa-Kan/> Modern Japanese translation is published by Heibonsha in 1980s. Terajima Ryōan, *Wa-Kan sansai zue* 和漢三才図会. 18 vols. Translated by Shimada Isao, Takeshima Atsuo, and Higuchi Motomi (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1985-1991).

⁶² Terajima, *Wa-Kan sansai zue*, vol. 55, <http://record.museum.kyushu-u.ac.jp/Wa-Kan/Wa-Kan-chi/page.html?style=b&part=1&no=6>

Italia (Italy) can be recognized. Also seen on the same map are Dwarf's land, Long Hair's land, Western Women's land, etc.⁶³

The term Seiyō 西洋 appears in the *gai'i jinbutsu* 外夷人物 [outside barbarians] section where it is treated as a single country in *Wa-Kan sansai zue*. The short entry based on the Chinese version reads: "The land Seiyō lies close to the shore of the southwest, and produces sappan wood, peppers, coral and gems. Its cotton cloth is very fine like paper. Its people shave and cover their heads with white cloths; they use gold as money and engage in trade."⁶⁴ Terajima also mentioned that Seiyō pays tribute to the Ming court in China. An illustration of a person from Seiyō (copied from *Sancai Tuhui*) depicts a man wearing a long robe that appears to be of East Asian style. From these details, one would assume that Terajima's definition of Seiyō possibly referred to a nation somewhere in southeast Asia, and had nothing to do with Europe.

Once again, the basic organizational principle of Terajima's geography was using the Chinese structure of center and periphery (Ka-I). This is hardly surprising considering his source materials were mostly Chinese. Terajima's structure not only applies to nations, but also to people and ethnic groups since he distinguishes *ikoku jinbutsu* (people of the foreign countries) from *gai'i jinbutsu* (outer barbarians).⁶⁵ *Ikoku jinbutsu* include Chinese, Koreans, Ryukyuans, Ainu (Ezo), Taiwanese, Dattan (Tartars /Mongols), Jurchen, Tonkin etc. Inclusion of Ainu and

⁶³ Terajima, *Wa-Kan sansai zue*, vol. 64, <http://record.museum.kyushu-u.ac.jp/Wa-Kan/Wa-Kan-chi/page.html?style=b&part=8&no=21>

⁶⁴ Terajima, *Wa-Kan sansai zue*, vol. 14, <http://record.museum.kyushu-u.ac.jp/Wa-Kan/Wa-Kan-jin/page.html?style=b&part=7&no=28>

⁶⁵ See, Terajima, *Wa-Kan sansai zue*, vol. 13, <http://record.museum.kyushu-u.ac.jp/Wa-Kan/Wa-Kan-jin/page.html?style=a&part=6&no=1> and vol. 14, <http://record.museum.kyushu-u.ac.jp/Wa-Kan/Wa-Kan-jin/page.html?style=a&part=7&no=1>

Tartars in this category seems to indicate the classification was mostly based on physical proximity to the center (China and Japan). The *gai'i jinbutsu* includes both real and imaginary people, defining those listed in the group as "those who use horizontal writing and not Chinese characters; those who eat with hands and not with chopsticks." This classification includes the people of Champa, Cambodia, Malacca, Siam, Java, as well more exotic people from imaginary lands such as the "chest-holed people," the "people lacking bellies," "three-headed people," "one-eyed people", "dog-headed people," etc. Spain (Ispania 以西巴爾垂) and the Netherlands (Oranda 阿蘭陀) are the only European countries included within the *gai'i jinbutsu*. The Dutch are described as having "fair-skin, red-hair, tall nose, round eyes with star" and it notes that they "raise[d] one leg when urinating like a dog." Terajima's description of the Dutch states that they like to engage in trade, eat meat, and were short lived, but he also credits them with excelling at astronomy, geography, mathematics, and medicine.⁶⁶

From all these evidence, it appears that the term Seiyō was not limited to Europe or the West to the Japanese of the early eighteenth century. It is further evident that Europe did not constitute a distinct cultural entity, nor was Europe or the West contrasted to Asia or to Eastern societies in a binary pair. Instead, Japanese geographers and writers of the early eighteenth century still clung to a Ka-I worldview even though Europeans had introduced their continent based view of the world. There was also no notion of "eastern" civilization versus "western" civilization in their works. The Japanese did not seem to feel they had much in common with the people of Asia, mattering little whether the nation was a next door neighbor like Korea, Ryukyu, and China or other Asians including people such as Cambodians, Siamese or Indians. Since few

⁶⁶ Terajima, *Wa-Kan sansai zue*, vol. 14, <http://record.museum.kyushu-u.ac.jp/Wa-Kan/Wa-Kan-jin/page.html?style=b&part=7&no=63>

Japanese traveled very far from home, most of them viewed other Asian people of outside countries as exotic in the same almost mythical manner they classified the Dutch with "dwarfs" and "giants."

In 1720, the Shogun Tokugawa Yoshimune 徳川吉宗(r. 1716-1745) loosened the restrictions on the importation of foreign books, including Chinese translation of European books, allowing books that did not contain Christian teachings to be imported to Japan. In 1740, the Shogun ordered two of his retainers to learn the Dutch language so that they could read the books being brought into the country, thereby starting a trend in Dutch Studies. As European books and knowledge became more accessible to the Japanese, a more solid and tangible concept of Europe and the West began to develop and take hold. Eventually by the last quarter of the eighteenth century the Japanese came to identify Europe with the West, either in the form of Seiyō [western ocean], Taisei 泰西 [far west], or Sei'iki 西域[western regions].⁶⁷ Evidently, the meaning of the word Seiyō had shifted from a vague notion of the lands that lay to the west of Japan (including Southeast Asia) to the much narrower meaning of "Europe." Kuchiki Masatsuna's 朽木 昌綱 (1750-1802) *Seiyō senpu* 西洋錢譜 [Coins of Seiyō], published in 1787, contained illustrations and explanations of solely European coins. Explanatory notes at the end of the book by Ozawa Yoritomi 小澤頼福 state that there are four continents: "Asia to the east,

⁶⁷ Kaikoku Hyakunen Kinen Bunka Jigyōkai, 開国百年記念文化事業会 ed., *Sakoku jidai Nihonjin no kaigai chishiki : sekai chiri, Seiyōshi ni kansuru bunken kaidai* 鎖国時代日本人の海外知識：世界地理・西洋史に関する文献解題 [Index of Documents on Japanese Oversea Knowledge, World Geography and Occidental History during the Era of Seclusion], (Tokyo: Kangensha, 1953) mentions of Kuchiki Masatsuna's 朽木 昌綱 *Taisei Kōchizu Setsu* 泰西興地図説(1789) in pages 88-91. The use of "Sei'iki [western regions] can be seen in Honda Toshiaki's 本多 利明, *Sei'iki Monogatari* 西域物語 published 1798. Today, the term Sei'iki is used for part of Central Asia, but Honda used the term to mean "Europe." For more information on Honda Toshiaki, see Donald Keene, *The Japanese Discovery of Europe, 1790-1830*, Revised Edition (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1969).

America to the west, Africa to the south, and Europe to the north." This unusual geographical structuring of the world has the Mediterranean Sea at its center, and Europe to the north. This is not helpful for a book with the title of *Coins of Seiyō*. Ozawa explains: "It is Europe that we call Seiyō. That is because Europe is to west of our country."⁶⁸ In this explanation, the term west to refer to Europe is totally of a Japanese origin rather than from any European source.

The late eighteenth century was also a time when Japan began to be alarmed by the possibility of a Russian invasion which increased their interest in "barbarian studies."⁶⁹ The main catalyst for fear of an invasion was the 1771 letter of Baron Moriz Aladar von Benyowsky, a prisoner of war who escaped from Kamchatka, which warned the Japanese about Russia's intention to invade Japan. Benyowsky's letter eventually proved to be nothing more than a mischievous prank but the Japanese took the warning seriously. The exploration of Ezochi (today's Hokkaido, Sakhalin, etc) conducted in 1785 reflected the bakufu's concern for defense of the northern border, especially because the Japanese were at the time unsure whether or not Ezochi was actually connected to the Asian landmass. Several books on Russia, Ezochi, and on military strategies were produced at this time. The return of Daikokuya Kōdayū大黒屋 光太夫 (1751-1828), a Japanese castaway who spent eight years in Russia, accompanied by a Russian

⁶⁸ Kuchiki Masatsuna 朽木 昌綱, *Seiyō senpu* 西洋錢譜 [Coins of *Seiyō*] (1787) can be found at Waseda University website: http://archive.wul.waseda.ac.jp/kosho/bunko08/bunko08_b0061/ Translation taken from 東方亞細亞、西方亞墨加、南方亞弗利加、北方歐羅巴 爾ルヲ西洋ト指ス者ハ、歐羅巴ハ、本朝ノ西方ニ當レハナリ.

⁶⁹ Since the late seventeenth century, there were increasing encounters between the Russians and the Japanese around the Aleutian islands and Kamchatka peninsula, and some Japanese were even taken to St. Petersburg to teach Japanese language to Russians.

envoy, Adam Laxman (1766 - c.1806) in 1791, also stirred Japan's interest in Russia and led to more exploration of the northern territories in the 1790s.⁷⁰

The Japanese called the Russians Aka Ezo 赤蝦夷/赤夷/赤狄. The term "*aka*" means "red" while "*Ezo*" was a term that Japanese used to refer to the Ainu, their northern barbarian neighbors. Hayashi Shihei 林子平 (1738 -1793) explained in his *Sangoku tsūran zusetsu* 三国通覧図説 [Illustrated Guide to Three Countries] (1785) that the Ainu called the Russians "Red Good People."⁷¹ The association of Russians with red color came from the red outfits that the Russians typically wore, which Hayashi noted to be similar to the ones worn by the Dutch. Hayashi clearly identified the origin of Russia to be the "Muscovy in Europe 歐羅巴ノ莫斯科未亞" who expanded into northern Asia and took over Tartary [*Dattan* 韃靼].⁷² From the earliest stage of their encounter, Russians were identified as "Europeans" and thus associated with the West, even though Russia occupied large portions of Asia.

Indeed, *Seiyō* was no longer perceived as purely a geographical entity but came to be associated with all the people of Europe no matter where in the world they actually lived.

⁷⁰ Numata Jirō, "*Sakokuka no Nihon to Seiyō bunka* 鎖国下の日本と西洋文化," in Numata, *Nihon to Seiyō*, 225-245; Keene, *The Japanese Discovery of Europe*, 31-58, Totman, *Early Modern Japan*, 482-493.

⁷¹ Hayashi Shihei 林子平, *Sangoku tsūran zusetsu* 三国通覧図説 [Illustrated Guide to Three Countries] (1785) in *Shinpen Hayashi Shihei zenshū* 新編・林子平全集 [New Complete Works of Hayashi Shihei] (Tokyo: Daiichi Shobō, 1978) vol. 2 *Chiri* [Geography], 36. Hayashi's *Sangoku Tsūran Zusetsu* treated Korea, Ryūkyū (Okinawa), and Ezo (Hokkaido etc. The Land of Ainu) and were translated into French (published in 1828) by Julius Heinrich Klaproth, a German Student in Russia who learned Japanese language, as *San kokf tsou ran to sets, ou, Aperçu général des trois royaumes*. Ezo section was also translated into Dutch by Philipe Franz von Seibold (1796-1866), a German physician in service of Dutch military who stayed in Deshima.

⁷² Hayashi, *Sangoku tsūran zusetsu*, in *Shinpen Hayashi Shihei Zenshū*, vol. 2, 42.

Japanese intellectuals saw the Europeans as aggressive expansionists who claimed and settled in faraway lands. Miura Baien 三浦梅園 (1723-1789) wrote in 1784:

Europe is also known as Seiyō. Since it is thousands of miles away from our country, we hardly hear about this land. However, [its people] are particularly clever, excel at astronomy and geography, explore [all] the areas under the sun, moon, and stars. Using the compass, they can determine the location of their own ships. The vast ocean is in their hands and they freely visit other people's lands, entice [the natives] with profits, confuse them with [Christian] teachings, and steal their lands when they have a chance . . . Now all the islands in the South Sea are in possession of *Seiyō*. . . ⁷³

The Japanese also understood the historical connection between Europe and the Americas where the nations were made up of land taken away from the indigenous natives and now inhabited by the Europeans. Satō Nobuhiro 佐藤信淵 (1769-1850) states thus in his *A Short History of the Western Countries* [*Seiyo Rekkoku Shiryaku* 西洋列國史略] published in 1808:

In the past, there were two empires and about twenty autonomous kingdoms with about seven hundred subordinate vassal states in "America." But about three hundred years ago, Europeans of various countries crossed the ocean and came to this land. They completely destroyed the various [American] kingdoms using force and they then sent governors, officials, soldiers, etc. from various [European] countries to pacify and rule the land. Moreover, Christian missionaries and priests built schools, and converted and subjugated the native people. [Europeans] collected the local products, gold, silver, and rare treasures and sent them back to their home countries. . . . ⁷⁴

⁷³ Miura Baien 三浦梅園, "Gogatsu ushō 五月雨抄 [Essay writing during rainy May]," in *Baien zenshū* 梅園全集 [The Complete Works of Baien] vol. 1 (Tokyo: Kodokan, 1912), 977. Translated from 歐羅巴の地又西洋ともいうこれより我國萬餘里をへだつればまことに風の音信もなき國なりしかるにかの國は智功ことに勝れ天文地理に達し日月星辰のある處を測りて自らの船のある處をしり羅經を以て緘路をさだめ萬里の大洋を掌中に置き自在に人の國にかよひ利も以て陷し教を以てまどはしひまをうかゞつて人の國をうばふ. . . .今は南海の諸島みな西洋の有となれり. . . .

⁷⁴ Satō Nobuhiro 佐藤信淵, "*Seiyo rekkoku shiryaku* [西洋列國史略 *A Short History of the Western Countries*] (1808) in Takimoto Seiichi, ed. *Satō Nobuhiro kagaku zenshū* 佐藤信淵家學全集, vol. 2 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1925), 795. Translated from 昔は「アメリカ」洲の内にも帝爵の國二つ、自立の王者二十餘國、附属の諸侯七百餘國ありしが、三百餘年以來歐羅巴の諸國より大洋渡りて此洲に來舶し、兵威を以て悉く其諸國を破滅し、其本國より守礼及び都督、軍卒等を遣して其地を鎮護し、且又天主學の導師、僧官等を置いて處々に學校を建て、以て土人を教化歸服せしめ、其地の物産金銀珍寶を集めて悉く其本國に遣輸す. . . . Satō was also known for his advocacy of Sino-Japanese alliance in the early nineteenth century. See Narsimhan, *Japanese Perceptions of China*, 22.

When Americans started to approach Japan from the east in the early half of the nineteenth century, Japanese people understood that Americans were westerners along with the British, Russians and French, even though they did not arrive from the more traditional western (southwestern) direction from which the others had arrived.

In the face of frequent appearances of Western ships on Japan's shores in the early nineteenth century, the bakufu tried to maintain its isolationist policy, perceiving these countries as major threats. The Japanese were especially alarmed by the Opium War (1839-1842) in China, which resulted in the Chinese making major concessions to Great Britain. By then, the association between Europeans and *Seiyō* had been so firmly established that "*sei* [west]" even came to be dropped and "*yō* [ocean]" came to be used as an adjective that meant "western," as in *Yōgaku* [洋学 Western studies].⁷⁵ During the Meiji era, *yō* was so well established to mean "Western" that it can be seen in such words as *Yōshiki* [洋式 Western style], *Yōshoku* [洋食 Western cuisine], and *Yōfuku* [洋服 Western dress], and contrasted to Japanese or *Wa* as in *Washiki* [和式 Japanese style], *Washoku* [和食 Japanese cuisine] and *Wafuku* [和服 Japanese dress]. This application of the term "*Yō*" to mean "Western" rather than "*Sei*," may indicate the absence of an eastern counterpart, *Tōyō*, as a distinct cultural entity in the earlier time period. It appears the concept of *Tōyō* as a geo-cultural entity rather than an ocean developed only in the nineteenth century, much later than *Seiyō*.⁷⁶ Perhaps the most famous early use of *Tōyō* and

⁷⁵ For example, the bakufu's western language translation office was once known as *Yōgakusho*. Yanaga Shunzō 柳河春三 published a book called *Yōgaku binran* 洋学便覧 in 1866. See Kaikoku Hyakunen Kinen Bunka Jigyōkai, ed., *Sakoku jidai Nihonjin no kaigai chishiki*, 76.

⁷⁶ This is clearly an area that needs further research. The author has not come across usage of *Tōyō* as a geo-cultural entity in documents produced before the nineteenth century.

Seiyō was made by a Confucian scholar, Sakuma Shōzan 佐久間 象山 (1811-1864), who was so shaken by China's defeat in the Opium War, that he took up Dutch studies and came to advocate *Tōyō no dōtoku, Seiyō no gei* 東洋道德西洋芸, "Eastern Morals and Western technology."

Sakuma's words were indicative of the Japanese people's recognition of Western nations' superiority in material accomplishments while refusing to surrender their own moral supremacy.

Nevertheless, Sakuma, being afraid that Westerners might be offended by the appellation "barbarians (*i, teki, ban*, etc), recommended such words be removed from official documents.⁷⁷

In popular usage the Westerners continued to be referred as 夷 or Ijin 夷人 as indicated by the late Tokugawa popular saying, "*Sonnō Jō-I*," or "Revere the Emperor; Expel the Barbarians." It was only during the Meiji era when the West came to be associated with "civilization" and that westerners were no longer referred to as barbarians.⁷⁸

"Middle Kingdom," "Confucianism" and "Tōyō": 1500s-1868

While the Japanese recognized Europeans as coming from the "west" and thus developed terms such as *Seiyō*, *Taisei*, and *Sei'iki*, their eastern counterparts were rarely mentioned before the nineteenth century. China remained the most important neighbor, but Japanese perception of China and its culture had gone through considerable changes between 1500 and 1868. While Chinese learning remained influential, others started to challenge China's cultural supremacy.

⁷⁷ Narsimhan, *Japanese Perceptions of China*, 25. Lydia H. Liu's *The Clash of Empires: The Invention of China in Modern World Making* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2004) and James L. Hsia's *English Lessons: The Pedagogy of Imperialism in Nineteenth Century China* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003) addresses the Englishmen's objections to being referred to "Yi" or "barbarians" by Chinese.

⁷⁸ "*Ikoku* 夷国 [barbarian countries]" and "*Ijin* 夷人 [barbarians]" may have been replaced by "*Ikoku* 異国 [foreign country]" and "*Ijin* 異人 [foreign person]."

Though Confucianism had been around in Japan for centuries, it was not until the Tokugawa era that Confucianism gained prominence as the state ideology. Prior to the Tokugawa Era, Confucian studies were largely restricted to court aristocrats and Buddhist monks, and therefore its influence over society was limited. The Tokugawa Shogunate found Confucianism, particularly the Zhu Xi 朱熹(1133-1200) variation, to be useful in legitimatizing samurai rule, and made the Zhu Xi School [known as *Shushi gaku* 朱子学] of Confucianism the official ideology by having Hayashi Razan 林羅山 (1583-1657) and his descendants serve as bakufu house scholars. With bakufu support, Confucian learning as well as literacy in Chinese became an essential part of the standard education among the samurai class. In addition to the Zhu Xi School, other Confucian schools also flourished during the Tokugawa era, such as the Wang Yangming 王陽明 (1472–1529) School represented by Nakae Tōju 中江藤樹(1608-1648) and Kumazawa Banzan 熊沢蕃山(1619-1691) and the Ancient Learning School advocated by Yamaga Sokō 山鹿素行(1622-1685) and Ogyū Sōrai 荻生徂徠(1666-1728). Moreover, Chinese medicine continued to be revered even though alternative medical practice derived from the Portuguese or Dutch became available. In short, Confucian influence was unprecedentedly strong during the Tokugawa era, and its influence would carry over to the Meiji Era as the following case studies will indicate.

On the other hand, since the late 1500s, certain Japanese started to challenge and question the superiority of Chinese culture and society. Toyotomi Hideyoshi's famous invasions of Korea in 1592-93 and 1594-96 were only a part of his grand plan to "conquer the Great Ming Empire,"

and to have "his name known in the three lands."⁷⁹ The Tokugawa Shogunate did not seek to reestablish formal diplomatic relations with the Ming Dynasty in order to avoid placing itself in an inferior position to China. When the Manchu Qing Dynasty was established, many Japanese considered it to be a barbarian takeover of China, leading some Japanese to begin asserting their nation's superiority over China. Such attitudes were expressed even among Confucian scholars. Ancient China, its great sages and Confucian scholars of the past continued to provide insights to their studies, but Japanese Confucians disassociated Confucianism from Qing China, as Ogyū Sōrai stated: "The excessive adulation that exists in Japan is for *Chūka* [Central Flower] and the exemplary moralistic system created by the great sage-kings, such as Yao, Shun, Wen, Tu, T'ang, Chou Kung, and not for the present day China and its people under Manchu rule."⁸⁰ With China being occupied by the "Tartar," Japan considered itself the true upholder of Confucian virtues. A Confucian scholar of the Ancient Learning School, Yamaga Sokō reflected in 1675, about thirty years after the Qing dynasty was established:

I once thought that Japan was small and thus inferior in every way to China, that "only in China could a sage arise." This was not my idea alone; scholars of every age have thought so and devoted themselves to studying Chinese. Only recently I have become aware of the serious error of this view. . . . In Japan, the one true imperial line, legitimate descendents of the Sun Goddess, has ruled from the divine ages to the present time without the interruption of a single generation. . . . No less deserving of mention is Japan's pursuits of the Way of martial valor. . . . Wisdom, humanity, and valor are the three cardinal virtues of a sage. When even one of these three is lacking, a man falls short of being a sage. When we compare China and Japan using these virtues as criteria,

⁷⁹ Hideyoshi's letter to the Philippines, 1591; Hideyoshi's Letter to Korea, 1590, in Rekishigaku Kenkyūkai, 歴史学研究会 ed., *Nihonshi shiryō* 日本史史料[Historical Documents on Japanese History] vol. 3. *Kinsei* [Early Modern] (Tokyo; Iwanami Shoten, 2006), 50-52.

⁸⁰ Ogyū Sōrai's words translated and quoted in Narsimhan, *Japanese Perceptions of China*, 7.

we see that Japan greatly excels China in each of them and undoubtedly merits the name Central Kingdom far more than China does. . . .⁸¹

Here Yamaga incorporates Shinto and the Shinto explanation of the origin of the royal family as a basis for Japan's superiority over China. Furthermore, he also uses "valor (*yū* 勇)" more specifically "martial valor (*buyū* 武勇)" as a virtue emphasized among the samurai class to advance his argument. The notion of China as the Middle Kingdom, the land of ritual propriety surrounded by barbarians at its four corners came into question when China had fallen to the point it was now occupied by the barbarians. For Yamaga, the notion of the central kingdom was defined based on socio-cultural terms and not geographical terms.

Yamaga and his Ancient Learning School colleagues were not the only Confucians expressing Japan's superiority over China. Asami Keisai 浅見綱齋 (1652-1711), a Confucian scholar belonging to Zhu Xi School, also expressed his view in *Chūgoku ben* 中国弁 [Treatise on the Concept of the Middle Kingdom]:

How much more so inasmuch as in our country the legitimate succession has continued without break since the beginning of Heaven-and Earth, and the great bond between lord and vassal has remained unchanged for ten thousand generations. This is the greatest of the Three Bonds, and is this not something that no other country has achieved? What is more, our country has a tradition of martial valor and manliness and sense of honor and integrity that are rooted in our very nature. These are the points in which our country is superior. . . .⁸²

⁸¹ Yamaga Soko, "Haisho Zanpitsu 配所殘筆 [An Autobiography in Exile]," (1675) in de Bary, etc., *Sources of Japanese Tradition*, vol. 2, 201-202. Japanese excerpts can be found in Rekishigaku Kenkyūkai, ed., *Nihonshi shiryō*, vol.3, 236-237.

⁸² Asami Keisai, *Chūgoku ben* 中国弁 [Treatise on the Concept of the Middle Kingdom] in de Bary, etc., *Sources of Japanese Tradition*, vol. 2, 92-95. Excerpts of the original Japanese can be found in Rekishigaku Kenkyūkai, ed., *Nihonshi shiryō*, vol.3, 237-238.

Once again, the continuous succession of the imperial family and martial traditions were emphasized, demonstrating the approach of Japanese samurai to Neo-Confucianism. Asami asserts the uniqueness of Japanese society and emphasizes it as a good base upon which Confucian virtues could be upheld and flourish. As a Japanese Confucian, Asami clearly sees the moral teachings of Confucianism to be universal and saw that Japan had embraced the ruler-subject bond better than China itself. In this work, he denies the notion that China is the only "Middle Kingdom," as well as rejects the idea of Japanese assimilation to Chinese society. Generally, Japanese Confucianists of the Tokugawa era sought to distinguish Japan from China rather than exploring the common culture that had for so long bound them together.

Other challenges to China and Confucianism came from scholars in the National Learning (*Kokugaku* 国学) and Dutch Learning (*Rangaku* 蘭学) Schools. While Japanese Dutch scholars challenged "Chinese Learning" in practical matters such as medicine and science, the National Learning scholars questioned the moral authority of China and its Confucian teachings.⁸³ Rather than study ancient China, the National Learning scholars advocated the study of ancient Japanese literature, as they believed that the centuries of Chinese influence had corrupted Japanese society. Whereas Japanese Confucian scholars of the Tokugawa era saw Shinto and Confucianism to be complementary, National Learning scholars regarded them as mutually exclusive. Kamo no Mabuchi 賀茂真淵 (1697-1769), founder of the National Learning School, expressed his views in *Kokuikō* 国意考 [Inquiry into the Idea of the Nation], written in the 1760s:

⁸³ Marius B. Jansen, *Japan and Its World: Two Centuries of Change* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980), 7-39. Keene, *The Japanese Discovery of Europe*, 16-30. Narsimhan, *Japanese Perceptions of China*, 15-17.

In ancient days Japan was governed in accordance with the natural laws of Heaven-and-Earth. There was never any indulgence in such petty rationalizing as marked China, but when suddenly these teachings were transmitted here from abroad, they quickly spread, for in their simplicity the men of old took them for the truth. In Japan generation after generation, extending back to the remote past, had known prosperity, but no sooner were these Confucian teachings propagated here than in the time of Temmu a great rebellion occurred. Later, at Nara, the palace, dress, and ceremonies were Chinesified, and everything acquired a superficial elegance; under the surface, however, contentiousness and dishonesty became more prevalent.⁸⁴

Interestingly, Mabuchi viewed Daoism, another Chinese philosophy with its emphasis on *wuwei* 無為 (effortless and no unnatural action) to be compatible with Japanese society. Before the introduction of Confucianism, Japan was attuned to the Way of Heaven-and-Earth and enjoyed peace and prosperity and according to Mabuchi, China and its Confucianism brought artificial and deceptive behavior and thought patterns to Japan that disrupted its original attunement. Mabuchi even stated that China (Tōkoku 唐国) was "a county of wicked heartedness (*kokoro waroki kuni* 心わろき国)," characterized by only superficial goodness, while Japan had been a country characterized by inner goodness and honesty.⁸⁵

As the Japanese observed China's defeat in the Opium War (1839–1842) and felt the growing pressure placed on their own nation by Western powers, contemporary China further lost respect among Japanese intellectuals.⁸⁶ China's tendency to view itself as the Middle Kingdom, its unwillingness to learn from the "barbarians," and the severe consequence of such an attitude were viewed by the Japanese as a fate they must avoid. For example, Sakuma Shōzan

⁸⁴ Kamo no Mabuchi 賀茂真淵, *Kokuikō* 国意考 [Inquiry into the Idea of the Nation] (c.1760) in de Bary, etc., *Sources of Japanese Tradition*, vol. 2, 493

⁸⁵ Kamo no Mabuchi, *Kokuikō*, in de Bary, etc., *Sources of Japanese Tradition*, vol. 2, 495. Japanese version is available at http://www2s.biglobe.ne.jp/~Taiju/1765_kokuikou.htm

⁸⁶ Narsimhan, *Japanese Perceptions of China*, 21-33.

identified the main causes for China's defeat in the Opium War as being "firmly convinced of the superiority of their own country, looking down on foreigners as barbarians," and failing to recognize Britain's superiority in science and military technology.⁸⁷ In short, Sakuma was critical of China's arrogance and inflexibility, though as a committed Confucian, he personally maintained a position that Confucian virtue was valid and did not have to be abandoned.

The Japanese viewed the Opium War not only as an event that affected China but also as the beginning of events that could potentially threaten Japan itself. The Japanese had long seen China as a bastion of defense against the Western invaders, but when China was defeated, the Japanese feared that western powers with aggressive tendencies might turn their attention to invading Japan. Thus, the Opium War was not something that the Japanese could dismiss easily as an affair of a foreign land.⁸⁸ In this context, the Japanese appeared to have started to embrace Tōyō as a distinct geo-cultural entity. For some, such as the aforementioned Sakuma Shōzan, Tōyō meant East Asia under the Confucian sphere of influence, while others came to envision Tōyō as extending to India. Individuals such as Satō Nobuhiro spoke of the "various countries of Tōyō" that included China as well as the Mughal Empire that had been ravaged by the *Sei'i* 西夷 or western barbarians. Satō advocated taking over China and establishing a buffer zone as a way of defending Japan from Western invaders.⁸⁹ The concept of establishing a Japanese empire in China was not limited to Satō since others, such as Yokoi Shōnan 横井 小楠 (1809-1869) and

⁸⁷ Sakuma Shōzan, "Haruma Shuppan ni Kansuru Hanshu Ate Jōsho ハルマ出版に関する藩主宛上書," in Rekishigaku Kenkyūkai, ed., *Nihonshi shiryō*, vol.3, 433-434.

⁸⁸ Narsimhan, *Japanese Perceptions of China in the Nineteenth Century*, 21-33.

⁸⁹ Satō Nobuhiro, "Zonka Zateki Ron 存華挫狄論" [Theory on Defeating the Barbarians in China] (1849) in *Satō Nobuhiro zenshū*, vol. 2, 862-939.

Shimazu Nariakira 島津 斉彬(1810-1858), also urged Japan to invade and establish a military base in China, a country now seen to be too weak to defend itself.⁹⁰

In the 1860s, with the bakufu lifting the ban on Japanese nationals to travel to foreign countries, opportunities arose for some individuals to observe what was actually happening in the outside world and information about real events in China became more readily available.

Japanese eyewitness impressions of Shanghai in the midst of the Taiping Rebellion (1850-1864) were of disillusionment and disgust. China, the land of "civilization" they had admired for centuries was a thing of the past. Shanghai, one of the treaty ports opened after the Opium War, was overrun by Westerners. There were sharp contrasts in Shanghai between the modern buildings that the Westerners had built and the impoverished Chinese sections of the city. The Japanese were also disturbed by the undesirable influence of Christianity that had manifested itself in the Taiping Rebellion. The Japanese observers understood that what was happening in China was something that could happen to their own country if Japan did not handle the situation properly. China became a negative example whose fate should be avoided at all cost.

Additionally, Japanese perceptions of China were also negatively affected by Western writers whose works they read to learn about China and the wider world.⁹¹ Japanese admiration for Chinese civilization was thus severely diminished by the end of the Tokugawa era, although Confucian scholars still remained influential.

⁹⁰ Narsimhan, *Japanese Perceptions of China in the Nineteenth Century*, 28-29.

⁹¹ Narsimhan, *Japanese Perceptions of China*, 33-44.

Conclusion

Before the sixteenth century, the Japanese worldview consisted of two overlapping spatial schemes: the Ka-I (center-barbarians) perspective and the Three-Land View (Japan, China, and India). In both of these systems, China occupied the most prominent place, essentially representing the ultimate "foreign land" to the Japanese. The existence of India was known but it remained nothing more than the fabled birthplace of Buddha whose stories were surrounded by myth and legends. After the arrival of Europeans in the 1500s, Japanese learned of the existence of Europe, the Americas, Africa, and Magellania (Australia) as well as many of different varieties of exotic peoples around the world. Nonetheless, the Ka-I and the Three-Land View did not completely die out until the Meiji era, as is attested by the use of Buddhist based world maps as well as continuation of the Ka-I scheme as the organizational principle in several geographical works. Europeans were also still considered "barbarians" at the end of the Tokugawa era, but that would change with Meiji.

Encounters with Europeans gradually helped create the notion of Seiyō, the Japanese equivalent of "the West." Being located on the eastern periphery of the Asian landmass, the Japanese had been aware since ancient times that a vast land lay across the sea, but much of their knowledge of that land was limited and based more on hearsay and legend than any real information. When Portuguese and Jesuit missionaries started to arrive in Japan in the 1500s, Japanese assumed that they came from somewhere to the southwest and therefore called them "Southern Barbarians." After Matteo Ricci's map became available in the early 1600s, the Japanese started to understand that Europeans actually came from the far northwest and began to reconsider their previous conceptions. Yet, Japanese did not immediately associate Seiyō with

Europe or Europeans. The term *Seiyō* which literally means "Western Ocean" can be seen in document produced in the 1600s and early 1700s, but at the time, it did not mean the West or Europe, but simply the body of water that lay to the west of Japan and China, which included Southeast Asia. It was only in the latter half of the eighteenth century that Japanese came to clearly identify Europe and Europeans with *Seiyō* (and other variation of words that indicate "West") since the Japanese now understood that Europeans came from the Far West (*Taisei*) by the Great Western Ocean (*Dai Seiyō*). By the nineteenth century, *Seiyō* was a cultural entity rather than geographical entity that even enveloped the United States regardless of the fact that it was located to the East of Japan and was therefore not geographically located with the rest of Europe. Eventually the identification of Europeans with *Seiyō* was so firmly established that the "*yō* (ocean)" rather than *sei* (west) became an adjective to mean "Western."

The Eastern counterpart to *Seiyō*, *Tōyō*, did not simultaneously develop as a geo-cultural entity alongside *Seiyō*. China had remained the ultimate foreign land to Japanese for such a long time that Japanese distinguished between "native" Japanese (*Wa*) and "foreign" Chinese (Jp. *Kan* / Ch. *Han* or Jp. *Tō* / Ch. *Tang*) products and practices. Even under the Tokugawa era when Confucian influence was unusually strong, Japanese intellectuals including Confucian scholars and National Learning scholars rejected the idea of assimilation and viewed Japan and China to be two separate and distinct entities. It was only around the time of the Opium War when Japanese started to perceive a common threat to both itself and China from the West, that worldviews began to change and the concept of *Tōyō* as a geo-cultural entity began to develop. As Japan's fears over western dominance grew from watching the decline and defeat of China, their respect for this highly idealized country faltered and eventually failed. No longer was

China held up as the model of civilization but instead it was now a cautionary tale of what could happen if Japan did not learn to cope with the changing world environment. It was during the Meiji Era, as Japan struggled to find its place in a new global order, that the East-West binary became one of the most important elements of discourse among Japanese intellectuals as they struggled to find the right course through which to navigate the treacherous waters that had so tragically wrecked China. These Meiji intellectuals would be responsible for remolding Japan through their arguments and discourse. Their ideas and their collective impact are the focus of the rest of this study.

CHAPTER 2
FUKUZAWA YUKICHI (1835-1901)
ONTO "CIVILIZATION"

In fall 1871, the Meiji government officially declared that the Japanese people were free to wear whatever hairstyle pleased them, releasing them from wearing topknots. A short loose European-inspired haircut, that the Japanese called *zangiri-atama* 散切り頭 (cropped head), became a fad and a symbol of *bunmei kaika*, or civilization and enlightenment. The popular expression of the time was "if you tap the *zangiri-atama*, you will hear the sound of *bunmei kaika*."¹ Two years later, the young Emperor Mutsuhito (the Meiji Emperor) himself sported a fashionably cropped haircut and appeared in a formal military uniform resembling that of Europeans rather than traditional Japanese style. Only a few years after the restoration to power of the Emperor who proclaimed "evil customs of the past shall be broken off" and "knowledge shall be sought throughout the world,"² the early 1870s saw visible changes taking place throughout Japanese society. Western novelties abounded in the early Meiji era with new sights such as railways, gas lights, brick buildings, and restaurants serving beef appearing in cities across the country. This was a time of great change where the people were entranced by talk of the coming *bunmei kaika*.

¹ This popular expression appeared in a newspaper in 1871, a few months prior to the *Sanpatsu Dattōrei* 散髪脱刀令 [Decree concerning Hairstyles and Removal of Swords] issued on 23 Sep (9 August Lunar Calendar) 1871. It is said that Kido Takayoshi, one of the leaders of the Meiji Reform, promoted the inclusion of several catchy phrases in various print publications. One of these was the expression "if you tap the *hanpatsu -atama* 半髪頭 (topknot with half shaved head), you will hear the sound of Conservatism" and "if you tap the *sōhatsu atama* 総髪頭 (topknot with full hair), you will hear the sound of the Imperial Restoration."

² "The Charter Oath," April 1868, in de Bary, etc., *Sources of Japanese Tradition*, vol. 2, 671-672.

The terms *bunmei* and *kaika* were neologisms of the day, derived from Fukuzawa Yukichi's translations of the English words "civilized" and "enlightened." Fukuzawa, trained as a Dutch Studies scholar, was among the first Japanese to study the English language and to visit both the United States and Europe during the late Tokugawa era. His atypical language skills and firsthand overseas experience enabled Fukuzawa to introduce "Western Civilization" to Japanese through a series of publications such as *Seiyō jijō* 西洋事情 [Conditions in the West] and *Seiyō tabi an'nai* 西洋旅案内 [A Travel Guide to the West], making him the leading Japanese expert on Western societies of his generation. Originally only a translator of Western publications, Fukuzawa eventually matured into an independent thinker and began to express opinions of his own in such works as *An Encouragement of Learning* [*Gakumon no susume* 学問ノススメ (1872 to 1876)] and *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization* [*Bunmeiron no gairyaku* 文明論之概略 (1875)]. His books became so popular and widely read that any books written about the West were once referred to as "Fukuzawa books [*Fukuzawa bon*]." ³ Fukuzawa Yukichi was also the founder of Keiō University, a school that emphasized Western learning, and established the influential newspaper *Jiji Shinbō* 時事新報. Through his various activities, Fukuzawa firmly established himself as Japan's foremost advocate of Westernization.

No study of Meiji intellectuals' understanding of the East-West binary would be complete or even valid without the inclusion of Fukuzawa Yukichi. The West, for Fukuzawa, represented progress and civilization, while the East, mainly referring to China and Japan, represented stagnation at a stage of semi-civilization. Japan, Fukuzawa argued, did not have to remain fixed

³ Jansen, *Japan and Its World*, 52.

at a level of semi-civilization; instead, he felt it could advance to a higher level by abandoning old ideas and institutions and adopting new concepts from the West. Freeing Japan from the shackles of old Confucian influence and embracing the new advanced civilization were necessary steps for Japan to survive as an independent country, according to Fukuzawa. Through the process of developing and presenting his arguments for the Westernization of Japan, Fukuzawa played a crucial role in reshaping the way many Japanese viewed Westerners and Western civilization. As discussed in Chapter 1, Japan's respect for China had been waning since the Opium War, but Fukuzawa, as one of the most influential writers of his time, contributed to knocking China from its once lofty pedestal as the land of inspiration by implying that China and Confucianism were the source of Japan's underdevelopment.

Fukuzawa's promotion of Westernization, combined with his urging of Japan to rid itself of Chinese influence, has made him into a highly controversial figure in recent years. Usually credited as the author of the famous *Datsu-A Ron* 脱亜論 or "*Escape from Asia Theory*," some view Fukuzawa as an imperialist who disdained Asia and used his works and personal influence to promote the invasions of Korea and China.⁴ Others question the authenticity of the numerous works attributed to Fukuzawa in the *Complete Works* since many of them were originally printed

⁴ *Datsu-A Ron* was published in the *Jiji Shinpō* on March 16, 1885. At the time the article was written, Japan was still in an early stage of exerting its influence over Korea. In 1876, Japan signed a treaty with Korea, formerly an isolationist vassal state of China's Qing Dynasty, forcing Korea to end its isolationism by opening three ports for trade with Japan. This action sparked tension between Japan and the Qing Dynasty that eventually erupted into the Sino-Japanese War in 1894-95. An example of the argument supporting Fukuzawa as a proponent of Japanese aggression in China and Korea is Yasukawa Junosuke 安川寿之輔, *Fukuzawa Yukichi no Ajia ninshiki: Nihon kindai shizō o torae kaesu* 福沢諭吉のアジア認識：日本近代史像をとらえ返す [Fukuzawa Yukichi's Views of Asia: Rethinking Modern Japanese History] (Tokyo: Kōbunken 高文研, 2000).

as anonymous articles in the *Jiji Shinpō*.⁵ For some, Fukuzawa represents the foremost Japanese liberal intellectual, fondly remembered as having proclaimed the equality of all people in his remark: "heaven does not create one man above or below another man."⁶

Considering the controversy surrounding Fukuzawa, it is best to examine documents that clearly identify Fukuzawa as their author and exclude those documents of questionable

⁵ Hirayama Yō 平山洋, *Fukuzawa Yukichi no shinjitsu* 福澤諭吉の真実 [The Truth about Fukuzawa Yukichi] (Tokyo: Bungei Shunjū, 2004), 62, 128-131. According to Hirayama, Ishikawa Kanmei 石河幹明, an editor of the *Jiji Shinpō* during the 1890s and the compiler of Fukuzawa's collected works, was the true author of many of the inflammatory entries attributed to Fukuzawa. Hirayama points out that the original edition of *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū* 福澤全集 or *The Complete Works of Fukuzawa*, was published in 1898 during Fukuzawa's lifetime, and consisted of only 5 volumes. The 1925 edition, edited by Ishikawa, totaled 10 volumes, and in 1933, an additional 7 volumes were published as the *Zoku Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū* 続福澤全集 [Addendum to the Complete Works of Fukuzawa]. This addendum consisted entirely of articles from the *Jiji Shinpō* that were believed to have been written by Fukuzawa. The newest edition, renamed as the *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū* 福澤諭吉全集 [The Complete Works of Fukuzawa Yukichi] was published under editors Tomita Masafumi 富田正文 and Tsuchihashi Shun'ichi 土橋俊一 between 1958 and 1964, and totals 21 volumes (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1958-1964). The newest edition, which is readily available in libraries around the world today, is basically a revised version of the earlier *zenshū* that consolidates the 10 regular volumes and 7 additional volumes into one continuous series. Hirayama argues, in the process of revising the *zenshū* during the 1930s and in the midst of Japanese aggression toward China, Ishikawa, a known supporter of invasion, included his own anti-Asian writings from the 1880s and 90s into Fukuzawa's collected works.

Ishikawa not only edited the collected works of Fukuzawa, he was also the author of a four-volume biography on Fukuzawa published in 1932. The biography casts Fukuzawa's life and views in a way that would make him supportive of the militarist policies of the Japanese government during the 1930s. Hirayama is not alone in questioning the authenticity of Fukuzawa's *Complete Works*. Another scholar, Ida Shinya 井田進也, also claims that Fukuzawa did not write many of the articles that appear in the *Complete Works* based upon a textual analysis he conducted against Fukuzawa's and Ishikawa's writings. See Ida Shinya, 井田進也 in *Rekisho to tekusuto: Saikaku kara Yukichi made* 歴史とテキスト: 西鶴から諭吉まで [History and Texts: From Saikaku to Yukichi] (Tokyo: Kōbōsha 光華社, 2001), and Hirayama, *Fukuzawa Yukichi no shinjitsu*, 82-85.

A rebuttal of Hirayama's views has been produced by Yasukawa Junosuke 安川寿之輔, whose previous work on Fukuzawa's views on Asia was criticized by Hirayama. Yasukawa, in his *Fukuzawa Yukichi no sensōron to Tennōseiron: aratana Fukuzawa bika o hihan suru* 福澤諭吉の戦争論と天皇制論—新たな福澤美化論を批判する [Fukuzawa Yukichi's Theories on War and Japanese Monarchy: Critique of New Fukuzawa Glorification] (Tokyo: Kōbunken, 2006) shows that Fukuzawa was a passionate supporter of the Sino-Japanese War and a loyal supporter of the Imperial system. Yasukawa supports his arguments by showing that Fukuzawa was the second largest private donor of funds for the Sino-Japanese War. Yasukawa specifically criticizes both Hirayama and Ida for glorifying Fukuzawa as a misunderstood liberal intellectual who does not deserve the bad press he has received in the post-war era. To Yasukawa, Fukuzawa should continue to be seen as a pro-Imperialist thinker who helped to encourage Japanese aggression in Asia.

⁶ Fukuzawa Yukichi, *An Encouragement of Learning*. Translated by David A. Dilworth and Hirano Umeyo (Tokyo: Sophia University, 1969), 1. This phrase "heaven does not create one man above or below another man" is found in the opening section of *An Encouragement of Learning*, Fukuzawa's most famous work.

authorship. Fukuzawa's writings that introduced the West, such as *Seiyō jijō* 西洋事情 [Conditions in the West (1866, 1867, 1869)], *Seiyō tabi an'nai* [A Travel Guide to the West (1867)] and his various publications on world geography, such as *Sekai kunizukushi* [世界国盡 All the Countries of the World (1869)] and *Shōchū bankoku ichiran* [掌中万国一覽 Handbook of the Myriad Countries (1869)], shed light on his understanding of the continental scheme in relation to the East and West as metageographical categories. More importantly, Fukuzawa's three philosophical works, *An Encouragement of Learning* [*Gakumon no susume* 学問ノススメ (1872-1876)], *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization* [*Bunmeiron no gairyaku* 文明論之概略 (1875)] and his autobiography [*Fukuō jiden* 福翁自伝 (1898-1899)] demonstrate the conceptual framework in which he placed the East and West.

Brief Biography

Fukuzawa Yukichi was born into a family of lower-ranking samurai from Nakatsu, located on present day Kyūshū, the southernmost of the four main islands of Japan.⁷ His background as a samurai of low rank appears to have played a major role in helping him develop his progressive ways of thinking instead of adopting the conservatism that many higher-ranking samurai tended to exhibit. As a samurai's son, he received a traditional Confucian education, but

⁷ Most of the information on Fukuzawa's life is taken from his autobiography, *Fukuō jiden* 福翁自伝 [*An Autobiography of Fukuzawa*] (1898-1899) in *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū*, vol. 7, 1-260. An English translation is available as *The Autobiography of Yukichi Fukuzawa*, trans. Eiichi Kiyooka (New York: Columbia University Press, 1966). The original Japanese edition was dictated and published in the newspaper *Jiji Shinpō* between July 1898 and February, 1899. The book version of the autobiography was published in June 1899. For a brief introduction to Fukuzawa's life, see Helen M. Hopper, *Fukuzawa Yukichi: From Samurai to Capitalist* (New York: Person Longman, 2005). Another good book on Fukuzawa available in English is Carmen Blacker, *The Japanese Enlightenment: A Study of the Writings of Fukuzawa Yukichi* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964).

his personal experiences with oppression and maltreatment from those above him in Japan's strongly hierarchical social structure helped him to appreciate the concepts of equality and freedom expounded by Western Enlightenment. In 1854, a year after Commodore Perry's arrival, Fukuzawa, then 19 years old, decided to pursue Dutch Learning, since it was the only Western education available in Japan at that time. Through hard work, Fukuzawa learned the Dutch language in a short period of time, and by 1858, was proficient enough to be ordered by his clan to open a school of Dutch Learning in Edo (present-day Tokyo).⁸ What passed as Dutch Learning at that time was mainly concentrated on topics related to the medical and military fields, and did not include the political and philosophical writings of the Enlightenment. After moving to Edo, Fukuzawa paid a visit to Yokohama, one of the ports opened to foreign traders as a result of the new treaties that had been signed with the Western powers such as the United States, the Netherlands, Britain, Russia, and France.⁹ While in Yokohama, Fukuzawa was neither able to figure out any merchant signs nor was he able to speak with any of the foreigners using his Dutch language skills. This experience made him realize that English was the language he needed to study, since two of the countries that Japan had signed treaties with were English-speaking countries. Despite the limited availability of materials and resources, Fukuzawa endeavored to study English. Acquiring a Dutch-English dictionary, he began studying English using his knowledge of the Dutch language.

⁸ Edo was the Shōgunal capital of the time. The Tokugawa Shōgunate had early on instituted a system called the alternate attendance system (*Sankin Kōtai*) where a *daimyō* [vassal of the Shōgun] was required to maintain two residences, one in Edo and one in his own domain, and reside in them alternatively. Fukuzawa was asked to open a school in a residential compound owned by the Nakatsu clan. See Fukuzawa, *Autobiography*, 93.

⁹ Yokohama is located southwest of Edo, on Tokyo Bay.

In 1860, when the Tokugawa Shogunate sent its first diplomatic mission to the United States, Fukuzawa volunteered to go to the U.S. as a servant of Captain Kimura, therefore becoming one of the first Japanese to visit the United States.¹⁰ Upon his return later that year, he published an English-Japanese dictionary, and started to teach English to his students instead of Dutch. He also obtained an appointment as a translator in the Shogun's government. In 1862, Fukuzawa spent almost the entire year traveling across Europe as a translator for the Shogunate. He and other Japanese delegates visited France, England, Holland, Prussia, and Russia during the year-long engagement, allowing Fukuzawa the chance to experience the West in a manner that had previously not been available to the Japanese. In 1864, after working for the Shogunate for about 4 years, Fukuzawa was appointed as a retainer of the Shogun, a significant political advancement for someone who started as the son of a low-ranking samurai from Nakatsu. Two years later, in 1866, he published the first part of *Seiyō jijō*, which started his introduction of the West to the Japanese people. In 1867, Fukuzawa visited the United States on his last trip outside of Japan.¹¹

From 1866 to 1869, Fukuzawa published a number of pamphlets designed to introduce the West to the Japanese people. At the same time, Japan was in the midst of a major regime

¹⁰ This trip took Fukuzawa to San Francisco. On their return trip the party visited Hawaii. See Fukuzawa, *Autobiography*, 104-123.

¹¹ The second trip to the U.S. took Fukuzawa to New York and Washington D.C. Since there was no transcontinental railway at the time, the Japanese delegates crossed the Isthmus of Panama by train and then boarded a ship to New York. The party returned to Japan in June 1867. See Fukuzawa, *Autobiography*, 166-167. For more information on Fukuzawa's travels, see Yamaguchi Kazuo 山口一夫, *Fukuzawa Yukichi no Amerika taiken* 福澤諭吉の亜米利加 体験 [Fukuzawa Yukichi's Experience in America], (Tokyo: Fukuzawa Yukichi Kyōkai, 1986); Yamaguchi Kazuo, *Fukuzawa Yukichi no A-Ō kenbun* 福澤諭吉の亜欧見聞 [Fukuzawa Yukichi's visit to Asia and Europe] (Tokyo: Fukuzawa Yukichi Kyōkai, 1992); and Yamaguchi Kazuo, *Fukuzawa Yukichi no Seikō junreki* 福澤諭吉の西航巡歴 [Fukuzawa Yukichi's Travel to the West] (Tokyo: Fukuzawa Yukichi Kyōkai, 1980).

change from the Tokugawa Shogunate to the new Meiji government, through which the Shogunate was abolished and the power of the Emperor was restored. At this stage in his writing career Fukuzawa did not express his own ideas; instead, he relied heavily on summations or translations of foreign works, mostly from British or American publications, to express concepts of the West to his Japanese audience. It was not until several years after the Meiji Restoration that Fukuzawa began expressing his own ideas through his writings with the publication of *An Encouragement of Learning* in 1872. Upon publishing this text, Fukuzawa became a philosopher that represented modern Japan, rather than being a mere translator. *An Encouragement of Learning* was written in plain Japanese so that it was accessible to the average person and could reach as wide an audience as possible. The timing of Fukuzawa's publication could not have been better since a feeling of change had captured the minds of Japanese people hungry to hear what a leading scholar had to say about progress and the future. Copies of *An Encouragement of Learning* were snapped up by the eager population and it became the best seller of his time, going through seventeen printings during Fukuzawa's own lifetime.¹²

An Outline of a Theory of Civilization or *Bunmeiron no gairyaku* was published in 1875, and it marked Fukuzawa's most scholarly work yet. It offered important insights into his understanding of the "East" and "West," as well as his concepts of "civilization," "semi-

¹² *An Encouragement of Learning* was a collection of seventeen essays published in pamphlets form between 1872 and 1876. The first essay was originally written as a speech in 1871 for the opening of a school in his hometown of Nakatsu. The first pamphlet was especially important and was even used as a school textbook. When the new Meiji government established eight years of compulsory education in 1872, there were no standardized textbooks and many of Fukuzawa's writings were used as textbooks. See a pamphlet produced by Aichi Prefecture Library, "*Bunmei kaika to kyōkasho: Meiji no kyōkasho sono 2*," 文明開化と教科書：明治の教科書その2 <http://www.aichi-pref-library.jp/list/event/meiji.pdf> The combined volume appeared in 1880 and it is estimated that 3,400,000 copies were sold in Fukuzawa's lifetime. See Earl H Kinmonth, "Fukuzawa Reconsidered: Gakumon no Susume and its Audience," in *The Journal of Asian Studies* 37, no. 4 (August 1978): 677-696.

civilization," and "barbarism." In 1882, shortly after an Imperial Rescript that declared the establishment of Parliament (Diet) in 1880, Fukuzawa founded a daily newspaper by the name of the *Jiji Shinpō*, which became the organ through which Fukuzawa would express his ideas. In 1898, at the age of 63, Fukuzawa completed the dictation of his autobiography before suffering a stroke in November. After surviving the initial stroke, he succumbed to a second one in 1901. Fukuzawa Yukichi's death, however, did little to slow the momentum for change that his life's work had set into motion.

Geographical Constructs: Five Continents and East versus West

Two meta-geographical constructs were particularly important to Fukuzawa. The first one was continents. Studying geography based on continents had been standard in the Western world, so for Fukuzawa, who provided summations and translations of American and British publications during his early career, it is understandable that he adopted a continental scheme. In his presentation of world geography, he consistently describes the world as being roughly divided into five continents. His delineation of the five continents, however, was inconsistent from book to book, since his source materials probably were inconsistent.¹³ For example, in

¹³ Fukuzawa Yukichi, *Shōchū Bankoku Ichiran* 掌中万国一覽 [Pocket Guides to the Country of the World] (1869), in *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū* vol. 2, 456; Fukuzawa, *Sekai kunizukushi* 世界国盡 [All the Countries of the World] (1869) in *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū*, vol. 2, 585. In his these two books on world geography both published in 1869, Fukuzawa claimed that he was not expressing his own opinion, but purely transmitting information provided by foreign publications. Fukuzawa did not always provide precise information on source materials used to write his books, but some of the source materials that Fukuzawa used were educational publications for juveniles and included Samuel Augustus Mitchell's and Sarah S. Cornell's geography textbooks as well as Peter Parley's *Universal History*. In *Shōchū bankoku ichiran*, in *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū*, vol. 2, 456, he identifies Mitchell's and Cornell's geography books among others as source materials. See also Minamoto Masahisa 源昌久, "Fukuzawa Yukichi cho 'Sekai Kunizukushi' ni Kansuru ichikenkyū: Shoshigakuteki chōsa 福沢諭吉著『世界国尽』に関する一研究: 書誌学的調査 [An Study of Fukuzawa Yukichi's "Sekai Kunizukushi": Study of Source Materials,]" in *Kūkan, Shakai Chiri Shisō* 空間・社会・地理思想 [*Space, Society and Geographical*

Seiyō tabi an'nai, Fukuzawa treated North and South America as a single continent and Australia as another.¹⁴ In *Shōchū bankoku ichiran*, he used the term "Taiyōshū 大洋州," the translation of "Oceania," and included Australia as part of that island chain rather than as a continent. Yet, when he provided information on size and population of each continent in the same book, he divided the world into six parts, separating North and South America.¹⁵ In *Sekai kunizukushi*, Fukuzawa treated North and South America as two separate continents, and excluded Oceania or Australia as a continent, but mentioned it as an additional place that was not part of the five.¹⁶

In actuality, the inconsistencies in his terminology for these areas had little impact on his overall discussion, since his main interest was in "the West" (Europe, including Russia, and the United States); the other areas did not matter much to him. Besides very bland comments in his basic world geography survey text, *Sekai kunizukushi*, Fukuzawa did not have much to say about Africa, South America or Oceania / Australia. Indeed he even commented: "Africa and Australia have an abundance of natural products, but people are inherently stupid . . . in short, these areas are uninspiring."¹⁷ Many of the books that Fukuzawa wrote centered exclusively on "the West." Even Asia seldom appeared in his writings.

Thought], 2 (1997), 2-18; Albert M. Craig, *Civilization and Enlightenment: The Early Thought of Fukuzawa Yukichi* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2009), 33-57.

¹⁴ Fukuzawa, *Seiyō tabi an'nai*, in *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū* vol. 2, 121.

¹⁵ Fukuzawa, *Shōchū bankoku ichiran*, in *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū*, vol. 2, 459-460.

¹⁶ Fukuzawa, *Sekai kunizukushi*, in *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū*, vol. 2, 591, 648.

¹⁷ Fukuzawa, *Seiyō tabi an'nai*, in *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū*, vol.2, 121. Translated from 亞非利加、澳太利も其國の産物はいくれども、國人の生れつき愚にして. . . 一口にいえばつまらぬ國柄なり

Fukuzawa's second important geographical construct was that of East and West. He adopted the terms *Seiyō* and *Tōyō* that were already in use in the mid-nineteenth century. Interestingly, Fukuzawa even provided an explanation of the term *Seiyō* in *Seiyō tabi an'nai*: "The reason why, in Japan, foreigners are called *Seiyō jin* 西洋人 [Western-Ocean people] is because Europeans and Americans brought merchandise from a westward direction."¹⁸ This comment by Fukuzawa in 1867 essentially agrees with a much earlier argument by Ozawa Yoritomi in 1787, that the term *Seiyō* reflects a Japanese geographical perspective rather than being a translation of the "Occident" or the "West." Fukuzawa also stated that these days many Europeans and Americans actually come to Japan from an eastward direction since travel conditions of trans-Pacific routes were more pleasant than those of trans-Indian Ocean routes. Thus, Fukuzawa comments, "Now it is not unreasonable to call these people coming to Japan from the east *Tōyō jin* 東洋人 [Eastern-Ocean people]."¹⁹

When Fukuzawa talked of *Seiyō*, he meant the countries of Europe, including Russia and the United States. *Seiyō jijō* or *Conditions in the West* was a series of Fukuzawa's writings designed to introduce the West to Japanese audience. The first part was published in 1866, followed by publication of supplementary materials or "*gaihen*" in 1867, with the second part being published in 1869.²⁰ In *Seiyō jijō*, not only does Fukuzawa introduce general information,

¹⁸ Fukuzawa, *Seiyō tabi an'nai*, in *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū*, vol. 2, 121-122 reads 日本にて外國人のことを西洋人といふは、歐羅巴、亞米利加の人々商賣の荷物を持渡るに、西の方より来るゆへなり。

¹⁹ Fukuzawa, *Seiyō tabi an'nai*, in *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū*, vol. 2, 124. Translated from 今は東の方より来るゆへ東洋人といふとも理なきにあらず。

²⁰ About 250,000 copies, including pirated versions, of 1866 edition of *Seiyō jijō* were sold. Blacker, *Japanese Enlightenment*, 7-8.

such as various kinds of government, systems of taxation, economics, military structure, school systems, various welfare institutions (such as orphanages) and technology,²¹ but he also provides specific details for selected countries about their history, political systems, military establishments and economic conditions. The first volume (1866) contains information on the United States 合衆國, Holland 荷蘭, and Great Britain 英國, while the second volume (1869) introduced Russia 魯西亞 and France 佛蘭西. The inclusion of the United States and Russia in the *Seiyō jijō* indicates that Fukuzawa used the existing notion of the West as a cultural entity as developed during the Tokugawa era. Indeed, in a footnote to *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization* Fukuzawa states: "In this book, I equate the terms 'Europe' and 'the West.' Although Europe and America differ geographically, the latter's civilization derives from Europe, and so I feel justified in using the general term 'European Civilization.' The same holds true in the case of the term 'western civilization.'"²² Fukuzawa's understanding of the West was by no means limited to the five countries mentioned in the *Seiyō jijō* since he mentions in other works that Europe and the West also include countries such as Spain, Austria, Prussia. and Portugal.²³

Having visited Europe and America and studied their histories, Fukuzawa saw commonalities between the countries of the West, but he did not homogenize the West into a single monolithic entity as was sometimes done by other writers. It is obvious from his writings that to Fukuzawa the United States and Great Britain occupied a higher status than other countries

²¹ Fukuzawa, *Seiyō jijō: shohen*, in *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū*, vol. 1.

²² Fukuzawa, *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization*, trans. by David A. Dilworth and G. Cameron Hurst (Tokyo: Sophia University Press, 1973), 33.

²³ Fukuzawa Yukichi, *Jōyaku jūichikoku ki* 条約十一国記 [Notes on Eleven Treaty Countries] (1867) in *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū*, vol. 2, 168-185.

of the West, despite their vices and imperfections. Fukuzawa's admiration of the spirit of American independence is demonstrated by his translation of the "Declaration of Independence" and the "American Constitution" into Japanese as part of the *Seiyō jijō*.²⁴ Britain also occupied a special place in Fukuzawa's mind, perhaps owing to the British political system that combined monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy, which he may have perceived as the most compatible governmental system for Japan.²⁵

Russia, on the other hand, seems to have been placed at the bottom of Fukuzawa's Western countries. Instead of the ideals of liberty and equality, Fukuzawa associated Russia with despotism, leading him to view Russia with suspicion.²⁶ In his *Autobiography*, he recalls his 1862 visit to Russia, where he was invited to reside by a member of reception committee:

I had heard that Russia was different from all the other countries of Europe. Now I understand it. For during my visits in England and France, and also in America the year before, nearly all the people I talked with were eager to come to Japan. In fact, I was often bored by having people ask me about jobs in Japan. . . . But I had not met anyone in those lands who advised me to stay in their country. I could guess from the committeeman's eagerness that it was more than a mere personal idea. Probably it was a political or diplomatic scheme; it might even have been an underhanded venture.²⁷

As discussed in the previous chapter, the Japanese had identified Russians as Europeans, and Fukuzawa had accepted such a designation, but as a nation, Russia was singled out as different from the rest of Europe. He was aware that Russia was westernized only as a result of Peter the

²⁴Fukuzawa, *Seiyō jijō: shohen*, in *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū* vol. 1, 321-345.

²⁵ Fukuzawa, *Seiyō jijō: shohen*, in *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū* vol. 1, 289, 370-372. Fukuzawa was known as a proponent of British style parliament in Japan.

²⁶ Fukuzawa, *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization*, 33; Fukuzawa, *Sekai kunizukushi*, in *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū*, vol. 2, 626.

²⁷ Fukuzawa, *Autobiography*, 138.

Great's efforts and he greatly admired him as the most remarkable monarch in Russian History. Whether or not Fukuzawa was aware of the great debates between Russian *Westernizers* and *Slavophiles* cannot be ascertained, but he simply states that "stubborn and stupid people did not appreciate" Peter's efforts to westernize Russia.²⁸ With its history of Mongol occupation, perhaps Fukuzawa saw Russia as an example of a country that was not originally considered part of Europe, but which became "European" due to Peter's efforts. Perhaps for Fukuzawa, Russia represented more of a country that adopted the Western appearance, but not its true spirit. He may have included Russia as part of Seiyō only because it was a country the Japanese delegation had visited, but he saw Russia as less advanced than Britain, the United States, or France.

Fukuzawa's concept of the East was much less clearly defined than that of the West. In examining two works that clearly represent Fukuzawa's own thinking, *An Encouragement of Learning* and *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization*, he uses the term Tōyō (East) much less frequently than Seiyō (West). For example, in *An Encouragement of Learning*, the word Tōyō was not employed at all, while Seiyō appeared over 50 times. Only in a single chapter, substitutions for Tōyō, such as Tōhō 東方 [Eastern direction] and TōZai 東西 [East-West] are found in regards to Fukuzawa's discussion of the differences between Eastern and Western religions.²⁹ In *An Outline of Theory of Civilization*, Fukuzawa used the term Tōyō only 6 times, while the word Seiyō appears about 140 times. Other variations of the "East" (such as Tōhō and TōZai) also appeared in *An Outline*, but still not as frequently (approximately 10 times) as the

²⁸ Fukuzawa, *Seiyō jijō: nihen*, in *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū*, vol.1, 530. Translated from 頑愚の民はこれを悦ばず。

²⁹ Fukuzawa, *Gakumon no susume*, in *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū*, vol. 3, 125, 128.

term Seiyō and its variations. The related term, Asia (亞細亞), was used about 20 times in *An Outline*, while there is virtually no reference to Asia at all in *An Encouragement of Learning*.

While Fukuzawa's reference to "the East" or "Asia" were limited, he spent a significant amount of time discussing China or *Shina* (シナ / 支那) and Confucianism.³⁰ In *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization* alone, China is mentioned 43 times. There are also many references to Confucianism (*Jugaku* 儒学) and Chinese Studies (*Kangaku* 漢学) both still influential during Fukuzawa's lifetime. There were only limited references to other counties of Asia, such as Korea, India, and Ottoman Empire (which he calls *Toruko* トルコ / 土耳其 meaning "Turkey"). References to Korea were found in passing, mostly limited to its being a route of transmission of ideas from China to Japan. India インド / 印度 and "Turkey" were recognized as parts of Asia, and some information about their current situations were discussed, but they played a rather minor role in Fukuzawa's discussion.³¹ Japan, his own country, was surely included in Asia, as well as part of Tōyō. He oftentimes contrasted the West to Japan or a combination of Japan and China. Drawing from this evidence, one may conclude that what constituted the East, or at least the opposing concept to the West, for Fukuzawa was mainly Japan and China, even though he occasionally extended his argument beyond China.

³⁰ The term "Shina" is derived from the European term for China. The Japanese traditionally referred to China with the name of a dynasty, such as Tō [Tang].

³¹ Reference to Korea was made once in *Gakumon no susume*, in *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū*, vol. 4, 89 [page 60 in English translation, *An Encouragement of Learning*]. Another reference to Korea can be found in *Bunmeiron no gairyaku*, in *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū*, vol. 4, 149 [page 139 in English translation, *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization*]. India and Turkey were mentioned together in *Gakumon no susume* [page 79 in English translation]. There are several references to India in *Bunmeiron no gairyaku* [pages 24, 31-32, in English translation].

Civilization, Semi-Civilization, and Barbarism

For Fukuzawa, the concepts of East and West" were closely related to his concepts of civilization and barbarism. The earliest evidence of his use of the term "civilization" can be found in a notebook he kept during his stay in London in 1862. In the notebook he mentions "*beschaving*," meaning "civilization" in Dutch, along with five conditions of *beschaving*, also written in Dutch. His second instance can be found in an early draft of the first volume of *Seiyō jijō* dated 1864, where he used the word *bunmei*, a term that would come into vogue during the Meiji era.³² The first character, *bun* 文 means "literary," "art," "culture," etc., while the second part, *mei* 明 means "bright," "clear," "to enlighten," etc. This combination of characters was once used as Japanese era name between 1469 and 1487, but it did not have any connotation of "civilization"³³ Whether or not Fukuzawa picked the term from previous reign names or came up with the term on his own cannot be ascertained, but he did introduce the term to a Japanese audience in the first volume of his *Seiyō jijō* in 1866.

In the first volume of *Seiyō jijō*, Fukuzawa did not say much about *bunmei*, nor did he clearly define it. He used the term twice on the very first page, and a few more times in the main text.³⁴ Here lies the beauty of combining "*bun*" and "*mei*"; it did not need much explanation since both are such basic characters, yet it left a lot of room for intellectuals to ponder its meaning, and interpret it however they saw fit. Only in *Seiyō jijō gaihen* (supplementary

³² Craig, *Civilization and Enlightenment*, 38-39.

³³ Craig, *Civilization and Enlightenment*, 38-39; Douglas R. Howland, *Translating the West: Language and Political Reason in Nineteenth-Century Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2002), 201.

³⁴ Fukuzawa, *Seiyō jijō: Shohen in Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū*, vol.1, 285, 312, 353, 355, 359, 380.

volume) published two years later, did Fukuzawa finally provide an explanation of differences between "civilization" and "barbarism." *Gaihen* was mostly based on a textbook, *Political Economy for Use in Schools, and for Private Instruction*, published in 1852 without identifying an author. Albert Craig identifies the author to be John Hill Burton (1809-1881) from Aberdeen, Scotland.³⁵ A comparison of Fukuzawa's work with *Political Economy* reveals that Fukuzawa translated the section "Civilization" under the heading of "*Yo no bunmei kaika* 世の文明開化" or "Civilization and Enlightenment of the World." The original English text, including errors, along with Fukuzawa's translation of select English terms, are as follows:

It is shewn [sic] by history that nations advance from a barbarous state to a civilised state [*bunmei kaika*]. The chief peculiarity of the barbarous state is, that lower passions of mankind have there [sic] greater scope, or are less under regulation; while the higher moral qualities of our nature [*reigi no michi* 礼儀の道] are little developed, or have comparatively little play. In that state, women were the slave instead of the companion of her husband; father has uncontrolled power over his child; and, generally, the strong tyrannise over and rob the weak. . . . It is only after civilisation [*bunmei kaika*] has imposed and can maintain equal laws for all, that true freedom can exist.³⁶

It is interesting to note that Fukuzawa translates "the higher moral qualities of our nature" into "*reigi no michi*," a classic Confucian phrase meaning "the way of propriety or proper conduct." Barton also argues that laws to regulate human society lead to true "freedom," a concept Fukuzawa later stresses in his own writings.

³⁵ Craig, *Civilization and Enlightenment*, 11-32, 58-60. Indeed Craig argues Fukuzawa's understanding of civilization and barbarism can be traced back to Scottish enlightenment thinkers, such as John Locke, Adam Smith, Adam Ferguson, David Hume, John Millar, etc.

³⁶ *Political Economy for Use in Schools and for Private Instruction*, Chambers's Educational Course, (Edinburgh: William and Robert Chambers, 1852), 6; Fukuzawa, *Seiyō jijō: gaihen*, in *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū*, vol. 1, 395.

At this point, Fukuzawa's own theory of civilization was still underdeveloped and he relied on foreign publications to explain the concepts of barbarism and civilization. In his two geography books published in 1869, *Sekai kunizukushi* and *Shōchū bankoku ichiran*, Fukuzawa touched on the concept of civilization and barbarism which he divided into two major categories of *bunmei* 文明 and *banya* 蠻野 (barbarism) that was then further subdivided into four ascending categories of *konton* 渾沌 "savages," *banya* 蠻野 "barbarians," *mikai* or *hankai* 未開/半開 "yet-to-be civilized" or "half-civilized," and *kaika bunmei* or *bunmei kaika* 開化文明/文明開化 "civilized and enlightened".³⁷ At this point, Fukuzawa had not yet settled on standard terminology as seen in the variations shown in the last two categories. In *Sekai kunizukushi*, Fukuzawa explains the "civilized" state as follows:

[Civilized people] value manners [*reigi* 禮義] and education and project a pleasant appearance with a mild temperament. Their skills improve on an almost daily basis while their intellects seem to expand monthly. The civilized society engages in agriculture and encourages industry with both benefiting from the lack of limitations on the advancement of their technology. Citizens of such nations enjoy the blessings of Heaven and are

³⁷ Fukuzawa, *Sekai kunizukushi*, in *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū* vol. 2, 663-665; Fukuzawa, *Shōchū bankoku ichiran*, in *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū*, vol. 2, 463-465. The author was not able to obtain all source materials that Fukuzawa used to write these books, but was able to obtain one source book, Peter Parley's *Universal History on the Basis of Geography*, 4th ed. (London: Thomas Tegg, n.d.[c. 1837]) and the 1876 edition (Fukuzawa had the 1867 edition, not the 1876) of *Mitchell's Intermediate Geography* (Philadelphia: J.H. Butler, 1876). Peter Parley divided human development into four stages: the savage state, the barbarous state, the civilized state, and the highest state of civilization (pp.11-12). Parley's criteria for "civilization" included types of housing, literacy, education and religion found in a society. For example he describes the highest state of civilization: ". . . the people live in good houses; they have good furniture, many books, good schools, churches, meeting houses, steam boats, and railroads." Mitchell's geography textbook uses the two basic divisions "the nomadic and the civilized" and further subdivides these into five stages of the savage state, the barbarous state, half-civilized, civilized, and enlightened. Mitchell's description of five stages of civilization appear to be very close to Fukuzawa's geography texts, except that Fukuzawa combines the last two into one category. Mitchell's describes "the civilized and enlightened state" as ". . . those which have made the greatest progress in refinement and justice, among whom art is improved and science cultivated." He continues with slightly smaller letters "Agriculture, commerce, and mechanic industry are systematically conducted; and thus great comfort and luxuries are provided." Furthermore, he distinguishes differences between "only civilized" where ". . . the mass of the people are ignorant and without voice in the government," and "civilized and enlightened," where ". . . the people are free and educated, all power is limited by law, and all who live virtuously may live happily." See *Mitchell's Intermediate Geography*, 12.

content in the lives they live. It can be said that the United States, England, France, Germany, Holland, Switzerland, etc. have all reached such a state of civilized existence.³⁸

Once again, a classic Confucian term *reigi* 禮義 [propriety or proper conduct] was employed to translate and explain "civilization." This explanation also emphasized a culture's economic and subsistence structure, such as agricultural or industrial, in a manner commonly seen in Western geography textbooks.

As Fukuzawa matured into a true philosopher, he developed his own theory of civilization. In his work *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization* (1875), the Confucian terms and measure of societal development based on economic and subsistence style were dropped:

Bunmei in English is "civilization." It derives from a Latin word, "civitas" which means *kuni* 國 [Kuni in Japanese can be translated as "country," "nation," "state," etc.] Therefore, *bunmei*, is an adjective that explains the process of human relationships changing for the better. It is opposite of primitiveness, lawlessness, and isolation and it takes a form of having a state.³⁹

³⁸ Fukuzawa, *Sekai kunizukushi*, in *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū*, vol. 2, 664-665. Translated from 禮義を重んじ正理を貴び、人情穩にして風俗やさしく、諸職の術は日々に新にして学問の道は月に進み、農業を勤め工業を励み、百般の技術盡さゞくものなく、国民業を安んじて天の幸を受け、末頼母しく自から満足せり。亞米利加合衆國、英吉利。佛蘭西、日耳曼、和蘭、瑞西等の諸國は文明開化の域に至れるものといふべし。 A similar passage can be found in Fukuzawa, *Shōchu bankoku ichiran*, in *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū*, vol. 2, 464-465.

³⁹ Fukuzawa, *Bunmeiron no Gairyaku*, in *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū*, vol.4, 38. Translated from 文明とは英語にて「シウヰリゼイション」と云ふ。即ち羅甸語の「シウヰタス」より来りしものにて、國と云ふ義なり。故に文明とは人間交際の次第に改りて良き方に赴く有様を形容したる語にて、野蠻無法の獨立に反し一國の體裁を成すと云ふ義なり。 Dilworth and Hurst translates "Hence the term 'civilization' in English" thus describes the process by which human relationships gradually change for the better and take on a definite shape. It is a concept of a unified nation in contrast to a state of primitive isolation and lawlessness." Fukuzawa, *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization*, 35.

Here one can clearly see the influence of Burton where the existence of law and state are emphasized rather than economic structure as a basis of "civilization."

In *An Outline of Theory of Civilization*, Fukuzawa also consolidated the previous four categories into three; *bunmei* 文明 (civilized), *hankai* 半開 (semi-developed), and *yaban* 野蠻 (primitive / barbaric), and offered his own explanation of "modern civilization:"

There is a stage in which men subsume the things of universe within a general structure, but the structure does not bind them. Their spirits enjoy free play and do not adhere to old customs blindly. They act autonomously and do not have to depend upon the arbitrary favor of others. They cultivate their own virtue and refine their own knowledge. They neither yearn for the old nor become complacent about the new. Not resting with small gains, they plan great accomplishments for the future and commit themselves wholeheartedly to their realization. Their path of learning is not vacuous; it has indeed, invented the principal of invention itself. Their business ventures prosper day by day to increase the sources of human welfare. Today's wisdom overflows to create the plans of tomorrow. This is what is meant by modern civilization. It has been a leap far beyond the primitive or semi-developed stages.⁴⁰

This explanation of modern civilization emphasizes the spirit of civilization, with particular emphasis on the principle of freedom. Equally evident was his emphasis on the future and progress, which demonstrates yet another departure from his earlier writings based on foreign texts. Here, Fukuzawa clearly divorces civilization from such Confucian concepts as *reigi* [禮義 or 禮儀], *reigaku* 禮樂 [rites and music], and *fukurei* [復禮 Revive Ritual] with traditional Japanese and Chinese societal values that Fukuzawa considered to be outdated.⁴¹ Confucianism was no longer the standard Fukuzawa used to gauge human advancement.

⁴⁰ Fukuzawa, *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization*, 14.

⁴¹ Fukuzawa, *Bunmeiron no gairyaku*, in *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū*, vol.4, 52-53; 61, 93-94, 117-118, 121, 162, 192.

For Fukuzawa, the three stages of development had close connections to the continents:

When we are talking about civilization in the world today, the nations of Europe and the United States of America are the most highly civilized, while Asian countries, such as Turkey, China and Japan, may be called semi-developed countries, and Africa and Australia are to be counted as still primitive lands.⁴²

This did not mean Asia was perpetually "semi-developed" and Africa and Australia were permanently "primitive." Nor were the "civilized" countries to always remain "civilized."

Fukuzawa understood that the standard of civilization was subjective and that it would change over time. Europe and America, *for the time being*, represented the current highest level of development, and therefore became the standard by which Japan should measure itself and strive to attain. In the future, it was possible that Japan or other nations might elevate themselves to an even higher level of civilization, and then the cycle would continue with nations and people trying to continually catch up with or overtake the current "civilized" leaders.

For Fukuzawa, civilization was neither defined by the adoption of western clothes and ways of life nor by material wealth or technological advancements. He repeatedly criticized such concepts as being only the outward appearance of civilization.⁴³ Fukuzawa argued that adopting an external appearance of Western civilization was easy, but inconsequential if the people's minds were not truly civilized. He rhetorically asked: "Can we say that the current Western styles seen more and more in daily Japanese life are a proof of civilization? Can we call those men with Western haircuts whom we meet on the street civilized persons? Shall we call a

⁴² Fukuzawa, *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization*, 13.

⁴³ Examples may be found in Fukuzawa, *Bunmeiron no gairyaku*, in *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū*, vol. 4, 19, 41.

person enlightened just because he eats meat?"⁴⁴ Fukuzawa's answer to these questions was, "Absolutely not."⁴⁵ Material and physical comfort was only a small part of his concept of civilization. For him, civilization was both a material and spiritual matter. Fukuzawa's most famous picture, the one on the Japanese ¥10,000 bill, seems to symbolize this concept. The portrait on the bill depicts him in traditional Japanese attire with *zangiri-atama*, cropped hair, the symbol of "civilization" during the Meiji Era. Fukuzawa himself commented in his *Autobiography* that he chose to wear Japanese clothes since he found them much more comfortable than western clothes.⁴⁶

The spirit of Western civilization was what Fukuzawa admired the most about the West, and also what he found to be the most contradictory concept to that of Asia.⁴⁷ This spirit he admired so much was a development of the Enlightenment that emphasized rationality and critical thinking, as well as liberal ideals of freedom and independence. In *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization*, Fukuzawa identifies the essence of Western civilization:

If we seek the essence of Western civilization, it lies in the fact that they scrutinize whatever they experience with the five senses, in order to discover its essence and its functions. They go on to seek the causes of its functions, and anything they find beneficial they make use of, while whatever they find harmful they discard. . . . With nature's engines harnessed and in his service, why should man fear and worship

⁴⁴ Fukuzawa, *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization*, 16; Fukuzawa, *Bunmeiron no gairyaku*, in *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū*, vol. 4, 19-20.

⁴⁵ Fukuzawa, *Bunmeiron no gairyaku*, in *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū*, vol. 4, 20. Translated from 決して然る可らず. The word *keshite* 決して is a term that emphasizes negative term. Dilworth and Hurst translated the same section "Hardly." 16.

⁴⁶ Fukuzawa, *Autobiography*, 331.

⁴⁷ Fukuzawa, *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization*, 15; Fukuzawa, *Bunmeiron no gairyaku*, in *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū*, vol. 4, 20.

nature? . . . Mountains, swamps, rivers, ocean, wind and rain, sun and moon -- they are now all slaves of civilized men.⁴⁸

He continues on to explain how such spirit can free one from not only superstition but also from tyranny:

Once the forces of nature are harnessed, they became our puppets. Why, then, should we fear what are merely man-made forces? Why should we be the puppets of these latter? As man's intellectual powers develop, he also probes the causes behind human activities in all their aspects. . . . We must reach the point where we do not allow even one thing to become an obstacle to freedom of mind. And anyone who resorts to force in society can be made to answer to reason. . . . Once the tendency to control tyranny by the use of reason is firmly established, social distinctions based upon force and authority can also be overturned.⁴⁹

Here it is clear that Fukuzawa was influenced by concepts born of the Enlightenment as evidenced by his use of words such as "reason" (*dōri* 道理, *kotowari* 理) and "freedom" (*jiyū* 自由). The influence of the Enlightenment can be also seen in his emphasis on nature and natural laws.

Fukuzawa did not consider Christianity a requirement for civilization, even though it is generally thought of as an important part of the Western spiritual heritage. Indeed, for Fukuzawa, Christianity was merely an external dimension of civilization, not an essential part or requirement for it.⁵⁰ In regard to the moral foundation of Western civilization often associated with Christianity, Fukuzawa felt that there was "not a great deal of difference between the

⁴⁸ Fukuzawa, *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization*, 111.

⁴⁹ Fukuzawa, *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization*, 111-112.

⁵⁰ Fukuzawa, *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization*, 96.

teachings of East and West.⁵¹ For example, Fukuzawa commented that a Japanese person would already be familiar with the last six of the Ten Commandments of Christianity without ever having been exposed to that religion.⁵² On this basis, Fukuzawa argued that the Japanese were not morally inferior to Christian Westerners, and Christianity was simply a religion to which Westerners adhered. He neither considered Christianity to be an obstacle to civilization, as did some radical Enlightenment thinkers, nor was it an essential part of civilization as expressed by some Christian missionaries. He was against the Japanese adopting Christianity, as some other Japanese scholars advocated, since it was only "an outward appearance" and, moreover, he saw many discrepancies between what Christianity taught and what was actually practiced:

In so far as impartial and universal brotherhood are concerned, if the world is one family and all men on the face of the earth are like brothers, then love should be meted out equally to all men. If the entire earth is as one and the same family how then did it happen this family was divided by national boundaries? . . . [they] set up government whose purpose is to work for the benefit of only those groups, and worst of all, to take up weapons and murder one's brothers within other boundaries, to take their land from them, and to contend with them for business profit—this cannot by any means be the aim of religion. In view of these abuses it seems that we should set aside for a while consideration of eternal punishment in the afterlife and say that punishment in the present life is still inadequate. And the offenders are the Christians.⁵³

⁵¹ Fukuzawa, *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization*, 98.

⁵² Fukuzawa must have used the Protestant version of the Ten Commandments. The first four commandments deal with God (no other gods, no idol worship, no utterance of God's name in vain, and observation of the Sabbath) while the last six deal with interpersonal relationships (honor thy parents, do not kill, do not commit adultery, do not steal, do not deceive, do not covet neighbors belongs). See Fukuzawa, *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization*, 85.

⁵³ Fukuzawa, *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization*, 177.

For Fukuzawa, "love thine enemy" was a lofty ideal promoted by Christians that they rarely, if ever, actually practiced.⁵⁴

Above all else Fukuzawa admired and emphasized the spirit of independence he felt was inherent in Western civilization. Summarizing François Guizot's *History of Civilization* (originally published in French in 1828, and later translated into English), he identified the beginning of Western civilization with the fall of the Roman Empire, and establishment of Germanic kingdoms throughout Western Europe. The Germanic tribes of the Dark Ages, as barbaric they may have been, made a great contribution to Western society since they were the ones who brought into it a spirit of independence.⁵⁵ Drawing on the need of people to become free, Fukuzawa saw an important lesson in European history in regards to how the Catholic Church had dominated the spiritual world and the secular elites dominated the physical and material world, but eventually, many free cities emerged that gained their independence from kings and feudal lords. The Protestant Reformation and the political revolutions of England (17th century) and France (18th century) were also seen by Fukuzawa as pivotal points in Western history that epitomized the spirit of freedom and independence and indicated "the progress of civilization."⁵⁶

⁵⁴ Fukuzawa, *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization*, 178.

⁵⁵ Fukuzawa, *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization*, 127 states: "Spirit of seeking the independence of the individual and the full development of his aspirations first originated in the German tribes. The spirit of freedom and independence in later European civilization, even today valued as a matchless jewel, was contribution of the German."

⁵⁶ Fukuzawa, *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization*, 125-134. Also see François Pierre Guillaume Guizot, *The History of Civilization from the Fall of the Roman Empire to the French Revolution*, 4 vols. (New York: D Appleton and Company, 1902[1828]).

Fukuzawa emphasized the concept of independence because he felt that Japanese sovereignty was threatened by western encroachment. In the midst of his admiration of the West he was conscious of the persistent threat posed by Western powers to Japanese independence. Fukuzawa stayed abreast of world events and saw the Western powers as being imperialists with a penchant for conquering and exploiting lesser nations:

[t]hose who have any concern for their country at all must carefully consider some facts of world history, both past and present. Whose country was present-day America originally? Is it not true that the Indians who owned the land were driven away by the white men and now the roles of master and guest are switched around? . . . What about in countries of the East and the islands in Oceania? In all places touched by the Europeans are there any which have developed their power, attained benefits, and preserved their independence? What has been the outcome in Persia, India, Siam, Luzon, and Java? . . . In China . . . the land is so vast that the interior has as yet to be penetrated by the white man, and he has left his traces only along the coast. However, if future development can be conjectured, China too will certainly become nothing but a garden for Europeans. Wherever the Europeans touch, the land withers up, as it were; the plants and trees stop growing.⁵⁷

Such was Fukuzawa's view of the West that he was dismayed with the way many Japanese simply equated adopting a western mode of life as "civilization." Being a person who was very much influenced by the Enlightenment movement and its concepts of liberty and equality, he was not happy with the way many Japanese kowtowed to foreigners. Fukuzawa pointed out the "equality" that was supposed to exist between the Japanese and foreigners, as stated in the treaties the Japanese government had signed when opening the country to Western powers was relegated only to theory and was not practiced. Fukuzawa observed that foreigners acted arrogantly and the Japanese simply acquiesced to their bad behavior: "When they [the

⁵⁷ Fukuzawa, *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization*, 188-189.

foreigners] get into an argument with anyone . . . the Westerners behave insolently; they punch and kick at will, and the cowardly, weak common people lack the courage to pay them back in kind. . . ." ⁵⁸ Fukuzawa also commented on the abuse of the justice system under the provision of treaties which recognized the extraterritorial rights of foreigners. Justice for the Japanese against foreigners were almost impossible since the law provided that the foreigners could only be judged by their own countrymen in courts that were likely never to find them guilty, making most Japanese take a submissive posture toward any legal issue arising with the foreigners.

Fukuzawa looked to Japan's history for an explanation for his people's submissiveness. He accepted a general notion of despotism [*zenken* 擅權] in Asia and considered that most of Japanese history was characterized by such a system, but he did not blindly support the theory as to why such despotism developed in Japan:

According to some Western books, the reason for the despotism in Asia lies in the fact that with its warm climates and fertile lands, Asia has become overpopulated, and because of geographical and topographical conditions, fear and superstitions tend to multiply. It is hard to say whether this theory truly applies to Japan or not. Even if it did apply, since the causes are all natural phenomena, what can humans do about them? Therefore I wish here only to speak about the development of despotism and show the way in which it has been carried out. ⁵⁹

Fukuzawa saw Japanese society throughout its history divided into what he called two basic elements: the ruler and the ruled. The ruled, after many years of servitude, accepted inequality

⁵⁸ Fukuzawa, *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization*, 183; Fukuzawa, *Bunmeiron no gairyaku*, in *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū*, vol. 4, 148-149. The concept of Oriental despotism was common in the nineteenth century. The notion of Oriental Despotism is quite apparent in *Mitchell's Intermediate Geography*. While he described most of the governments in Europe to be "monarchy" (either "absolute" or "limited," meaning constitutional), he described most Asian governments as "despotism." See *Mitchell's Intermediate Geography*, 72-91. Also see J.M. Blaut, *The Colonizer's Model of the World: Geographical Diffusionism and Eurocentric History* (New York: The Guilford Press, 1993).

⁵⁹ Fukuzawa, *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization*, 138.

as a basic fact of life and rarely questioned the authority of the ruler. Not only were individuals controlled by the ruling elites, but also religious institutions and scholarship came under government control. Confucianism during the Tokugawa era was used as a particularly powerful tool of the government to consolidate its power and authority. As far as Fukuzawa was concerned, Confucianism advocated absolutism (*sensei* 専制): "Of all the Confucianists who have ever been in Japan, those who enjoyed a reputation as most talented and most capable were the greatest experts on absolutism, and the greatest tools of the government."⁶⁰ As a result of the lack of independence of the common people, religion and learning, etc., Fukuzawa concluded that the Japanese people never developed a sense of personal independence.

In both *An Encouragement of Learning* and *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization*, Fukuzawa spends a significant amount of time on issues of independence. He encourages education because he perceives it to be essential for Japan's independence from foreign control: "If we Japanese will begin to pursue learning with spirit and energy, so as to achieve personal independence and thereby enrich and strengthen the nation, why shall we fear the Powers of the West?"⁶¹ His purpose for promoting "Western civilization" was so that Japan could quickly gain the skills and institutions needed to avoid subjugation by the West in a time when other countries were quickly falling under Western control. He was, after all, a fiercely patriotic man that was concerned about the survival of the Japanese state. He seems to be generally supportive of the Meiji government's slogan, "enrich the nation and strengthen the military (*fukoku kyōhei* 富国強

⁶⁰ Fukuzawa, *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization*, 151; Fukuzawa, *Bunmeiron no gairyaku*, in *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū*, vol. 4, 161, reads: 古來日本の儒者にて最も才力を有して最もよく事を爲したる人物と稱する者は、最も専制に巧にして最もよく政府に用ひられたる者なり。

⁶¹ Fukuzawa, *An Encouragement of Learning*, 16.

兵)," and his stated method of accomplishing that goal was through Westernization. Fukuzawa did not see Westernization as something fashionable or just merely desirable; instead he saw it as absolutely necessary for Japan to maintain its sovereignty. In order to survive, Japan needed to strengthen itself against foreign powers and to do so Fukuzawa thought that the Japanese people's mentality must be changed. He clearly saw the difference between the aggressive and confrontational Western mentality of the foreigners and the meek and subservient attitude displayed by too many of his countrymen. In order to move forward, he found it necessary to discard old ways of thinking and quickly embrace new ideas: "My objective is to attain the fruit of independence by going forward, rather than go backward and preserve independence in empty name only."⁶²

China, Japan, and Confucianism

While Fukuzawa associated the West and the ideals of the Enlightenment with progress and forward thinking, he associated China and Confucianism with stagnation and backwardness. Of the three major branches of learning developed during the Tokugawa era, Chinese or Confucian, Dutch, and National Studies, Chinese Studies was by far the most influential. Despite some criticism from Dutch and National Studies scholars, Chinese Studies still exerted a strong influence upon Japanese society into the late Tokugawa and early Meiji era. Fukuzawa himself had studied Confucianism for several years before deciding to pursue Dutch Learning. So called Dutch Learning was centered on the study of Western medicine, which was in direct

⁶² Fukuzawa, *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization*, 195.

competition with Chinese medicine and Fukuzawa recalled his experience as a student of Dutch Studies in his autobiography:

Though we often had discussions on many subjects, we seldom touched upon political subjects as most of us were students of medicine. . . . The only subject that bore our constant attack was Chinese medicine. And hating Chinese medicine so thoroughly, we came to dislike everything that had any connection to Chinese culture. Our general opinion was that we should rid our country of the influence of the Chinese altogether.⁶³

His dislike of Chinese medicine and by extension, all things Chinese, continued throughout his life. Indeed, after he was exposed to the ideas of the Enlightenment, he was even more convinced that China and Confucianism represented backwardness since Confucianism emphasized the ways of ancient sages as the model of human conduct and government. He even directly questioned the soundness of Confucianism since Fukuzawa felt that Confucius' teachings were not practical and were actually antiquated during Confucius' own lifetime:

Confucius advocated only the ways of government of Yao and Shun [two legendary sages believed to lived during the second millennium BCE] and proposed to transform the empire through moral principle. Of course, this actually never happened. In reality Confucius was farther removed from the trend of his times than were other contemporary officials.⁶⁴

Yet surveying Japanese history, Fukuzawa found that Confucianism, along with Buddhism, were forces that brought the Japanese out of barbarianism: "At any rate, we must admit that it was Buddhism and Confucianism that saved us from barbarianism and raised us up to the level of civilization which we do enjoy today."⁶⁵ While he gave Buddhism and Confucianism credit as the forces that brought Japan from barbarianism to semi-civilization, with their literature,

⁶³ Fukuzawa, *Autobiography*, 91.

⁶⁴ Fukuzawa, *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization*, 96.

⁶⁵ Fukuzawa, *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization*, 149.

etiquette, and concept of an afterlife etc, he still felt that they were trappings of the past that must be discarded in order for Japan to progress into next stage of civilization. In Fukuzawa's view, Chinese teachings were incompatible with the concept of independence promoted by the Enlightenment, and, therefore, it was imperative that Japan abandon the Confucian way of thinking and embrace Western Enlightenment thinking if it was to survive as a sovereign power. Indeed Fukuzawa regarded Chinese teachings to be the root of all Japan's shortcomings, and tried to remove its "degenerate influences" from the Japanese mindset.⁶⁶ For him, Chinese teachings were a "retrogressive doctrine" that needed to be wiped out, and he made it his mission to do so through his writings and his school:⁶⁷

The true reason of my opposing the Chinese teaching with such vigor is my belief that in this age of transition, if this retrogressive doctrine remains at all in our young men's minds, the new civilization cannot give its full benefit to this country. In my determination to save our coming generation, I was prepared even to face single-handed the Chinese scholars of the country as a whole.⁶⁸

Fukuzawa sought to eliminate Confucian influences from Japan, and felt that such an endeavor was easier to carry out in Japan than in China, since the historical experiences of the two countries were so different. According to Fukuzawa, China experienced its spirit of "freedom" during the Eastern Zhou era, when the "hundred schools" emerged. Ever since the unification of China under the First Emperor, however, the Chinese people came to be ruled by a government that was the embodiment of both "the most sacrosanct and the most powerful." In Japan, on the

⁶⁶ Fukuzawa, *Autobiography*, 216.

⁶⁷ Fukuzawa, *Autobiography*, 216.

⁶⁸ Fukuzawa, *Autobiography*, 216.

other hand, due to the establishment of the Shogunate in 1192, "the most sacrosanct and the most powerful" were divided into two separate entities, the emperor and the shogun. This division of power allowed the Japanese room for "reason" to come into play. In a rather simplistic manner, Fukuzawa commented:

In summary, I say that China has endured as a theocratic autocracy over the centuries, while Japan has balanced the element of military power against the element of theocracy. China has had but one element, Japan two. If you discuss civilization in these terms, China has never once changed and thus is not equal to Japan in their development. It is easier for Japan to adopt Western civilization than for China.⁶⁹

Perhaps he was familiar with Confucian teachings but not so familiar with Chinese history, considering the very simplistic view he had of the two country's histories. Fukuzawa's comparison of Japanese and Chinese history, along with numerous other negative or unflattering comments about China and Confucianism being backward and stagnant, clearly indicate that he saw China not as a model to be followed, but as the symbol of everything Japan needed to avoid.

Conclusion

Fukuzawa Yukichi was a prolific writer, an educator, and Japan's foremost advocate of Westernization, and he played a critical role in molding the way that Japanese came to define East and West. Geographically, Fukuzawa defined the West to be Europe, west of the Ural Mountains, and the United States of America, and the East to include China and Japan. Conceptually, Fukuzawa associated the West with civilization, progress, and the future, while he

⁶⁹ Fukuzawa, *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization*, 20-23.

associated the East (especially China and Confucianism) with semi-civilization, degeneration, and the past.

Fukuzawa lived during an era in which the world was undergoing a series of major changes, and the Japanese perception of Westerners changed from barbarians to viewing them as the very symbol of civilization. Fukuzawa's writings on the West and his association of Westernization with civilization played no small part for this change of perception among many Japanese. To be sure, many people never grasped the far reaching concepts and ideas presented by Fukuzawa's work; instead associating civilization only with material aspects of Westernization. Regardless of what the general population understood of his work, Fukuzawa saw the future and realized that the spirit of Western civilization, which he defined as the "spirit of independence," was something that Japan must adopt in order to maintain its sovereignty.⁷⁰ Fukuzawa was not a blind admirer of the West. Instead, he saw the West as both a model to which Japan had to aspire and as an enemy that threatened Japan's independence.

As the West was elevated from the land of barbarians to the land of civilization, China, which had provided political and cultural inspiration to the Japanese for centuries, was knocked off from its once lofty pedestal. Fukuzawa presented China and Confucianism to the Japanese people as being one with backwardness and stagnation, emphasizing that the way of antiquity was an unsuitable ideology in an age of progress and enlightenment. For Fukuzawa, Confucianism had served its role and was responsible for elevating the Japanese from a state of barbarism to semi-civilization, but its time had long passed and it could no longer prove a means for the advancement of society. Only by fully embracing the Western spirit of independence and

⁷⁰ Fukuzawa, *An Encouragement of Learning*, 30.

tossing away the outgrown and incompatible vestiges of Confucianism could the Japanese people learn to adopt the new enlightened world view that was necessary for them to advance to a higher level of civilization.

Fukuzawa's teachings probably helped the Japanese to shift their perception of China from an exalted land of civilization to that of an inferior one with which they could compete and even conquer. Two of the main works by Fukuzawa examined here, *An Encouragement of Learning* and *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization* were both written before the Sino-Japanese War of 1894-95, and do not provide any direct indications that Fukuzawa promoted the idea of a Japanese invasion of China or Korea. Neither does his *Autobiography* (1898-1899) provide any evidence that would promote aggression toward Japan's neighbors. Whether or not Fukuzawa wrote some or even all of the contested articles in the *Jiji Shinpo* has no bearing on his feelings toward Japan's need for Westernization. By associating the West with civilization and the East with stagnation, and actively encouraging the Japanese people to rid themselves of Chinese influences, Fukuzawa helped to pave the way for Japan to leave its past and actively pursue involvement with the outside world.

CHAPTER 3

SHIMODA UTAKO (1854-1936)

STRONG WOMEN, STRONG NATION

In 1907, Japan's leftist newspaper, *Heimin Shinbun* [Common People's Newspaper], published a series of articles over a forty-one day period entitled "Enchantress Shimoda Utako (Yōfu Shimoda Utako 妖婦 下田歌子)."¹ The "enchantress" in question was a powerful widow in her fifties, Shimoda Utako, the principal of Jissen Women's School (Jissen Jogakkō 實踐女學校) and founder of the Patriotic Women's Association (Aikoku Fujin kai 愛國婦人會). A beautiful, intelligent, and very influential woman of the day, Shimoda was accused of being sexually involved with many of Meiji Japan's powerful politicians, among the most prominent of which were Ito Hirobumi 伊藤 博文(1841-1909), Yamagata Aritomo 山縣 有朋(1838-1922), and Inoue Kaoru 井上馨(1836-1915).² While the articles were a leftist attack on corrupt right-

¹ Yamamoto Haruo, ed., *Yōfu Shimoda Utako: Heimin Shinbun yori* 妖婦 下田歌子：平民新聞より [Enchantress Shimoda Utako: From Heimin Shinbun, Common People's Newspaper] (Tokyo: Fūbaisha, 1999). *Heimin Shinbun* was founded by two socialists, Kōtoku Shūsui and Sakai Toshihiko in November 1903. It was published as a weekly paper until January 1905, when it was forced to close by the Japanese government. *Heimin Shinbun* was re-launched as a daily paper (except on Mondays) in January 1907, but was closed again in April 1907. "Yōfu Shimoda Utako" was published between 24 February 1907 and 13 April 1907 (uncompleted).

² Itō Hirobumi (1841-1909) was the first prime Minister of Japan, who played the crucial role in drafting the Meiji Constitution of 1889 based on the model of the German Second Reich Constitution. Itō served four times as the Prime Minister as well as serving as the Resident General of Korea between 1905 and 1909 before his assassination by a Korean nationalist, An Jung-geun 安重根. Yamagata Aritomo (1838-1922) was a Field Marshall of the Imperial Japanese Army who promoted securing control of Korea as it was strategically positioned like "A Dagger Pointed at the Heart of Japan." Yamagata also served as Prime Minister twice. Inoue Kaoru (1836-1915) was one of the Meiji oligarchs who occupied some of the nation's most important ministry offices in his career such as Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Interior, Agriculture and Commerce, etc.

wing politicians, the fact that the author of the story chose Shimoda to be the main character demonstrates the prominent position and celebrity she held in early twentieth-century Japan.³

Shimoda Utako, who promoted the concept that women should strive to be "good wives and wise mothers (*ryōsai kenbo* 良妻賢母)" came to the public's attention as a pioneer of Japanese women's education. Because of her right-wing royalist proclivities and her support of Japan's territorial expansion, Shimoda is generally considered a conservative, but close examination of her works pertaining to her conceptualization of Eastern and Western societies reveals that she considered herself as part of the *Secchūha* 折衷派 or advocates of combining Eastern and Western customs and institutions.⁴ During the Meiji Era (1868-1912), she perceived that the East was well behind the West in many different ways, including the status of women; but instead of advocating the adoption of Western institutions and customs in their entirety, Shimoda advocated retaining the Eastern base, while selectively choosing to incorporate some specific aspects of Western civilization in order to "enrich and strengthen" Japan.⁵

Indeed, Shimoda's views of East and West were closely connected to her nationalistic concerns; she advocated greater roles and responsibilities for Japanese women for the sake of "enriching and strengthening" the state. She viewed individual homes to be the basic building blocks of a society, and considered women's roles at home to be critical for Japan's future. For her, men and women were fundamentally different in physical strength, biological functions, and mental capacities. She fully accepted the traditional Confucian (and Victorian) notion of gender

³ The author of the articles is said to be Fukao Shō 深尾韶.

⁴ Shimoda Utako, *Fujin jōshiki no yōsei* 婦人常識の養成 [Cultivations of Women's Common Sense] (Tokyo: Jitsugyō no Nihonsha, 1910), 25-26.

roles and separate spheres for male and female; she considered the public sphere to be the realm of men and the private sphere to be the domain of women. These two spheres were closely connected in Shimoda's mind; she perceived women in the private sphere (the household) as helping her husband and children fulfill their roles as honorable, hard-working, and loyal citizens of the public sphere, thereby contributing to the building of a strong Japanese state.

For Shimoda, the West represented the rich, powerful, and civilized polity that Japan was striving to become. Therefore, the West became the standard against which Shimoda measured Japan's progress. Shimoda believed there was much to learn from Western society, especially from those who were of the same gender, so that Japan could achieve its glory and prosperity. Against this baseline of the West, Shimoda identified Japan and other East Asian societies to be the East. Among Eastern countries, Shimoda felt that only Japan was in a position to compete with the West and she envisioned that it was Japan's divine destiny to lead the East into civilization.

Brief Biography

Shimoda Utako was born in 1854, as Hirao Seki 平尾鉞, a year after Commodore Perry's initial arrival and the same year that Japan ended its isolationist policy by signing the US-Japan Friendship Treaty.⁶ Her samurai-class family surnamed Hirao lived in Iwakara (part of today's

⁶ There are only a limited numbers of secondary sources on Shimoda Utako, most of these being non-academic biographies in Japanese. A few short biographies were written during Shimoda's lifetime, such as those in *Jinbutsu gaden* 人物画伝 [Biographies] compiled by Ōsaka Asahi Shinbunsha (Tokyo: Yūrakusha, 1907); Sase Suibai 佐瀬酔梅, *Tōsei katsujin ga* 当世活人画 [Portraits of Distinguished Individuals of the Day] (Tokyo: Shunyōdō, 1900); and Miyoshi Etsunan 三好鉞南, *Chōya no jinbutsu* 朝野の人物 [Distinguished Individuals] (Tokyo: Shōbundō, 1911), as well as biographies written shortly after Shimoda's death, such as Nishio Toyosaku 西尾豊作, *Shimoda Utako den* 下田歌子傳 [A Biography of Shimoda Utako] (Tokyo: Kōsaijuku, 1936); Hirao

Gifu prefecture), which was under the control of the Matsudaira branch of the Shogun's family. Her father and grandfather were Confucian scholars who took a loyalist stance toward the Emperor, instilling in the young Shimoda a strong sense of devotion to the royal family. Their loyalty to the Emperor put her family at odds with their local Matsudaira lords, and eventually led to the trouble for the family. Shimoda benefited from being the first child born to an aging couple, since she spent the first six or seven years of her life, prior to her brother's birth, as an only child and was able to study the Confucian Classics, an education considered essential for samurai men. An exceptionally bright and gifted child, Shimoda was said to have read all the books in her family library, both in Classical Chinese and Japanese. She excelled in composing poems in both the Chinese and Japanese styles. However, Shimoda's childhood was not necessarily an easy one; her family's pro-Imperial stance, despite living in an area ruled by the

Kazuko 平尾寿子, *Shimoda Utako kaisō roku* 下田歌子回想録 [Remembering Shimoda Utako] (Tokyo: Sanyōsha, 1942); and Jissen Jogakkō ko Shimoda kōchō sensei denki hensanjo 実践女学校故下田校長先生伝記編纂所, *Shimoda Utako sensei den* 下田歌子先生伝 [Stories of Shimoda Utako Sensei] (Tokyo: Ōzorasha, 1989 [orig. 1943]). These biographies, written during the 1930s and 1940s, have a propagandistic quality, justifying Japan's position in wartime and promoting Shimoda's position as a patriotic woman. The more recent biographies have been largely written by novelists and tend to focus on her love life and the scandals associated with her, often including fictional conversations between Shimoda and her lovers. The books in this category include, Shimoda Kageki 志茂田景樹, *Hana no arashi: Meiji no jotei, Shimoda Utako no ai to yabō* 花の嵐：明治の女帝・下田歌子の愛と野望 [The Storm of Flowers: the Queen of Meiji era, Shimoda Utako's Love and Ambition] (Kyoto: PHP Kenkyūsho, 1984); and Nanjō Norio 南条範夫, *Yōketsu Shimoda Utako* 妖傑下田歌子 [Beautiful and Strong Shimoda Utako] (Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1994). Finally, there are short biographies based on the older published biographies such as Iwahashi Kunie 岩橋邦枝, "Shimoda Utako," in Seto'uchi Harumi 瀬戸内晴海 ed., *Meiji ni kaikashita saientachi* 明治に開花した才媛たち [Talented Women who Blossomed During the Meiji Era], vol. 2 of *Onna no isshō: jinbutsu kindai joseishi* 女の一生：人物近代女性史 [Women's Lives: Biographical History of Modern Japanese Women] (Tokyo: Kōdansha 1980), 63-98; and Oyama Itoko 小山いと子, "Shimoda Utako," in Enchi Fumiko 円地文子 ed. *Kyōiku bungaku eno reimei* 教育・文学への黎明 [The Dawn of Education and Literature], vol. 12 of *Jinbutsu Nihon no joseishi* 人物日本の女性史 [History of Japanese Women through Biographies] (Tokyo: Shūeisha, 1978), 113-150 (contains imaginary conversations). There is also a novel based on Shimoda by Hayashi Mariko 林真理子, *Mikado no onna* ミカドの淑女 [The Lady of the Emperor] (Tokyo: Shinchōsha, 1990).

Shogun's family, resulted in her grandfather's expulsion from the Matsudaira domain and her father's house arrest.

In 1870, her father, now freed from house arrest, decided to go to Tokyo to become an official in the new Meiji government. Shimoda, then about 16 years old, went with him. In Tokyo, Shimoda met her grandfather for the first time, living with him for a year. This brief time with her grandfather had a great influence upon Shimoda, especially her grandfather's conviction that "a woman should act like a woman (*josei wa josei rashiku* 女性は女性らしく)." During her time in Tokyo, between 1872 and 1879, Shimoda worked in the Imperial court as one of the ladies-in-waiting.⁷ Though she started in the lowest ranking position, Shimoda distinguished herself with her talent in composing Japanese style poems, elevating her position, until she became a favorite companion of the Empress. Indeed, it was the Empress who awarded Shimoda the epithet of "Utako" or "the poetess."⁸ Court life afforded Shimoda the opportunity to attend classes and lectures, including French language lessons. While serving in the court, Shimoda established important political connections with such prominent figures as Itō Hirobumi, Yamagata Aritomo, and Inoue Kaoru. These connections proved essential for the success of Shimoda's future career. As one of the favorite ladies-in-waiting, Shimoda was asked to assist the Empress on her educational projects beginning in 1875. This opportunity provided Shimoda with valuable experience to form the foundation of her future career as leader of the Japanese women's education movement.

⁷ Ladies-in-waiting were chosen from the daughters of nobility or *daimyo* [feudal lords], but after the Meiji Restoration, the daughters of former samurai came to be employed in the role.

⁸ "Uta" meaning song or poetry and "ko," a generic ending for women's names.

In November 1879, Shimoda resigned from the Imperial court to marry Shimoda Takeo 下田猛雄, a man her family had chosen. Her new husband was unfortunately an alcoholic suffering from a serious stomach ailment. As a result, until his death in 1884, Shimoda spent much of her married life taking care of her infirm husband. While dealing with her husband's illness, she was still able to open her home as a private school for girls over the age of 10 in 1881. Her powerful acquaintances from court urged her to establish the school because they wished to provide a proper education for their daughters but no such school existed at the time. The school was also a way for Shimoda to earn a desperately needed income. Yet, Shimoda never let her role as teacher take her away from her husband, going to him whenever he called for her even in the middle of lectures, a model of the devoted wife.

When the Empress decided to establish Kazoku Jogakkō 華族女學校 or the Girl's School for the Nobility in 1883, Shimoda Utako was asked to assist in the venture. Initially she declined the offer due to her husband's condition, but after his death in 1884, she accepted the position of assistant principal (*gakkan* 學監). At Kazoku Jogakkō, Shimoda taught ethics (*shūshin* 修身) and home economics, while also authoring a few textbooks.

In 1893, Shimoda Utako was sent to the West to gather information about educational programs for aristocratic female students. She spent a total of two years overseas, visiting the United Kingdom, France, Switzerland, Belgium, Italy, Austria, Germany, the United States, and Canada. Of all the places she visited, she stayed the longest in the United Kingdom, over a year, allowing her to acquire the ability to communicate in English. Shimoda was also given the rare opportunity to meet Queen Victoria, a very important event for her since she was a great admirer of the queen. Upon returning to Japan, she continued to work for the upper-class school, *Kazoku*

Jogakkō (later absorbed into *Gakushūin* 學習院 where she continued to work) She also began contemplating how to provide an education for middle- and lower-class women. In 1899, Shimoda founded a school for middle-class girls, *Jissen Jogakkō* 實踐女學校, or Practical School for Women (later Jissen Women's University), and the same year a school for lower-class girls, *Joshi Kōgei Gakkō* 女子工藝學校 [Women's Vocational Craft School].⁹

As a widow with no children, she kept herself extremely busy with numerous activities such as serving as a private tutor for two imperial princesses (Tsunemiya 常宮 and Kanemiya 周宮 from 1896), establishing Aikoku Fujinkai 愛國婦人會 or the Patriotic Women's Association (1901), as well as writing numerous books and articles. In 1907, she decided to concentrate her efforts on the education of middle and lower-class women and withdrew herself from her activities working with the upper-classes. Until her death at the age of 83 in 1936, Shimoda Utako was involved in numerous women's schools, often serving as principal, including Junshin Jogakkō 順心女學校, Ōmi Joshi Jitsumu Gakkō 淡海女子實務學校, Meitoku Jogakkō 明德女學校, and Aikoku Yakan Jogakkō 愛國夜間女學校. The importance of her leading role in developing Japanese women's education is unquestionable, as is her status as one of the most important and powerful women of the Meiji era.

⁹ Shimoda continued to work for *Gakushūin* until 1907. In 1898, she founded *Teikoku fujin kai* 帝國婦人協会, [Japanese] Imperial Women's Association, the mother organization *Jissen Jogakkō* and *Joshi Kōgei Gakkō*. *Joshi Kōgei Gakkō* concentrated on teaching sewing, knitting-crocheting, embroidery, etc. *Joshi Kōgei Gakkō* was absorbed into *Jissen Jogakkō* in 1908. Hirao, *Shimoda Utako kaisō roku*, 193-204.

Overlapping Binaries

Shimoda Utako was a prolific writer of books and articles during her long career. Starting with the publication of a Japanese language textbook in 1885, she went on to author works covering a wide range of topics including literature, history, ethics, manners, cooking, handicrafts, early childhood education, grammar, etc. Shimoda's travels through Europe and North America in 1893-1895, allowed her the rare opportunity to reflect upon the differences and similarities between Western and Eastern women. Her ability to read English and French materials gave her access to many Western publications in which she found inspiring stories and applicable theories to inspire her own writings. She believed that it was particularly beneficial for a young girl's moral development to read stories of exemplary women. Thus, Shimoda wrote many biographies of such women, finding stories from both the Eastern and Western worlds.¹⁰ In her capacities as principal of numerous schools and as leader of several women's associations, Shimoda had many occasions to deliver speeches, many of which were recorded and printed in women's magazines of the time. A careful examination of her Meiji era writings and speeches as they pertain to her conceptualization of East and West reveals that Shimoda Utako's mind operated via a series of overlapping binaries.¹¹

East versus West certainly constituted a major category of comparison for Shimoda, but she also constantly compared and contrasted men and women, old and new, and now and then.

¹⁰ Some examples from the Western worlds (not featured in this paper) include Princess Alice of England, Mrs. Gladstone (Great Britain), Hannah Duston, Dolly Madison (USA), Eleanor of Toledo (Italy), and Charlotte Corday (France).

¹¹ Many of Shimoda's books are available through the digital collection of Japan's National Diet Library. Most of Shimoda's magazine contributions can be found in Itagaki Hiroko ed., *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*. *shiryōhen* [The Collected Works of Shimoda Utako].

To grasp her worldview, it is necessary to analyze her writings within the context of multiple overlapping binaries. Geographically, two conceptual frameworks pairs appear in her writings: Tōyō [East] and Seiyō [West] (or Taisei, "Extreme West"), and the interior (*uchi / nai* 内 or *naichi* 内地 or Japanese homeland) and exterior or foreign lands (*soto / gai* 外 or *gaikoku / totsukuni* 外國). She clearly identifies Japan as belonging to the East (Tōyō) as she oftentimes uses the expression “*waga Tōyō* 我が東洋” or “our East.” The West constitutes the other, and she interchangeably uses the terms Seiyō, Taisei or Ō-Bei 歐米 (Europe and America) to denote the West.¹² The West also represented foreignness, as in the term *gaikoku* (foreign land) when referring to the West. The term *gaikoku* could also mean anywhere not part of the historical Japan, including Europe, America, China, Manchuria, and Korea.¹³ Thus, China and Korea were included as part of Tōyō, but they were also "outside" of Japan. This is most clearly illustrated when Shimoda published a set of books called *Stories of Exemplary Girls of Japan* [*Naikoku Shōjo Kagami* 内國少女鑑 (1901)] and *Stories of Exemplary Girls of Foreign Lands* [*Gaikoku Shōjo Kagami* 外國少女鑑 (1902)]. Where the former was a collection made up of stories of

¹² There are many instances in which Shimoda used the expression "Our East." Some examples can be found in Shimoda Utako, *Taisei fujo fūzoku* 泰西婦女風俗 [Lifestyles of Western Women] (Tokyo: Dai Nihon Jo Gakkai, 1899), 4, 22, 55, 214; "Katei no ōkoku 家庭の王國 [Kingdoms of Home]," *Nihon Fujin*, 28 Jan 1900, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 4, 47-48; "Haha to shite no tainin no han'i 母としての耐忍の範囲 [Limits of Mothers' Patience]," *Nihon Fujin*, 27 Jun. 1900, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 4, 145-152, etc. While Shimoda used the term, Taisei most often, she never used its Eastern counterpart, Taitō. The exact reasoning is not clear, but she seems to have employed three terms to express West, Seiyō, Taisei, and Ō-Bei without much thought in differentiating them. Today, it is rare to see the terms Taisei and Taitō used, but during the Meiji Era, these terms were quite common.

¹³ Historical Japan includes Honshū, Shikoku, Kyūshū, but not Hokkaidō, the northern most of modern Japan's island colonized during the Meiji era.

Japanese girls, the latter involved stories of virtuous girls from Europe, North America, and China.¹⁴

Adding to these geographical layers was a male-female dichotomy that Shimoda Utako perceived so clearly. Her Confucian upbringing, combined with her experiences with Victorian contemporaries made her visualize a clear division along gender lines where men belonged to the public or outside (*soto* 外) world and women to the private or inside (*uchi* 内) world, meaning the home.¹⁵ In 1900, Shimoda wrote:

The most distinctive characteristics of men is [their ability to exercise] power. The most distinctive characteristics of women is [their ability to] influence. As powerful as they may be, [men] cannot exert gentle and peaceful influence [like women]. Men lead with principle; women persuade people with emotion. Men's sphere is in society; women's heaven is in the household. Men lead with their brains; women work through their spirit. The logic and reason that men use do not speak [to people's hearts] directly as does the

¹⁴ Shimoda Utako, *Naikoku shōjo kagami* 内國少女鑑 [Stories of Exemplary Girls of Japan] (Tokyo: Hakubunkan, 1901); Shimoda Utako, *Gaikoku shōjo kagami* 外國少女鑑 [Stories of Exemplary Girls of Foreign Lands] (Tokyo: Hakubunkan, 1902).

¹⁵ Confucianism emphasizes "proper behavior" of individuals based upon one's relationship with another person. The relationship between husband and wife is recognized as one of the "five cardinal relationships" and teaches "wifely" virtues such as "compliance" (Ch. *shun*, Jp. *jun* 順) and "chastity" (Ch. *jie*, Jp. *setsu* 節). Confucius himself had almost nothing to say about women, but later Confucians (female writers) wrote books on women and how they should behave. Some of the examples of Confucian texts on women includes Liu Xiang 劉向, *Biographies of Virtuous Women* (*Lienü zhuan* 列女傳, 1st century BCE), Ban Zhao 班昭, *Admonitions for Women* (*Nüjie* 女誡, 1st-2nd century CE), the *Classic of Filiality for Women* (*Nü xiaojing* 女孝經, Tang Dynasty), and Song Rozhao 宋若昭, *Analecets for Women* (*Nü lunyu* 女論語, Tang dynasty). In these works, Confucianism emphasizes the role of women in the household. For more information, see William Theodore De Bary, Irene Bloom, Wing-tsit Chan, Joseph Adler, and Richard John Lufrano, eds., *Sources of Chinese Tradition*. vol. 1, 2nd ed., 819-840.

When Shimoda Utako visited late nineteenth Victorian England and encountered its emphasis on separation of men's and women's spheres, she probably found it compatible to her Asian heritage. For more discussion of Victorian culture, Robert Shoemaker and Mary Vincent, ed., *Gender and History in Western Europe* (London: Arnold, 1998), 177-225; Susan Kingsley Kent, *Gender and Power in Britain, 1640-1990* (London and New York: Rutledge, 1999); and Martha Vicinus ed., *A Widening Sphere: Changing Roles of Victorian Women* (Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press, 1977), etc.

sincerity of women. Men control society indirectly; women influence individuals directly. Men lead the world with principle; women save the people with sympathy. . . .¹⁶

Shimoda perceived a fundamental difference between men and women that combined to form a mutually complementary relationship between the two; neither was complete without the other. For Shimoda, the division was divinely ordained, and she frequently spoke of "women's heavenly ordained occupation (*joshi no tenshoku* 女子の天職 or *joshi ga tempu no shokumu* 女子が天賦の職務)" as wives, mothers, and household managers.¹⁷ With this understanding of gender separation and her understanding of Western women from her travels, Shimoda decided that both Western and Eastern women were of the "same gender" (*dōsei* 同性), playing a similar societal role even though they belonged to very different geo-cultural entities.¹⁸ She believed that Eastern women could learn a great deal from their Western counterparts and Shimoda found examples of exemplary figures from both the Eastern and Western worlds. Thus, her book

¹⁶ Shimoda Utako, "Katei no ōkoku," *Nihon Fujin*, 28 January 1900, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 4, 47-48. Translated from 男子の特質は、権力なり。女子の特質は勢力なり。権力いかに強大なりといふとも、勢力の温和圓滿なるが如きこと能はず。男子は、主義を以て世に立ち、女子は感情を以て、人を服す。男子の及ぼす範囲は社會に在り。女子の働く天國は家門にあり。男子は腦髓を以て立ち、女子は靈心を以て働く。男子の唱ふる道理は、女子の訴ふる眞情にしかず。男子は、間接に社會を風靡するも、女子は直接に個人を感化す。男子は主義を以て世を導き、女子は同感を以て人を救ふ。 . . .

¹⁷ Shimoda's idea of "heaven" appears to be the traditional East Asian concept of 天 *ten* (Ch. *tian*), a somewhat vague and impersonal entity. Some examples of "women's heavenly ordained occupation" can be found, in *Taisei fujo fūzoku* 泰西婦女風俗, 4, 7, 14; "Joshi no shōkyoku teki yūki 女子の消極的勇氣 [Women's Quiet Courage]," *Nihon Fujin*, 25 March 1900, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 4, 88-95; "Danjo no tokusei o nobete joshi no tenshoku o ronzu 男女の特性を述べて、女子の天職を論ず [Different Traits between Men and Women, and Women's Heavenly Ordained Occupation]," *Nihon Fujin*, 25 April 1902, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 5, 47-53; "Joshi no tenshoku o mattō suruno michi ikan 女子の天職を全うするの道如何 [How Do We Fulfill Women's Heavenly Ordained Occupation]," *Nihon Fujin*, 25 August 1902, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 5, 103-109, etc.

¹⁸ Shimoda Utako, "Nijūseiki ni okeru joshi no chii 廿世紀に於る女子の地位 [The Status of Women in the Twentieth Century] in *Nihon Fujin*, 25 January 1901, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 4, 245-251.

Ryōsai to kenbo 良妻と賢母 [*Good Wives and Wise Mothers* (1912)], contains chapters on "Western Good Wives" and "Western Wise Mothers" as well as "Eastern Good Wives" and "Eastern Wise Mothers."¹⁹ Indeed, Shimoda points out many aspects of Western women that inspired her, and she felt Eastern women could learn and benefit from if adopted. In this manner, she showed that she was open to new ideas and ways of thinking as long as they led to a better life for women and allowed them to excel in their role as good wives and wise mothers.

Shimoda Utako's East and West, and her understandings of Japanese History

For Shimoda Utako, the distinction between Japan or *naichi* 内地 (the interior) and foreign lands (*gaikoku* 外国) was simply geographical, while the difference between the East and West was cultural. Shimoda observed regional and national variations in the West, but she also saw a cultural commonality in the teachings of Christianity. The East was less well defined, but Shimoda seemed to envision it as an East Asian culture zone historically under the influence of China and its Confucian heritage. The division may also have been based not only on cultural differences, but also racial differences between Europeans and East Asians. When Shimoda learned of the raping and killing of Chinese women by foreign soldiers during the Boxer Rebellion (1899-1901), she expressed her anger toward Westerners who claimed to have come to China "in the name of civilization and humanity."²⁰ She was enraged by the fact that so many

¹⁹ Shimoda Utako, *Ryōsai to kenbo* 良妻と賢母 [*Good Wives and Wise Mothers*] (Tokyo: Toyamabō, 1912).

²⁰ The Boxer Rebellion is generally considered an anti-foreign movement reacting to an increased foreign presence after China's defeat in the Sino-Japanese War. Since the movement targeted foreign businesses and Christian churches, it was suppressed by a coalition of eight nations consisting of Japan, Russia, Great Britain, France, the United State, Germany, Italy, and Austria-Hungary.

Westerners who purportedly valued "humanity" were so apathetic to the atrocities taking place in China. In her writings of the time, Shimoda calls special attention to racial commonalities by referring to Chinese women as *dōhō* 同胞 (of the same womb) implying a biological or racial connection between Chinese and Japanese women.²¹ In other works she assigns the designation of *dōhō* also to Korean women, but never to Western ones.²²

Shimoda saw vast differences in the status of women in Eastern and Western societies. Eastern societies tended to "value men and demean women (*danson jōhi* 男尊女卑)," while Western societies did the opposite, that is, "value women and demean men (*jōson danhi* 女尊男卑)."²³ She partly attributed the difference to the institution of marriage since the West based its practices on the teachings of Christianity and adhered to monogamy, while the East (at least the upper classes) practiced polygamy. Men having mistresses or concubines in the East was traditionally socially accepted and even expected, while in the West, Shimoda observed that women did not tolerate men's infidelity. As an example, Shimoda explained that while staying in Britain she came across an incident where a woman was ostracized by the other ladies of her status because she decided to forgive and marry her unfaithful fiancé. In contrast Shimoda observed that historically in the East, wives who accepted their husband's mistresses and

²¹ Shimoda Utako, "Dōhō josei no fukō o kanashimu 同胞女性の不幸を悲しむ [Expressing Sadness for the Tragedies of Chinese Women]," *Nihon Fujin*, 25 March 1901. in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 4, 265-273.

²² Shimoda Utako calls Korean women "*dōhō*" and "sisters" in "Aikoku Fujinkai sōritsu tōji o natsukau 愛國婦人會創立當時を懷ふ [Recalling the Founding of the Patriotic Women's Association]," *Aikoku Fujin*, 1 March 1911, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 2, 111-112. Shimoda uses the term *dōhō* when Westerners were referring to other Westerners, but they were not considered her *dōhō*. See Shimoda Utako, *Taisei shoken katei kyōiku* 泰西所見 家庭教育 [Observations of Western Home Education] (Tokyo: Hakubunkan, 1901), 133-134.

²³ Shimoda Utako, *Ryōsai to kenbo*, 2; Shimoda Utako, *Fujin jōshiki no yōsei*, 16.

concubines without causing any problems were praised as good wives.²⁴ Shimoda saw that Western women had developed self-respect, pride, and dignity to a point where they were actually cherished and respected by men. She was truly "surprised that unlike in Japan, husbands were so kind to wives" in Western society.²⁵ Shimoda hoped that the recent introduction of monogamy in Japan would bring improvements to the treatment of Eastern women in the future.

Shimoda saw commonalities between Eastern societies with their tendency to demean women. In her publications and speeches aimed at Japanese audiences, however, her discussion of Eastern women usually centered on Japanese women.²⁶ She identified Confucianism, Buddhism, and the rise of the warrior class as historical factors that led to the subjugation of women in Japan. Prior to the introduction of Confucianism and Buddhism, Shimoda argued, the Japanese did not adhere to the concept of "value men and demean women."²⁷ In order to prove her point, Shimoda cited the mythology of the genesis of Japan by the god Izanami and goddess Izanagi, who had a monogamous relationship.²⁸ According to mythology, the two deities made children by each circling around a heavenly pillar in opposite directions. When the two met by

²⁴ Shimoda Utako, *Ryōsai to kenbo*, 30-52; Shimoda Utako, *Taisei fujo fūzoku*, 218-224.

²⁵ Shimoda Utako, *Taisei fujo fūzoku*, 20. Translated from . . . その日本の風俗と異なりて夫が妻に対する務めの甚だ懇篤親切なるに驚きたりき。

²⁶ According to Joan Judge, "Talent, Virtue, and the Nation: Chinese Nationalisms and Female Subjectivities in the Early Twentieth Century," *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 106, No. 3 (June 2001), 765-803, when Shimoda addressed Chinese audiences, she projected herself more as a Pan-Asianist rather than a Japanese nationalist. Some of the speeches she gave to Chinese audiences were translated and only available in Chinese publications. (She would have been able to read Chinese due to her Confucian background, and she took lessons in conversational Chinese, but she still gave speeches in Japanese to Chinese audiences).

²⁷ Shimoda Utako, *Fujin jōshiki no yōsei*, 1-16. Shimoda states that Confucianism was introduced to Japan in 285 CE (Japanese Imperial Year 944), and Buddhism in 551 CE (JIY 1212) in her *Japanese History Textbook for Girls* [*Joshi Nihon rekishi kyōkasho* 女子日本歴史教科書] (Tokyo: Bungakusha, 1903) vol. 1, 29, 39-40.

²⁸ Shimoda Utako, *Ryōsai to kenbo*, 33.

the pillar for the first time, the goddess spoke first, resulting in the birth of an unsatisfactory child (the leech-child). Thereafter, it was decided that men should speak first, establishing the principle that "man leads, and woman follows." Shimoda fully accepted men's leadership based on mythology, but she argued strongly that this form of leadership did not mean subjugation of women. She explained that it was more like geese flying in formation with the second goose flying slightly behind its leader (*gankō*雁行). This was not an act of subjugation or domination; it was simply understanding one's place in the formation. She also pointed out that there was a strong sense of reverence toward the Sun Goddess, Amaterasu, from whom the royal family traced its ancestry, serving as evidence that the Japanese had not thought of women as inferiors in ancient times, since the very foundation of the imperial family rested on its ties to a goddess rather than a god.²⁹

Furthermore, ancient Japanese history provided Shimoda with numerous examples of brave and strong women, especially those who accompanied their husbands into battle or to stand and face an enemy on their own. An example of one of Shimoda's favorite heroines was Empress Jingū 神功 (c. 170-269 CE) who continued to lead the Japanese invasion of Korea even after the demise of her husband, Emperor Chūai 仲哀 (r. 178-200 CE).³⁰ She also praised a woman named Ōbako 大葉子 (6th century) who, like Empress Jingū, accompanied her

²⁹ Shimoda Utako, *Fujin jōshiki no yōsei*, 2-5.

³⁰ Empress Jingū's biography can be found in Shimoda Utako, "Jingū Kōgō 神功皇后 [The Empress Jingū]," *Onna*, 15 June 1902, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 1, 91-93, and *Aikoku Fujin*, 25 May 1902, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 2, 5-6. Other references to the Empress can be found in Shimoda Utako, *Fujin jōshiki no yōsei*, 6-16, *Joshi Nihon rekishi kyōkasho*, vol. 1, 26-28; *Joshi Nihon shō rekishi* 女子日本小歴史 [Short History of Japan for Girls] (Tokyo: Banshōsha, 1902), 8-9, etc.

commander husband on a different unsuccessful military expedition to Korea (Silla). After her husband was killed in battle, Ōbako continued to encourage her husband's Japanese soldiers to keep fighting. Her determination so enraged the king of Silla that he had Ōbako executed. Shimoda described the death of Ōbako as "*chūshi* 忠死" or "a loyal death."³¹

While Shimoda saw many examples of strong women like Jingū and Ōbako in ancient Japanese history, the instances of such women, or at least records of them, began to diminish as new ideas came to Japan from overseas. With the introduction of Confucianism and Buddhism, Shimoda saw that the two foreign teachings brought with them the detrimental concept of "value men and demean women." Confucianism introduced the concept that women had to follow "three forms of obedience (*san jū* 三従)": obey your father as a daughter, obey your husband as a wife, and obey your son as an aging mother. In addition to these three requirements, Confucianism also introduced seven conditions where a husband could or should divorce his wife: disobedience, promiscuity, failing to bear children, being jealous, too talkative, stealing, and having a bad disease.³² She also blamed Buddhism for a decline in women's status because Japanese Buddhism traditionally taught that women could not be saved because women were too

³¹ Ōbako's biography can be found in *Onna*, 15 Jan 1903, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 1, 121-122, and *Aikoku Fujin*, 10 June 1903, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 2, 61-62. The word "*chūshi* 忠死" appears in "Joshi to kokka no genki to 女子と國家の元氣と [Women and Wellness of the State]," *Nihon Josei*, 25 February 1900, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 4, 66-75. She also mentions Ōbako on other occasions. See "Kaikoku no josei wa umi o osorubekarazu 海國の女性は海を恐るべからず [Women of Maritime Nation Should Not Fear the Sea]," *Onna*, 15 August 1904, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 1, 193-199; *Joshi Nihon shō rekishi*, 13-14.

³² Shimoda Utako, "Joshi no tenshoku o mattō suru no michi ikan," *Nihon Fujin*, 25 August 1902, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 5, 103-109; "Toshi tachikeru hi 年たちける日 [A Day in a Year]," *Nihon Fujin*, 25 January 1903, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 5, 151-153. Shimoda did not go into detail on three obediences and seven conditions for divorce in her writings, as such concepts were probably part of common knowledge of time. These concepts were especially emphasized after a Japanese Confucian Scholar Kaibara Ekken 貝原益軒 published *Onna daigaku* [The Great Learning for Women] in 1716.

sinful.³³ While these two foreign teachings began to erode the status of women in Japan, Shimoda did acknowledge that daughters of the aristocracy were valued for political reasons and enjoyed a high status, but this too would be challenged by the ascendancy of the warrior class in the twelfth century.³⁴

According to Shimoda, it was the rise of the warrior class during the late Heian Era (c.1185-1192) that caused women's social status to truly decline. Shimoda explained that during the period of warfare, women who were no match in physical strength to men came to be considered useless, eventually turning them into "men's slaves or material possessions":³⁵

Our countrywomen's social status has sunk so deep in the last 700 years during the period of warrior rule to the present that we no longer seem to belong to the same race as men. Whether it was appropriate or not, reasonable or not, women had to uphold the teachings of three obediences, which did not allow women to gain any independence. Consequently, the pressures placed upon good and meek women were tremendous, though no comparison to the pressures placed upon non-virtuous women who did not follow such teachings. . . .³⁶

³³ Shimoda Utako, *Fujin jōshiki no yōsei*, 6-16. It should be noted that the Buddhism introduced to Japan was significantly different from what Gautama Siddhartha originally taught. Buddhism was introduced to Japan in the 6th century CE via Korea, about 1000 years after it was established. Gautama Buddha accepted female followers to the Order, indicating Buddhism originally taught women were as capable of attaining Nirvana as men. Later Buddhism, however, developed the ideology that women were not capable to become a Buddha. Thus, the concept of reincarnation came to imply the very fact of being born as a woman meant that they were too sinful in their past lives.

³⁴ Shimoda Utako, *Fujin jōshiki no yōsei*, 6-8.

³⁵ Shimoda Utako, *Fujin jōshiki no yōsei*, 10. Translated from 男子の奴隸か器物.

³⁶ Shimoda Utako, "Toshi tachikeru hi," *Nihon Fujin*, 25 January 1903, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 5, 151-153. Translated from . . . わが國婦人社會の沈淪は、殆ど、七百有餘年、武家專政時代よりこなた、今日の久しきに亙りて、遂に、男子とは、同一人種の如くならざきが如き感あるに至れき。即ち、女子は、可と無く不可と無く、理と無く非理と無く、たゞゞ、それ彼の三從の教を一任して、毫も、自主獨立の活動を許さざりし結果、その抑壓の重量は、善良和順の女子にのみ加はること、甚しくして、その道を逸せる、不義不徳の女子には、更に、この壓力、及ぶこと能はざりき。

As a result of prolonged oppression, women came to lose their sense of dignity, resulting in the development of a slavish mentality. Understandably, Shimoda viewed the period of warrior rule as the low point in Japanese women's history.³⁷

Shimoda perceived the Meiji era as a transitional period [*hensen jidai* 変遷時代 / *kato jidai* 過渡時代] when Japanese women were just starting to liberate themselves from this long period of oppression, reviving the high status that ancient Japanese women had enjoyed.³⁸ For Shimoda, the Meiji era represented so many new experiences for Japanese people, and she viewed many of these as restoring Japanese women back to the status of their ancestors. Having seen the West, Shimoda knew her countrywomen were well behind the women of the strong, rich, and "civilized countries (*bunmeikoku* 文明國)" of the West, but she had high hopes that the difficulties could be overcome and Japanese women could ascend to their rightful and former respected place in society. To this goal, she dedicated her life.

West as "Civilization"

Shimoda Utako appears to have accepted Fukuzawa Yukichi's three-stage development of society from barbarism (*yaban* 野蛮) to semi-civilization or "yet-to-be civilized" (*mikai* 未開)

³⁷ Other articles that expressed Shimoda's view of Japanese history include, Shimoda Utako, "Joshi to kokka no genki to," *Nihon Josei*, 25 February 1900, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 4, 66-75; "Joshi no shin'iku ni tsukite 女子の心育に就きて [On Women's Spiritual Education]," *Nihon Fujin*, 28 July 1901, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 4, 320-325.

³⁸ There are many instances where Shimoda mentions that Japan is in a transitional period [*hensen jidai* 変遷時代 / *kato jidai* 過渡時代]. Examples can be found Shimoda Utako, "Joshi no shōkyoku teki yūki," *Nihon Fujin*, 25 March 1900, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 4, 88-95; "Tsuma to shite no tainin no han'i 妻としての耐忍の範囲 [Limits of Wives' Patience] *Nihon Fujin*, 26 May 1900, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 4, 128-135. *Fujin Jōshiki no yōsei*, 17 speaks of "shin kyū kato jidai konton shakai 新舊過渡時代混沌社會" or "chaotic society of the transition period from old to new."

to civilization (*bunmei*文明).³⁹ In this scheme, civilization is a stage of development rather than a geographical category, and Shimoda considered Meiji Japan to be in an "era of transition [*hensen jidai*変遷時代 / *kato jidai* 過渡時代]" from semi-civilization (*mikai*) to civilization (*bunmei*). The West, on the other hand, had already reached the stage of "civilization" in Shimoda's mind. She advocated that Japan needed to catch up with the West in order to become an equal.

However, Shimoda did not feel that catching up with the West meant Japan had to abandon its traditional customs and adopt all things Western. She considered herself to be a moderate reformer, belonging to the *Secchūha*折衷派 who pursued the middle road between the extremes of radical Westernizers who wanted to abandon Japanese ways (there were those who even advocated abandoning speaking Japanese and adopting English as the new language), and conservatives who rejected everything Western, clinging to the old traditions. She thought it was unreasonable to simply apply Western theories and practices to Japan since it had a unique preexisting society so different from the West. She appreciated the introduction of women's education resulting from the Western encounter, but she felt that it was a "direct interpretation" of a Western model that did not fit Japan's societal needs. For example, Shimoda pointed out that Japanese had to cook their staple food (rice) everyday, whereas their Western counterparts would simply purchase bread from a bakery; Japanese women tailored their own clothes while Western women could have professional tailors do the job. She felt that Western women's education was not working well in Japan and sought to make women's education more

³⁹ Shimoda Utako, *Joshi Nihon rekishi kyōkasho*, vol. 1, 1.

"practical" for Japan's needs.⁴⁰ Therefore, what she advocated was not wholesale adoption, but the combining of the best from both East and West:

. . . the combination theory holds that the Japanese nation has historically developed its own pure character, but at the same time, as citizens of a changing world who breathe the new air, recognizes the need for change. It seeks to elevate Japanese woman's character and knowledge by taking the most beautiful and most important [aspects] from both East and West of old and new times, and not rushing into new [ways] or blindly adhering to old [customs]. There is no question that this is a much more reasonable and solid theory than the ones advocated by radicals who ignore Japan's national polity [*kokutai*國體] or those theories advocated by conservatives who ignore the changing tide of the world.⁴¹

For Shimoda, there were many things that Japan could learn from the West, but she insisted that traditional Japan be used as the base, as if it were a painting, and bits and pieces of Western culture and customs would be added as "colors" to make Japan better. Instead of copying the West, she wanted to selectively learn from the West and then adapt the new ideas in a way that would allow them to fit Japan. Shimoda saw, for example, the positive effect Christianity had on the Western society, but rather than simply advocating Christianity, she encouraged the Japanese to embrace some sort of religious belief, "worshipping whichever god or Buddha" they preferred

⁴⁰ Shimoda Utako, "Joshi gakkō no sotsugyōsei ha jissai yakuni tatanuka 女子学校の卒業生は實際役に立たぬか[Are Graduates of Women's School Really Useless?]," *Fujin Sekai*, 1 January 1911, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 7, 12-24.

⁴¹ Shimoda Utako, *Fujin jōshiki no yōsei*, 25-26. Translated from . . . 折衷説は、一方には日本の國家として、此迄歴史的に經て來た所の、純粹の性質があり、又一方には、世の推し移りからして、新空氣を呼吸する所の國民として 何うしてもなければならぬ要點があるといふので御座いますから、新に奔らず舊に偏せず、東西古今に通じて、其中の最も美しい點を取り、最も大切な部分を擧げて、之れで以て日本の女子の品性と智識とを高めやうとするのであります。日本の國體を無視する急進主義の人や、世界の風潮を度外視する保守主義の人の説 に比べて慥かに確實で、又緊要な説である事は云ふまでもありますまい。

as long as the religion did "not interfere with national polity (*kokutai*) or compromise the way of loyalty to the Emperor."⁴²

Shimoda did not develop an elaborate theory of "civilization," but generally associated the term with "order (*chitsujo* 秩序)," "regulations (*kiritsu* 規律)," and general advancements in society. Shimoda explains:

What does it mean [to reach a state of] civilization? It means developing a complete set of institutions and customs that control all aspects of citizens' lives. It means a pleasant and harmonious family life, a well-organized and beautiful society, and people demonstrating good and gentle manners. Everything aspect of social life such as law, education, commerce, and agriculture would be well-organized, orderly, and well-established. An enviable system is established that allows the orderly conduct of citizens, both from an emotional and logical basis, when dealing with events as small as family issues and ranging all the way to complex matters like the nation's economy. Citizens live vibrant lives in such societies where everyone believes that all people [have a right] to live [their lives to the fullest extent].⁴³

For Shimoda, civilization meant having an orderly society that would allow people to realize their heavenly given potential. It required the development of a system that would protect those lacking physical strength so that they could have full lives and be allowed the chance to make important contributions to society. This meant that women needed to be protected and treated

⁴² Shimoda Utako, *Joshi no tsutome* 女子のつとめ[Duties of Women] (Tokyo: Narumidō, 1902), 4-5. Translation based on . . . そは神にても佛にても、また其種類は何にてもよし。たゞ、わが國體に舐觸せず、わが忠君の道に違背せずば. . .

⁴³ Shimoda, "Nijūseiki ni okeru joshi no chii," *Nihon Fujin*, 25 January 1901, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 4, 245-251. Translated from 抑も、文明とはいかなるものぞ。渾て、國民の生活に關する、制度、習慣全體の完全に發達したるを云えるにて、家庭の清快圓滿なる、社會の整頓完美せる、風俗の善良溫厚なる、其他、法律、教育、商業、及び農事に至る迄、みなことごとく、秩序整頓、基礎鞏固なる等、小は一身一家の生計より、大は、國家の經濟に至る迄、之を人情に訴ふるも、之を道理に爭ふも、いかにしても、慕ふべく羨むべき組織實行の相ひ伴ひつゝある、人事萬端の活氣ありて然る所の生活は、生活に生きとし生ける、各國民の共有すべきものなりとす。

with respect as individuals and in their roles as wives, mothers, and the mistresses of the household.

In civilized states, women not only contributed to society by running their households and raising responsible new citizens, they also often extended their influence to society as a whole by reaching out through works of charity:

Women in civilized countries receive an education comparable to men and enjoy health comparable to men. Pleasant Home Kingdoms are being created by daughters, wives and mothers. Having influence, sympathy, good character, and love, women gather together to form a healthy societal paradise. . . . The laws and institutions do not allow the wicked things, the evil things, injustice, unfairness, brutality, oppression, immorality, and irrationality. . . . Women, who are of *our same gender*, devote their lives to philanthropy if they have the necessary time and extra money. . . .⁴⁴ [Emphasis added by the author]

What she meant here by "women in civilized countries" were Western women, who were of the "same gender" as her countrywomen, but had a vastly different position in society. Most likely, she associated "civilization" with what she had witnessed among the middle and upper class women she met during her travels in late nineteenth-century Victorian England. These Victorian women were from good families and had the stability and finances to be able to fulfill the ideals of domesticity and philanthropy that Shimoda wanted so badly for Japanese women. These Victorian women belonged to the "more advanced" zone of an East-West binary, but because they were also of the "same gender" in a male-female binary, they became the measure to which Shimoda measured progress.

⁴⁴ Shimoda Utako, "Nijūseiki ni Okeru joshi no chii," *Nihon Fujin*, 25 January 1901, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 4, 245-251. Translated from 文明の婦人は、男子と雁行すべき教育を受け、男子と随伴すべき健康を有し、清快なる家庭の王國は、賢き女（むすめ）や、妻や、母の手に造られ、健全なる社交の樂園は、感化力あり、同感あり、品性あり、純愛ある、婦人の聚合となり. . . . 邪なるもの、惡なるもの、不正なるもの、不公平なるもの、慘忍なるもの、壓制、無道、非理等は、法律、制度にも、之を許さず. . . . 苟くも、暇あり、餘財あれば、其暇、其餘財の一部は、我等の同性に頼りて、其社會の善事に注がれ. . . .

Shimoda lamented that the benefits of civilization were so slow to extend to Eastern women. At the turn of the century, she had observed huge differences in the ways women were treated by men, as well as the manner in which the women themselves behaved. For Shimoda, Western women had the opportunity to live dignified lives, fulfilling their respectable roles as wives, mothers, and managers of households, in contrast to Japanese women still living under the shackles of old traditions and living like slaves to men. She felt that most Japanese women were still tied to the old virtues of absolute obedience to men, living undignified and miserable lives. According to her thinking, the long history of oppression resulted in Japanese women having a slavish mentality, obeying the orders of men whether it was the right thing to do or not.⁴⁵ Comparing the concept of self-sacrifice in both Eastern and Western traditions, Shimoda commented that Western women, such as Florence Nightingale, undertook selfless acts based on conviction (*kakushin* 確信), while Japanese women oftentimes sacrificed themselves based on tradition and superstition (*meishin* 迷信).⁴⁶ Like her Victorian contemporaries, she accepted the basic principle of women's compliance to men's leadership, but she rejected the notion that men should exercise absolute power over women. She urged women to stand up for justice and scold their husbands if necessary, rather than slavishly complying with whatever commands their husbands ordered. She even recognized that daughters should have the right to express their

⁴⁵ The phrase "slavish obedience (*doreiteki fukujū* 奴隸的服従)" can be found in Shimoda Utako, "Joshi no shōkyoku teki yūki," *Nihon Fujin*, 25 Mar. 1900, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 4, 88-95; The phrase "slave-like position (*doreiteki ichi* 奴隸的位置)" appears in "Meiji sanjūgo nen o mukaete 明治卅五年を迎へて [Welcoming in the 35th year of Meiji Era], *Nihon Fujin*, 25 January 1902, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 5, 1-7; The phrase "slavishly blind obedience (*doreiteki mōjū* 奴隸的盲従)" is in "Joshi no tenshoku o mattō suru no michi ikan," *Nihon Fujin*, 25 August 1902, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 5, 103-109.

⁴⁶ Shimoda Utako, "*Nihon no jotoku ni tsukite* 日本の女徳につきて [On Japanese Women's Virtue], *Aikoku Fujin*, 26 December 1899, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 4, 20-28.

likes and dislikes about any potential spouse that their parents proposed for an arranged marriage. Clearly, she had been inspired by her concept of Western women with their independent minds, strong will, and most importantly, dignity.⁴⁷

Shimoda was not completely against the traditional Eastern virtue of compliance (*jūjun* 柔順 / 従順), but she was against the excessive and unreasonable servility that many Japanese women exhibited. She found the Victorian concept of separate men's and women's spheres to be natural and compatible with her Eastern heritage, especially since it fit in well with the accepted role where women were assigned to be wives, mothers, and the managers of households. To be a good wife (*ryōsai* 良妻), Shimoda thought a woman should be a valuable assistant to her spouse, helping him to succeed, or helping him to do the right thing.⁴⁸ A wife was to help the husband from within (*naijo* 内助, inside help), and supplement his weaknesses with her virtue so that he could be successful in the public sphere. Her stories of exemplary wives came from both Eastern and Western worlds, but Shimoda's chief inspiration for the model of a dignified woman seems to have come from the West, the land of "civilization."

Women were to take charge of their household, and not merely be slaves to men. For Shimoda, being a *shufu* 主婦 (today used to describe married women who do not work outside the home) meant being a female (*fu* 婦) lord and also (*shu* 主) of her own domain within the house. Shimoda envisioned the household as a kingdom, and *shufu* as queens (*jō'ō* 女王) ruling

⁴⁷ Shimoda Utako, "Joshi no tainin no han'i ni tsukite 女子の耐忍の範囲に就きて [On Limitation of Women's Patience]," *Nihon Fujin*, 25 Apr. 1900, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 4, 107-127; "Tsuma to shite no tainin no han'i," *Nihon Fujin*, 26 May 1900, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 4, 128-135.

⁴⁸ Among the Western women Shimoda featured as examples of good wives were Mrs. Bismarck, Dolly Madison and Mrs. David Livingstone

over their own kingdoms. The woman was no longer to be the vine (*tsuta* 蔦) on a tree, hanging onto her husband and completely dependent on him, but rather she should establish a strong footing as the foundation stone (*chūseki* 柱石) of the household.⁴⁹ The man was still considered the head of the household, but Shimoda argues that husbands should entrust household responsibilities to their wives based on the principle of division of labor. Women's primary occupation, according to Shimoda, was to be "the angels of peace at home (*katei ni okeru heiwa no tenshi* 家庭に於る平和の天使)" and to create "happy and peaceful family kingdoms (*en'man kōfuku naru katei no ōkoku* 圓滿幸福なる家庭の王國)." ⁵⁰

Though these concepts may resonate with the Victorian cult of domesticity, Shimoda considered Western women to be more "Queens of social balls" rather than "Queens of the household." For her, Western women in ballroom gowns were like "flowers," who were the showy and flashy queens of social occasions. It was not her intention to turn Japanese women into copies of Western women, but instead she wanted to keep the good management and household attributes of Japanese women while learning concepts such as strength of character and dignity from Western women. Shimoda urged Japanese women to become "fruits rather than flowers." Along this same line, while she wanted Japanese women to catch up with the women of civilized countries, Shimoda certainly did not include the adoption of Western dress and costume. She simply wished for Japanese women to be the queens of their household and

⁴⁹ Shimoda Utako, *Fujin jōshiki no yōsei*, 472; "Shufu no kokoroe 主婦の心得 [Proper Mindset of Shufu]," *Onna* 15 December 1901, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 1, 62-64.

⁵⁰ Shimoda, "Katei no ōkoku," *Nihon Fujin*, 28 January 1900, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 4, 49. Shimoda's use of "angel" imagery is reminiscent of a famous poem by Coventry Patmore, "the Angel in the House" published in 1854, which illustrates the Victorian ideals of womanhood.

the foundation of the family while also retaining the dignity and respect they deserve like their Western counterparts.⁵¹

While Shimoda's idea of femininity was closely tied to the domestic sphere, she also acknowledged that such lifestyles were not for everyone. She was well aware of different household income levels and knew that, for some women, there was no option to stay at home when they were needed to help the family earn a living. When she wrote the book, *Taisei fujo fūzoku* 泰西婦女風俗 [*Lifestyles of Western Women* (1899)], she found it impossible to discuss the subject without dividing women into upper, middle and lower class groups. Shimoda observed that in the West lower class women often ran inns from their homes or worked outside of the house, oftentimes in factories. She noted that in the West there were cheap daycare centers and kindergartens where poor women can drop off their children, allowing them to work.⁵² Her interest in women of the middle and lower classes was stimulated by what she saw in her travels abroad and eventually led Shimoda away from teaching the upper class and towards offering an education to women of more modest means. Upon her return, she founded two schools, Jissen Women's School for the middle class and a vocational school (Joshi Kōgyō Gakkō) for lower classes. While Shimoda stressed that being good wives, wise mothers, and an effective household manager was the ideal goal for women, she also understood the world and realized that in some cases it was not so practical. When it was necessary for survival and/or

⁵¹ Shimoda Utako, "Heikō sōritsu man jusshūnen kinen shukuga shiki hi ni oite 弊校創立滿十周年紀念祝賀式日に於いて [On the Celebration of Ten Year Anniversary of Our School]," *Nihon Fujin*, 15 March 1909, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 6, 320-326; "Joshi sotsugyōsei ni nozomu 女子卒業生に望む[Wishes for the Female Graduates]," *Fujin Sekai*, 3 April 1906, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 7, 2-3.

⁵² Shimoda Utako, *Taisei fujo fūzoku*, 109-117.

needed to help strengthen her beloved country, Shimoda understood and supported women working outside of the home.⁵³

Being an extremely well-educated woman, Shimoda was also not completely against women taking professional jobs, such as being physicians, journalists, nurses, etc. Shimoda even approved limited instances of women remaining single, if they had a truly good reason to do so, such as devoting oneself to religion, being extremely talented in some form of arts, or serving the public in some capacity (within the women's realm).⁵⁴ After all, one of the women she admired greatly was Florence Nightingale. There were also several Japanese women Shimoda held in high regard that had been widowed and never remarried, like herself, that went on to make important contributions to society. Yet, she remained firmly against women stepping into the sphere of men, especially politics. She was, in general, unsupportive of the women's suffrage movement, which she felt was one of the negative side-effects (*heigai* 弊害) of women being educated.⁵⁵ Nonetheless, she urged Japanese women to pay attention to world affairs and study history and geography, so that they could not only gain respect from their countrymen, but also from people around the world, advancing Japan as a world power.

⁵³ Shimoda Utako, "Joshi to shokugyō 女子と職業 [Women and Work]," *Nihon Fujin*, 5 October 1906, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 6, 3-5; "Shuyō shōkun: Fujin to Shokugyō 主要小訓・婦人と職業 [Small Lessons: Ladies and Work]," *Nihon Fujin*, 15 February 1908, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 6, 121-125.

⁵⁴ Shimoda Utako, "Fujin no dokushin seikatsu to sono rehei 婦人の独身生活と其の利弊 [Pros and Cons of Single Women's Lives]," *Taiyō*, 1 June 1913, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 9, 280-281.

⁵⁵ Shimoda Utako, *Taisei fujo fūzoku*, 193-197. One exception may be Frances Willard, whom Shimoda presents very favorably as more of a prohibitionist than a suffragist. Willard's biography appeared as a part of "Meien densō 名媛伝叢 [Biographies of Famous Women]," *Nihon Fujin*, 15 July 1908, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 6, 189-203.

Rich West, Poor Japan

For Shimoda, the West represented not only "civilization" but also wealth to which Japan aspired. To catch up with the West economically, the Meiji government introduced a number of measures that included government sponsored industrialization. Even with these changes, Shimoda felt Western countries remained far wealthier than Japan. Recalling her experiences from parties she attended while living abroad, Shimoda commented on the thoughtless way Westerners spend their wealth stating that she was "not envious of the precious stones themselves but very envious of the amount of wealth [of the Western countries] where such frivolous spending on women's fashion was accepted with little impact on their nation's economy."⁵⁶ Evidently, the West was doing something right financially and Shimoda thought that Japan could learn from the West to generate and accumulate wealth.

Japan's problem, according to Shimoda, was that its warrior culture had devalued commercial activities. During the Tokugawa era, Japanese society was divided into four classes of people: warriors (samurai), farmers, artisans, and merchants. Although merchants were typically better off financially than any other group, they were placed at the bottom of the social ladder due to Confucian teachings that regarded merchants as the epitome of selfish and "petty men." Based on Confucian principles, dealing with money was considered disgraceful and demeaning so the samurai elite tended to deemphasize mathematics and business matters. From their long history and tradition, Shimoda felt that the Japanese were superior warriors due to their

⁵⁶ Shimoda Utako, "Sengo no fujin no kinken 戦後の婦人の勤儉 [On Savings of Ladies in Post-War Era]," *Nihon Fujin*, 15 December 1906, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 6, 34-40. Translated from 寶石其物は羨しくは無かったが、只斯くの如く女子の装飾を盛んにしてさえ國の傾かぬ程の富は實に羨ましい事であると思ひました。

long-standing martial education (*bujin teki kyoiku* 武人的教育), but uneducated and poor in economic matters. While Shimoda was pleased that Japan had been victorious in the foreign wars it had undertaken, she saw that Japan was still “underdeveloped in economy, commercial and industrial matters.”⁵⁷

Indeed, Shimoda found one of the chief characteristics of Westerners was their keen sense of money. She noted many times in her writing and speeches that Westerners were trained since childhood to shop around to determine the best deals. Children were given money to spend on toys, and in so doing children learned how to spend their money wisely. Shimoda was also very impressed by the Westerner’s habit of saving money rather than spending or wasting it.⁵⁸ In contrast, Shimoda felt that most Japanese still believed in the stigma of handling money and therefore never developed a proper sense of how to spend and save their money. This lack of monetary understanding was not limited to the men since it was taught that having no knowledge of one’s husband’s spending habits was part of being virtuous woman. Shimoda advocated throwing away this “bad custom (*rōshū* 陋習)” and urged women to take charge of their family

⁵⁷ Shimoda Utako, “Gunkoku no katei 軍國の家庭 [Households in a Military Nation],” *Nihon Fujin*, 25 March 1904, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 5, 295-303; Translated from 経済も、商工業も、未だ十分に發達して居りませぬ。 Also see, “Gunkoku fujin no kokoroe 軍國婦人の心得 [The Proper Mindset of Ladies in a Military Nation],” *Nihon Fujin*, 25 May 1907, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 5, 314-325; “Moshi sekai ga kinsen de umattara もし世界が金銭で埋まったら [If the World Were Filled with Money],” *Fujin Sekai*, 1 October 1911, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 7, 108-117.

⁵⁸ Shimoda Utako, “Eikoku ni okeru katei kyōiku 英國に於ける家庭教育 [Household Education in Britain],” Part II, *Onna*, 15 August. 1902, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 1, 94-99; “Eikoku ni okeru katei kyōiku,” Part III, *Onna*, 15 September 1902, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 1, 103-109; “Watashi ga Yōkō ni mitaru Seiyōjin no biten 私の洋行に見たる西洋人の美点 [Virtuous Points of Westerners That I Observed During My Trip to the West],” *Fujin Sekai*, 1 January 1910, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 7, 6-10; “Ishokujū to keizai 衣食住と経済 [Clothing, Food, Housing, and Economics],” *Onna Kagami*, 1 April 1907, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 9, 96-99; *Taisei fujo fūzoku*, 30-31, 202-203; *Taisei shoken katei kyōiku*, 128-135.

finances.⁵⁹ According to Shimoda, the role of women was essential for generating wealth for Japan as a nation:

The wealth of a nation is created and accumulated by individual families. If families become wealthy, then the nation becomes wealthy; [in other words,] the wealth of a nation is the same as the wealth of its families. Women are essential in generating wealth within the family and therefore women must make every effort to improve their household economies since it is the root of wealth.⁶⁰

Being an ardent nationalist, Shimoda's thoughts about the economy were not centered on the Japanese people's material standard of living as much as on Japan's wealth as a nation.

Generally, Shimoda was supportive of the Japanese tradition of frugality and admonished against extravagance and frivolous spending, but she found many Japanese people's attitudes toward money to be "passive (*shōkyoku teki* 消極的)," focusing more on not spending than spending wisely or generating additional wealth. She felt such passive strategies could potentially have

⁵⁹ Shimoda Utako, "Tsuma to shite no tainin no han'i," *Nihon Fujin*, 26 May 1900, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 4, 128-135.

⁶⁰ Shimoda, "Gunkoku fujin no kokoroe," *Nihon Fujin*, 25 May 1907, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 5, 314-325. Translated from 國家の富と云ふものは、誰が生んで、何で云ふ蓄積からできたものかと云ふに、個々の家庭から成立つて行くものである。家庭が富めば、即ち國家富み、國家の富は家庭より來たる。而して家庭の富を生む所のものは女子である。故に富の源なる家事經濟を好く研究し工夫して上手にならなければならぬ。 Shimoda's connecting household wealth with national wealth may have been influenced by François Fénelon's (1651-1715) theory of female education [*Traité de l'éducation des filles* (1687)]. Clearly, Shimoda was familiar with Fénelon's work and helped translate a portion of these (Asaoka Hajime is listed as a main translator; Shimoda is listed as someone who supplemented) which appeared in *Nihon Fujin*, 25 Nov. 1902, 25 Dec. 1902, 25 Feb. 1903, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 5, 130-133, 140-143, 165-167. The Jissen Women's University archive possesses part of her translation of Fénelon's work. As a French Catholic theologian writing in the seventeenth century, Fénelon's concern was not with building a nation, but with relating the education of women to combating the problems of heresy within the larger community: "The world is not abstraction; it is the sum total of families; and who can civilize it more effectively than women [Women] are scarcely less important to the public than those of men, since women have a household to rule, a husband to make happy, and children to bring up well. . . . In short, one has to consider not only the good which women do when they are well brought up, but also the evil which they cause in the world when they lack an education which inspire them to virtue. . ." H.C. Barnard, *Fénelon on Education: A Translation of the 'Traité de l'éducation des filles' and Other Documents Illustrating Fénelon's Educational Theories and Practice, Together with an Introduction and Notes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966), 2-3.

negative effects, such as saving money by cutting back on food which could result in a deterioration of one's health. In the midst of the Russo-Japanese War, Shimoda urged Japanese women to take an active (*sekkyoku teki*積極的) approach that focused on generating wealth by using examples from France and Britain where people worked extra hours, or taking up a craft like knitting to generate extra wealth.⁶¹ The issue was not just saving money, but also additional efforts to increase wealth.

In line with her thoughts on wealth generation, Shimoda felt that Japan could learn the virtues of hard work from Westerners. She felt that the Japanese were not used to working a standard schedule with set times and were generally lazy and too laid back compared to the Westerners. She even wondered if Sundays-off were necessary for Japanese. Her reasoning was that Westerners observed Sunday for religious reasons and that most Westerners did seven days worth of work in only six days. Japanese, on the other hand, were hardly doing six-days worth of work in six days. Shimoda also observed that Westerners went to church on Sundays, which she considered to be essential for maintaining their morality. Bearing this in mind, she suggested that Japanese use Sundays to visit their ancestral graves, go to a shrine, or receive lectures on morals such as *kokutai* (national polity) or *chūkō shugi* 忠孝主義 (principles of loyalty and filial piety), so that Sundays were not wasted by "lazy" Japanese.⁶²

⁶¹ Shimoda Utako, "Gunkoku fujin no kokoroe," *Nihon Fujin*, 25 May 1907, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 5, 314-325.

⁶² Shimoda Utako, "Jogakusei to nichiyōbi 女学生と日曜日 [Female Students and Sundays]," *Fujin Sekai*, 1 June 1911, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 7, 71-79. Shimoda also mentions one of the great points that the Japanese can learn from the Westerners is hard work in "Watashi ga Yōkō ni mitaru Seiyōjin no biten," *Fujin Sekai*, 1 January 1910, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 7, 6-10.

For Shimoda, Western societies were based on great wealth and astute economic prowess. Westerners dealt with monetary issues without any of the stigma Japanese attached to dealing with money. Japan had to overcome its economic disadvantage if it wanted to become a contender in world affairs and that would happen only if it could increase its wealth by making households more prosperous and by improving the Japanese work ethic to match the drive of Westerners. There was a great deal that Japan needed to learn from the West in regards to finances and economics if it were ever to reach the level of strength and power needed to challenge Western domination.

The West: Strong and Imperialist

As with many intellectuals of the day, Shimoda was not a blind admirer of the West. Shimoda saw Westerners as imperialists preying on the East, and she distrusted Western intentions. In an essay fashioned after the *Pillow Book* written by Sei Shōnagon, a court lady of the 11th century, Shimoda mentioned as one "scary thing" to be "the mind of the Westerner," since she had heard that Westerners were "plotting to bring Eastern countries under their control."⁶³ She also thought that Westerners by nature were "tenacious, arrogant, ferocious, and

⁶³ Shimoda "Soto no hama zuto 外の濱づと [Essays Written on Foreign Seashores]," *Taiyō*, 20 May 1900, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 9, 164. Shimoda jotted down these essays during her trip to the West. Like *Pillow Book* of Sei Shōnagon, the book consisted of lists of "things" such as "beautiful things," "interesting things," "ugly things," etc. The *Pillow Book* is considered one of the great masterpieces of Japanese literature, for its elegance of prose and expression of Japanese aesthetics. The quoted section reads 恐ろしきもの：西洋人の人の心の中。早晚、東洋諸州は、我が掌の中に握りてんと、下に希い思ふ事は斯う斯うぞなぞと人の云うを聞くこそ、最も恐ろしけれ。In another essay during her travel, she also commented that Hong Kong was taken by the British, and if the people of Asia would not wake up, it will be taken by the "foreigners." See, Shimoda Utako, "Omoi izuru mama 思い出づるまゝ [Whatever Came to My Mind]." *Joshi no Tomo*, 23 January 1900, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 9, 393-395. Notice Shimoda's concern does not extend beyond Asia; the European expansion into Africa or American expansion into the Pacific did not concern her. Indeed, other than East Asia, Europe and North America, she has very little things to say about the rest of the world. Africa was simply dismissed

cruel" and also "greedy," with these undesirable character traits mitigated only by the teachings of Christianity.⁶⁴

Despite her distrust of Westerners, Shimoda was "envious" of their wealth and power Japan was also striving to achieve.⁶⁵ Shimoda supported the Meiji government's policy to "enrich the nation and strengthen the military (*fukoku kyōhei* 富國強兵)," and took an active role helping to achieve these goals using her influence as a leader of women's education. She considered it essential that girls be educated properly so as to create a solid foundation for the Japanese state in their homes. After all, Shimoda understood that individual homes were where the new "citizens" were born and raised, and also where good virtues must be instilled. Shimoda seems to be influenced by the idea of Republican Motherhood, where mothers play a critical role in educating children to be good loyal citizens (though in her version, she does not advocate "Republicanism"). She found it critical for Japanese women to become "wise mothers" for the sake of the Japanese state:

It is already a well-established theory that to enrich and to strengthen the nation, [a state] must create wise mothers first. In other words, all mothers from the top to the bottom

as "barbaric" (*Fujin jōshiki no yōsei*, 125) while India is acknowledged as the birth place of Buddhism (*Joshi Nihon rekishi kyōkasho*, vol. 1, 40). Additionally, she noted on some Indian passengers in the ship (Shimoda, "Omoi izuru mama," *Joshi no Tomo*, 23 January 1900, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 9, 393-395), but what constituted her East-West binary, the rest of the world mattered very little to Shimoda.

⁶⁴ Shimoda writes of the Westerners as "tenacious (*shitsuyō* 執拗), arrogant (*gōman* 傲慢), ferocious (*dōmō* 獐猛), and cruel (*zan'nin* 残忍)," in *Taisei fujo fūzoku*, 207. The phrase "tenacious and cruel (*shitsuyō zankoku* 執拗残酷)" also appears in her *Taisei shoken katei kyōiku*, 118. She also states that "the people of Europe and America would practice mammonism (*O-Bei no kokumin wa ganrai haikinshū nari* 欧米の國民は元來拜金宗なり)" and they are "greedy peoples (*yokubō tsuyoki kokumin* 欲望強き國民)" in *Taisei shoken katei kyōiku*, 120.

⁶⁵ Shimoda Utako, "Soto no hama zuto," *Taiyō*, 20 June 1900, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 9, 174. The section "things she is envious of" includes "rich and powerful countries."

must become wise mothers since a country without wise mothers will be poor, and its soldiers will be weak.⁶⁶

To be a wise mother meant that women needed to have practical knowledge including caring for themselves so that they would be healthy and strong to support their households and raise healthy children. But Shimoda felt that most Japanese women were too frail due to the lack of physical activities imposed upon them by traditional culture.⁶⁷ Japanese upper and middle class women were not only confined inside their homes, but even the smallest details of their conduct were ritualized, severely limiting their physical activities. Shimoda was clearly impressed by the health of Western women, whose bodies were large and plump.⁶⁸ She felt that the Japanese as a whole were inferior to Westerners in physical health, but she saw women in much worse condition than men:

⁶⁶ Shimoda Utako, "Teikoku Fujin Kyōkai kaijō ni oite 帝國婦人協会々上に於いて [At the Imperial Women's Association Meeting]," *Nihon Fujin*, 3 December 1899, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 4, 1-7. Translated from 國の富を生み、國の力を養はんとせば、宜しく、先づ賢き母を造り出すべしとは、既に争ふべからざる定論となれり。言ひ換へれば、賢母なき時は國の貧しくなり、兵も弱くなると云ふ次第となれば、世間の母親は、上から下まで、皆賢き人と貰はねばならず。

⁶⁷ There are many references to the weakness of Japanese women's body. See, for example, she comments "kyojaku no taishitsu 虚弱の体質 [frail bodily constitution]" in "Seibo ni taisuru joshi no kansō 歳暮に對する女子の感想 [Comments about Women at the End of the Year]," *Nihon Fujin*, 25 December 1900, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 4, 232; and "Nihon no joshi ha taikaku ga yowai 日本の女子は體格が弱い [Japanese women have weak bodies]" in "Misesu Rainhāto no Chibetto tankendan o kikite shokan o nobu ミセスラインハートの西藏探検談を聞きて所感を述ぶ [Listening to Mrs. {Reinhart's?} Exploration of Tibet]," *Nihon Fujin*, 25 December 1903, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 5, 262.

⁶⁸ Shimoda used various expressions to describe the "large and plump" physique of Western women. The expression "*kukan idai* 軀幹偉大 (large bodied)" appears in *Taisei fujo fūzoku*, 29, and *Taisei shoken katei kyōiku*, 154. "*Kinkotsu kyōken* 筋骨強健 [muscles and bones strong and healthy]" is also mentioned in *Taisei shoken katei kyōiku*, 154. "*Shinshin kyōken* 心身強健 (minds and bodies strong and healthy)" in *Taisei fujo fūzoku*, 29. Shimoda describes the upper class Western women as "*kukan hidai* 軀幹肥大 (large and fat bodies)" in *Taisei fujo fūzoku*, 58. She mentions French ladies as being "shorter (than British), plump, round-faced, and fair skinned." Large and plump, for Shimoda, were generally compliments, though she observed some upper-class British women to be overweight.

One area that Japanese citizens are inferior to citizens of civilized countries is their health. Since the laws of biology dictate that inferior health is accompanied by inferior moral qualities and inferior intellect, I should not have to argue once again that we need to have a great reform in this aspect for the sake of our Japanese citizens' future.⁶⁹

Shimoda found it imperative that Japanese mothers be healthy and strong in order to give birth to healthy and strong Japanese citizens.⁷⁰ With this nationalistic aim in mind, Shimoda emphasized the prime importance of physical education in her Jissen Women's School and designed less restrictive uniforms for her students.⁷¹

⁶⁹ Shimoda, "Joshi kyōiku ni kanshite fukei no chūi o nozomu 女子教育に関して父兄の注意を望む [Begging for attention of fathers and brothers about women's education," *Nihon Fujin*, 25 October 1900, in *Shimoda Utako Chosakushū*, vol. 4, 200-206. Translated from 日本國民が、世界文明國民と並立して、第一に劣れるものは、其健康ならん。劣れる健康は劣れる徳性、劣れる智力と共はざるべからざるは、生物の原則上、止むを得ざるの結果なれば、我等日本國民の將來は、殊に此點よりして、大改革を施すことの必要なることは、茲に改めて詳論するの要なからん。

⁷⁰ Shimoda, "Joshi kyōiku ni kanshite fukei no chūi o nozomu 女子教育に関して父兄の注意を望む [On Women's Education: Begging for the Attention of Fathers and Brothers]," *Nihon Fujin*, 25 October 1900, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 4, 200-206. It reads "kenzen naru kokumin wa kenzen naru haha ga tainai ni sodatsu 健全なる國民は健全なる母が胎内にそだつ. . . [healthy citizens grow up in the wombs of healthy mothers]." Joan Judge states that Shimoda probably would have witnessed the eugenic movement while in Britain, and had been influenced by it. Joan Judge, "Talent, Virtue, and the Nation," 775.

⁷¹ In order to improve women's health, Shimoda advocated the reform of Japanese women's clothing. She thought that the traditional kimono was too restrictive for physical activities. She did not, however, advocate the adoption of Western dress since it was her belief that Japanese ladies did not look right in them and she thought wearing a corset too restrictive and harmful to a woman's health. To overcome these issues, Shimoda designed a new woman's *hakama*, or long loose skirt-like lower body covering, based on the dress of ladies-in-waiting, and used the new clothing as the uniform of her Jissen Women's School. This new dress not only allowed tremendous mobility but also met the standard of modesty and dignity she sought from the *new* Japanese woman.

The *hakama* is a traditional Japanese costume worn usually by men and court ladies. A traditional *hakama* has a pants like structure, suitable for riding horses. Today, it is worn by practitioners of Japanese archery (*kyūdō* 弓道) and swordsmanship (*kendō* 剣道, usually using a bamboo sword). Shimoda's *hakama* was designed especially for women by changing the traditional slacks-like structure to a skirt-like structure to facilitate use in a Japanese style bathroom. Shimoda's woman's *hakama* spread to other women's schools during the Meiji (1868-1912) and Taishō (1912-1926) eras. Today, many Japanese women choose to wear *hakama* during their college graduation ceremony.

See Shimoda, "Honbō joshi fukusō no enkaku 本邦女子服装の沿革 [The Historical Development of Women's Clothing in Japan]," Part I, *Onna*, 31 January 1901, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 1, 1-3; "Joshi no tainin no han'i ni tsukite," *Nihon Fujin*, 25 April 1900, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 4, 107-127.

Shimoda also considered good health to be critical for Japanese expansion.

Understanding the manner in which Britain emphasized physical education and after seeing its people in excellent health, Shimoda realized that good health was essential to British successes in creating a global empire over a wide range of climates.

What impressed me deeply while visiting in Britain was the fact that the country places great value on men's and women's physical education, discusses ways to encourage it, and makes steady progress [implementing the plans discussed to encourage physical activities]. Britain realized that in order for its citizens to go to lands so different in climate, lifestyles, and customs, and face all kinds of challenges... it was necessary to have strong bodies. [Encouragement of physical education is] the result of realizing that it is impossible to administer overseas colonies successfully with weak bodies. I believe that the reason why Britain has such a vast empire and has achieved such prosperity is due to its citizens embracing this lesson.⁷²

This comment was made after Japan had secured its access to Korea and Manchuria as a result of the Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905). Shimoda certainly felt it necessary for both Japanese men's and women's health to be improved, so that both men and women could go outside of the *naichi* (Japanese homeland or interior) and settle in new overseas territories. She was concerned that Japanese men oftentimes returned to Japan after only a few years of living in Korea or Manchuria, and Shimoda reasoned that it was because they left behind loved ones in Japan. She saw that Japan was "well behind the great powers of Europe and America (*Ō-Bei rekkyō* 歐米列

⁷² Shimoda Utako, "Joshi no kaigai ijū o nozomu 女子の海外移住を望む [Hoping that (Japanese) Women Immigrate Overseas]," *Onna*, 15 July 1906, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 1, 243-248. Translated from 私が先年英國に赴きました際深く感じました事は、彼國が特に男女の體育を重んじて、銳意獎勵の道を講じ著々として實績を收めつゝある事でありました。之は、英國の領土が坤輿至る所に撒布し居るを以つて、國民は本國と季候生活風俗等の異なる地にも赴き種々の艱苦危険と闘はねばならず之と戦うて勝を制するには、... 強健なる身體を備ふことは、... 必要で肢體羸弱では、とても海外の經營事業は成功が覺束ないと云ふ事を悟った結果であります。而して國民が能く此實驗場の教訓を遵守し勵行し、爲に英國は今日の如く廣大なる殖民地を領して繁榮を極めていゝと思はれます。

強) in overseas development and settlement," and wished for Japan to catch up with the West in its bid to become a great colonial power, but such improvement would require greater numbers of Japanese willing to settle and raise families in the new colonies. Shimoda hoped that "many Japanese women would have the resolution to be buried in Manchuria or Korea," for the sake of the Japanese state, much like ladies of the Western empires.⁷³

Another way wise mothers could strengthen the nation was through instilling good virtues at home. Generally she considered mothers who set good examples for their children, encouraged good behavior and admonished bad behavior, and helped their children accomplish great deeds to be "wise mothers." Shimoda found that many heroes (*ei'yū* 英雄) or great figures (*ijin* 偉人) had admirable mothers, and she considered their accomplishment as much the result of how a mother is nurturing and training as the child's own doing. The most frequently mentioned "wise mother" by Shimoda was George Washington's mother whom she recognized as one of the "wisest of wise mothers (*kenbo chū no kenbo* 賢母中の賢母)."⁷⁴ Shimoda considered George Washington to be one of the greatest historical figures who was able to lead the United States to its independence and subsequent glory because of his exceptional character. She was impressed

⁷³ Shimoda Utako, "Joshi no kaigai ijū o nozomu," *Onna*, 15 July 1906, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 1, 243-248. Translate from . . . 欧米列國との比較上殊に遅れ勝ちなる邦人の海外開拓事業 and . . . 私は成るべく多数の日本女子が満韓の地を墳墓とする覚悟で、続々と移住せんことを望むのであります。

⁷⁴ Shimoda Utako, *Ryōsai to kenbo*, 85-93. Other references to Washington's mother can be found "Joshi kyōiku no zento ni tsuite 女子教育の前途に就いて [The Future of Women's Education]," *Onna*, 15 February 1904, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 1, 152-156; "Gunkoku fujin no kokoroe ni tsuite 軍國婦人の心得に就て [On Proper Mindset of Ladies of Military Nation]," *Nihon Fujin*, 15 November 1904, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 5, 375-376; Shimoda Utako, "Heikō sōritsu man jusshūnen kinen shukuga shiki hi ni oite," *Nihon Fujin*, 15 March 1909, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 6, 320-326, etc. Another woman who was considered "wisest of wise mothers" was the mother of the ancient Chinese sage, Mencius, but Shimoda only mentioned her a few times. The story of Mencius's mother can be found in *Ryōsai to kenbo*, 58-64. Mencius' mother is mentioned in passing in Shimoda Utako, "Joshi no tenshoku o mattō suruno michi ikan," *Nihon Fujin*, 25 August 1902, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 5, 106.

by the fact that Washington was humble and not greedy, a characteristic she believed resulted in his personal success as well as that of his new country. Shimoda equated Washington's virtue of humility with that of his mother, who lived on a humble country farm even after her son had become the first President of the United States. Shimoda found the story of George Washington and especially his mother to be an exemplary tale, exhibiting how a wise mother could contribute to the state by raising a great hero.

Shimoda also admired Queen Victoria as a wise mother, a good wife and an exemplary monarch ruling over the greatest empire of the day. Having met Queen Victoria in person and read her biography, Shimoda found many wonderful qualities to be admired, and she praised the queen both during her lifetime and after her death in 1901. A biography of the queen written by Shimoda is full of praise such as "benevolent," "merciful," "humble," "kind," and "smart." Shimoda saw the queen's benevolence in a number of philanthropic projects that helped the poor and less fortunate, and she viewed Great Britain's success as an empire owing to the queen's outstanding virtues. To Shimoda the queen was a wise mother who did not spoil her children; instead the queen had her sons engage in farming and carpentry work and required the girls to learn sewing and cooking to teach them the dignity of labor and to entrust in them sympathy and understanding toward the poor. As a wife, Victoria followed her husband, according to the teachings of Christianity. Queen Victoria embodied the combination of wise mother, good wife, and benevolent ruler that Shimoda cherished. So high was Shimoda's admiration of the queen that she considered her to have reached the position of being almost a "saint (*seiken* 聖賢)." ⁷⁵

⁷⁵ Queen Victoria's short biography was published in *Joshi no Tomo*, 20 July 1897, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 9, 296-302. A longer biography (10 episodes) was written upon her death and can be found *Onna*, between 25 February 1901 and 15 May 1902 issues (in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 1). The same biography

Shimoda found examples of wise mothers from both the Eastern and Western worlds, but she felt the influence of mothers over their children was greater in the East due to the Confucian emphasis on "filial piety (*kō* 孝, Ch. *xiao*).\" Shimoda considered this virtue of "filial piety,\" and its extension to junior member's giving deference to senior members, as one of the great traditional virtues that should be continued, but she also felt that it should not supersede the virtue of loyalty (*chū* 忠) to the Emperor and the Japanese state. Part of being a good mother or good wife meant not yielding to selfish desires to keep loved ones at home when the Emperor needed their service. Mothers were expected to teach proper virtues to their children including loyalty to the state. According to Shimoda, it was a mother's duty to educate their boys to be loyal citizens and their girls to be good wives, wise mothers and capable household managers.

The concept of nationalistic education was important to Shimoda and she felt there was a great deal that the West had to teach the East about how it should be handled. She observed that Western societies established a sense of patriotism (*aikokushin* 愛國心) from the youngest age, both at home and in school. She seemed a bit shocked by the vengeful and belligerent attitudes, as well as excessive pride in one's country that people of Western societies often exhibited, but she still found it important to teach children about loving and serving their own country, especially if Japan were to join the league of world powers. Shimoda illustrated how Western societies taught patriotism to their children telling a story in which a Japanese student, staying with an American family, had formed a brother/sister bond with his host's teenage daughter. One day, the American mother asked the daughter what she would do to her friend if Japan and

can be found in *Nihon Fujin* (in *Shimoda Utako Chosakushū*, vol. 4 and 5). The word "saint" can be found in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 1, 84.

America were to go to war. The young daughter was not able to answer the question and was therefore admonished by her mother for forgetting the virtue of patriotism and was told that she should fight for the sake of the country even if it means killing her dear friend.⁷⁶ This story seems to suggest that the Japanese also needed to teach their children about patriotism and personal sacrifice for their country if Japan were to survive in the new world environment. Shimoda expressed the view that the sense of pride and patriotism instilled in children through Western school curricula was excessive, but when she wrote her own textbook, *A Short History of Japan for Girls*, she clearly stated that its purpose was the development of “patriotism” within the young reader.⁷⁷ Clearly Shimoda had reservations about the extremes to which nationalism could be taken, but still felt that it necessary for the survival and prosperity of the state.

During the Meiji Era, for Shimoda Utako, the West was not seen as an enemy, but rather it embodied the goals and objectives to which Japan needed to strive. To her the West embodied civilization and advancement as much as it represented rich and powerful imperialists. For Japan to survive in the early twentieth century, and for it to rise from a "yet-to-be-civilized" to a "civilized" state, Shimoda saw many attributes of the West that Japan had to learn from and in some cases incorporate into its own way of life. Her approach was not wholesale adoption of Western ideas and institutions; instead, she sought to selectively and deliberately combine the best aspects of the West into the East to establish a better and stronger Japan that could stand toe-to-toe as an equal with the Western powers.

⁷⁶ Shimoda Utako, "Eikoku no katei kyōiku," Part 3, *Onna*, 15 September 1902, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 1., 105-106; *Taisei shoken katei kyōiku*, 119-128, *Taisei fujo fūzoku*, 172-173.

⁷⁷ Shimoda Utako, *Joshi Nihon shō rekishi*, preface.

Shimoda Utako and East Asia

For Japan to be recognized as a major power, Shimoda understood that it would have to take on the role of a colonizer. Japan's location in East Asia provided a strategic advantage over Western powers, offering an opportunity for Japan to take the lead in colonizing and civilizing East Asia. After the Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905), Shimoda actively encouraged Japanese men and women to move to and settle in Korea and Manchuria, the land "outside" of the Japanese homeland (*naichi*). For this purposes, she also worked to promote better health education so that Japanese people could survive and flourish in different climates away from their homeland. Since Japan was the only nation in East Asia to have made so much progress towards civilization through industrialization, education, and the development of economic and military power, it was the obvious choice to lead all countries of the region. In 1906, Shimoda stated:

If we were to compare East and West today, the West is like a flower in full bloom, while the East is like a flower [past its prime and] dropping. Among the latter countries, Japan alone. . . is like a bud that is about to bloom and has made long strides within a mere forty years that have shocked the world's peoples. People around the world are absolutely astonished by the Japanese [whom they consider to be] exceptional among the Eastern race.⁷⁸

She agreed with the assessment of Japanese as an "exceptional race," but she disagreed with the point that Japan "developed" suddenly in forty years; instead she argued that Japan had a long history that spanned 2500 years. She also felt that the Japanese had a different style of learning

⁷⁸ Shimoda Utako, "Tōyō joshi kyōiku no shōrai," *Nihon Fujin*, 15 March 1906, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 6, 458-463. Translated from . . . 今の有様は東洋と西洋を二ツに分けると、西洋は今盛りの花の様な有様であつて、東洋は殆ど散り方の花の様な有様でございます。其中で單り. . . 日本が荅を方に開いて出る花の様な情態で、此四十年に足らぬ僅かの年月に於いて世界の人の耳目を驚かすやうな長足の進歩をして、日本國民は 東洋人種の中に卓絶してあらゆる世界の人種から絶驚されて居る。

(*gakujutsu* 学術) from Westerners, but that this did not mean the Japanese were uneducated or inferior. In Shimoda's mind, the Japanese were fit to lead all the other Asian groups, such as Chinese and Koreans, to civilization.

Shimoda saw Chinese and Koreans, as well as other East Asian peoples as "*dōhō* (of the same womb)" or comrades, but not of the same Japanese race (*Nihon minzoku* 日本民族). While Shimoda thought Japan was behind the West, she believed other East Asian peoples to be much further behind than the Japanese. She saw the Chinese stubbornly clinging to old Confucian ideas, while being humiliated by those whom they called "barbarians."⁷⁹ To Shimoda, practices such as Chinese foot binding would also likely have been seen as a sign of slavish subordination of women to men, and to stand out as an example of the type of old unproductive traditions that needed to be abandoned in the new world environment.⁸⁰ She accepted the Japanese justification for the war with Russia as an attempt to "help its neighbor," and saw even more clearly Japan's role as leader (*sendōsha* 先導者) of the East after its military victory over the Russians. As she saw the British and Americans spreading civilization to the "uncivilized" in an attempt to "save" them, she envisioned Japan taking up its own civilizing mission to East Asia, since "Japan had reached a position where it received the heavenly mandate to help with the development of the East."⁸¹ Five years later, in 1911 Shimoda expressed her support for the Japanese annexation of

⁷⁹ Shimoda Utako, "*Shin'etsu kikō* 信越紀行[Travel to Shin'etsu Region]," *Nihon Fujin*, 25 February 1900, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 4, 83.

⁸⁰ Shimoda did not necessary connect foot binding and women's subordination to men, but her comments on foot bindings are negative. See *Shimoda Utako chosakushū* vol. 6, 243, vol. 5, 162. vol. 9, 100

⁸¹ Shimoda Utako, "Joshi no kōtō kyōiku ni tsukite 女子の高等教育に就きて[On Women's Higher Education]," *Nihon Fujin*, 15 July 1906, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 5, 478. Translated from 東洋の進歩を助けよと云う天の使命を受けたとても云うべき位置に日本は成った。 In a rather envious manner, she

Korea in 1910, since it provided Koreans "the fortune to receive the Emperor's august virtue." As for Japanese women, Shimoda wished they would "set themselves up as good examples, to lead and enlighten their [Korean] sisters (*shimai dōhō* 姉妹同胞) who joined [Japan] as a result of annexation."⁸²

According to historian Joan Judge, Shimoda played, "the single most important Japanese role in educating young Chinese women in the early twentieth century."⁸³ Shimoda had connections to important Japanese leaders, including those who envisioned Pan-Asian unity and Sino-Japanese collaboration, such as Konoe Atsumaro 近衛篤磨 (1863-1904), the founder of the East Asia Common Culture Society (Tō-A Dōbun Kai 東亞同文會). She was also well respected by Chinese leaders, including the Empress Dowager Ci Xi 慈禧 (1835-1908) and Zhang Zhidong (張之洞 1837-1909), leaders of the late-Qing Reforms. Shimoda's concept of "good wives and wise mothers" was well received among Chinese leaders because they found it "compatible with the Chinese way of womanhood."⁸⁴ In 1901 in Shanghai, Shimoda helped to establish *Zuoxin*

mentions that British and Americans are so civilized that they are determined to spread civilizations to the "uncivilized and unenlightened." See "Misesu Rainhāto no Chibetto tankendan o kikite shokan o nobu," *Nihon Fujin*, 25 Dec 1903, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 5, 261. Also see "Sarani gunkoku fujin ni tsugu 更に軍國婦人に告ぐ [Speech to Women of a Military State]," *Nihon Fujin*, 15 February 1905, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 5, 402, which states "[Japan] must lead the East to enlightenment (Tōyō o kaimei ni michibikaneba naranai 東洋を開明に導かねばならない)" as leader (*sendōsha* 先導者).

⁸² Shimoda Utako, "Aikoku Fujinkai souritsu tōji to natsukau," *Aikoku Fujin*, 1 March 1911, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 2, 111-112. Translated from 鷄林八道の民悉く皆皇化に浴するの幸運を得 and 朝鮮合併の結果、新たに加はり来つた彼の地の姉妹同胞の幸福の為に、自ら良模範となり、誠意誠心を以て之を誘導開啓されんことを希望致すのであります。

⁸³ Joan Judge, "Talent, Virtue, and the Nation," 778.

⁸⁴ Rong-qing, Zhang Baixi, and Zhang Zhidong, "Zouding mengyang yuan zhangcheng ji jiating jiaoyu fa zhangcheng [Memorial on Regulations for Early Training Schools and for Education on Household Matters]," 13 January 1904, in Chen Yuanhui, ed., *Xuezhì yǎnbìan* [The Evolution of the Educational System], in the series

*She*作新社 or "Society for Renewal," a publishing house whose journal *Dalu* 大陸 [The Continent] introduced many of Shimoda's ideas to a Chinese audience.⁸⁵ Additionally, Shimoda's Jissen Jogakkō was among the first women's schools in Japan to accept Chinese students and had the largest female Chinese student population.⁸⁶ In 1905, Shimoda's school even created a special Chinese division (*Shinkoku Ryūgakusei bu* 清國留学生部) to accommodate the needs of so many Chinese students. In the early days of this period, the Chinese students who entered Jissen Jogakkō were usually those that accompanied male relatives to Japan, but starting in 1903, there were those who came to Japan on their own to receive education at Shimoda's school.⁸⁷

In Shimoda's mind, as the only country in the East counted among the "first-rate nations of the world (*sekai no ittōkoku* 世界の一等國)," Japan was in a position to lead, and the others were to follow. This did not, however, mean that Shimoda thought of non-Japanese East Asian women as inferior to Japanese. She described her Chinese students as smart (*reiri* 伶俐) and

Zhongguo jindai jiaoyushi ziliao huibian [Compendium of Sources on the History of Chinese Modern Education] (Shanghai, 1991), 393-96, quoted in Joan Judge, "Talent, Virtue, and the Nation," 777.

⁸⁵ Joan Judge, "Talent, Virtue, and the Nation," 773-775.

⁸⁶ It should be noted that many Chinese were in Japan in the early twentieth century, after Zhang Zhidong mentioned in the text above and others recommended students be sent to Japan rather than to the West since it was less expensive and more efficient way to learn about the West. At least 25,000 Chinese students were said to have come to Japan between 1898 and 1911. In addition to students, governmental officials and political refugees also came to Japan. See Douglas R. Reynolds, *China, 1898-1912: The Xinzhen Revolution and Japan* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993), 41-49.

⁸⁷ Joan Judge, "Talent, Virtue, and the Nation," 765-803; Jissen Jogakkō ko Shimoda kōchō sensei denki hensanjo, *Shimoda Utako sensei den*, 393-394.

gentle (*onwa* 温和).⁸⁸ She even felt that if Chinese women received an "education in civilization" that they would do better on social occasions than their Japanese counterparts. Shimoda hoped that her Chinese students "upon their return [to China], would become the leaders of civilization and serve for the sake of the state."⁸⁹ Whether or not Shimoda meant this "state" to be Japan or China is not clear from this particular document, but considering Shimoda also told Chinese students not to forget "that they received their education in Japan, even though they grew up in China," it could very well have been Japan to which she was referring. It was her hope that these Chinese women, educated in Japan, would become the agents of "civilization" in their own country and that they would work in tandem with Japanese who were expected to migrate and settle "outside" of their homeland, in order to create a great Japanese empire.⁹⁰ For Shimoda, China, Korea, and Manchuria were clearly part of "the East," although outside (*soto/gai* 外) of Japan. It fell to Japan to lead the East directly or indirectly.

Conclusion

As a pioneer in the field of women's education during Meiji Japan (1868-1912), Shimoda Utako was an influential figure who promoted the virtues of "good wives and wise mothers."

⁸⁸ Shimoda Utako, "Shinkoku fujin ryūgakusei 清國婦人留学生, in *Nihon Fujin*, 25 January 1903, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 5, "Shina ryūgakusei sotsugyōsei no sotsugyō shiki ni nozomite 支那留學生の卒業式に臨みて[On the Graduation of Chinese Students]," *Nihon Fujin*, 15 August 1906, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 5, 489-490.

⁸⁹ Shimoda Utako, "Utsukushiki shitei no jō 美しき師弟の情 [Beautiful Feelings between Teacher and Students]," *Fujin Sekai*, 1 January 1909, in *Shimoda Utako chosakushū*, vol. 7, 4-5. Translated from . . . 帰國の暁には、文明の先導者となって、國家の為に尽さなければ成らない. . . .

⁹⁰ Jissen Jogakkō ko Shimoda kōchō sensei denki hensanjo, *Shimoda Utako sensei den*, 400.

Shimoda viewed much of her surroundings through the lens of binary opposites, as she contrasted East and West, inside and outside, old and new, and men and women. The comparison between the East and West was a particularly important one, as it helped Shimoda to situate Japan against the “other” to which Japan was trying to catch up. For Shimoda, the West symbolized what the Japanese state was striving to become: rich, powerful, and civilized. During the Meiji era, Shimoda saw Japan to be in the period of transition to civilization, while she perceived the West as already having achieved such a state. For her civilization meant having an orderly society where the weaker societal members were protected and supported so that they could fulfill their heavenly assigned roles. For women, those roles were to be wives, mothers, and managers of the household. Shimoda recognized that Japanese women, having only recently emerged from under the oppression of warrior rule, had developed a slavish mentality and lacked a sense of self-respect and dignity that was necessary to make them valuable members of society. Having spent time in late nineteenth-century Britain, Shimoda equated civilization with the lives of the upper and middle class women who represented to her the Victorian ideal of femininity. Shimoda wanted to elevate Japanese women from their slave-like status to become dignified and respected beings that would raise their children wisely, support their husbands, and create "happy kingdoms" within their homes. This desire to see the situation of women improve was not viewed as merely for the sake of the individual, but rather to strengthen and elevate the Japanese state as a whole.

As a nationalist, Shimoda supported the Meiji government's policy to create a rich and powerful state. She saw the role of "good wives and wise mothers" to be critical in such a venture, and sought inspiration from Western societies that were far wealthier and stronger than

Japan. Shimoda perceived Japan to be economically underdeveloped due to the old stigma attached to handling money, while she observed that Westerners had a keen sense of understanding regarding spending and saving money. To enrich the state, Shimoda advocated that women should take charge of their household finances, since she believed that the wealth of the nation derived from the collective wealth and prosperity of individual families. To create a strong country, Shimoda found it critical to have healthy, strong, and wise mothers who would give birth to and raise able and loyal citizens. She was inspired by the health of Western women and wanted that same vitality for her own countrywomen. It was also her belief that a healthy body was critical for colonial ventures that would require Japanese people to survive in climates different from their homeland. In addition to physical education, Shimoda found mental education to be critical if Japan were to become a strong nation. Mothers were essential for instilling the proper virtues of citizens, especially in creating a sense of nationalism and loyalty to the state.

The West provided the base from which Shimoda judged what made up a civilized, rich, and powerful society. While Shimoda acknowledged the many strengths and virtues of the West, she was not a radical Westernizer advocating wholesale acceptance and adoption of everything western, nor was she an ultra-conservative who wanted to cling to the old traditions and customs. Shimoda considered herself as someone who pursued the middle road of the two extremes, one that combined the best from both the East and the West to form a new concept that was stronger than either part from which it was derived. She valued Japanese *kokutai* (national polity), its mythology, and the Confucian emphasis on the virtue of loyalty and filial piety. She sought to retain these desirable traditions while selectively borrowing particular aspects or ideas from the

West in order to make Japan stronger, wealthier, and more civilized. Shimoda saw Japan to be at the leading edge of a movement toward civilization, while the other nations of Asian were falling behind. She believed it was Japan's heavenly ordained role to lead their fellow East Asians to civilization. Shimoda's concept of "good wives and wise mothers" with its nationalistic aims and relative conservatism was well received not only among the Japanese but also among Chinese leaders, making Shimoda Utako one of Asia's most influential women in the early half of the twentieth century.

CHAPTER 4
UCHIMURA KANZŌ (1861-1930)
CHRISTIAN CIVILIZATION IN JAPAN

The "incident" took place on January 9, 1891 at the prestigious First Higher Middle School in Tokyo. The school received the Imperial Rescript on Education and the principal solemnly read this "sacred" document issued by the Emperor to the Japanese school children at the school's beginning-of-the-year ceremony. All students and teachers were asked to go to the platform one by one and bow down to the Imperial signature on the Rescript. Upon his turn, as the third schoolteacher in line, Uchimura Kanzō内村鑑三 (1861-1930), a Japanese Christian, failed to bow down to the Imperial signature. The incident created a major scandal when news of the disrespectful and "unpatriotic" behavior of a Christian teacher quickly spread across the country making Uchimura Kanzō a household name in Japan.¹

As an influential Christian writer who promoted a "Non-Church" version of Christianity that rejected rituals, clergy, and denominationalism, Uchimura Kanzō remains Japan's most famous Christian leader to this day. During the Meiji era, upon which this chapter focuses, much of Uchimura's effort was concentrated on finding Japan's heavenly assigned role in the ongoing advancement of humanity.² Uchimura's Christian beliefs led him to adopt a Providential view of

¹ Uchimura's own account of the Imperial Rescript incident can be found in his letter to his friend, Mr. Bell. See Wm. Theodore de Bary, Carol Gluck, and Arthur E. Tiedemann, *Sources of Japanese Tradition*, vol. 2. *1600 to 2000*. 2nd edition (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), 1166-1167.

² This study is based on Uchimura's published works during the Meiji Era reproduced in the first 19 volumes of his collected works, *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū* 内村鑑三全集 [The Complete Works of Uchimura Kanzō], 40 vols. (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1980).

history, where the westward march of civilization across the globe from West Asia to Europe and then to North America was according to God's plan. He firmly believed that Japan was the next destination of civilization after it passed through the United States and that civilization would eventually overtake all areas where ancient customs were still being practiced. He saw that civilization was being passed to Japan from the West, and that the Japanese people were enthusiastically accepting these new ideas and concepts. While Uchimura recognized the Japanese were adopting civilization, he did not feel the version they accepted was adequate or complete, since from his perspective, it appeared to be "Christian civilization without Christianity."³ Since Uchimura believed Christianity to be the soul of civilization, he urged Japan to adopt the essence of Christianity along with the modern concepts brought from the West.

While Uchimura promoted civilization, he was still highly critical of *modern* Western society and rejected the version of Christianity practiced in the West since he felt it was grossly corrupted with denominationalism, mammonism, and imperialism. A close examination of Uchimura's writing during the Meiji period indicates that he maintained an ambivalent attitude toward the West, whereby he recognized its *historical* importance and even acknowledged its superiority over stagnant Eastern societies, while criticizing its failure to live up to the standards he expected of a "Christian civilization." Clearly, in his mind, modern Western society and its debased version of Christianity was not a model to be imitated or copied. Instead, Uchimura advocated a new Non-Church Christianity that relied on the Bible alone and abandoned all the unnecessary trappings that encrusted and weighed down the Christian beliefs of the West.

³ Uchimura, "Japan's case," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 4 April 1897, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 4, 95. See also "Nihonkoku no dai konnan 日本国の大困難 [Great Troubles in the Japanese State]," *Seisho no kenkyū* 聖書之研究, 10 March 1903, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 11, 147-156.

Uchimura envisioned Japan's heavenly assigned role to be the center of the Non-Church Christianity movement that would shake loose all of the baggage Christianity had taken on since its beginnings in West Asia and bring it back to its original pristine state as taught by Jesus, Peter, and Paul.

Brief Biography

Uchimura Kanzō was born in the year 1861 in the city of Edo (Tokyo) as a son of a samurai from Takasaki 高崎 (in today's Gunma Prefecture).⁴ His birth came at the very end of the Tokugawa (1603-1868) era, just seven years before the Meiji Restoration (1868), and placed him in a perfect time period to witness Japan's metamorphosis from a feudal state into a modern world power. As a youth, Uchimura received the typical Confucian education for samurai boys that emphasized the virtues of loyalty and filial piety. He also received instruction in the English language beginning in 1872, which allowed him to express his feelings and ideas fully in both Japanese and English. Prior to his conversion to Christianity, Uchimura offered daily prayers to "each of the four groups of gods located in the four points of the compass," as well as paying respect at every temple he passed by. His dedication to myriad folk gods was such that "[t]he

⁴ There are several works on Uchimura Kanzō available in English such as John. F. Howes, *Japan's Modern Prophet: Uchimura Kanzō, 1861-1930* (Vancouver and Toronto: UBC Press, 2005); Hiroshi Miura, *The Life and Thought of Kanzo Uchimura, 1861-1930* (Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans Pub, 1996); Raymond P. Jennings, *Jesus, Japan, and Kanzō Uchimura: A Study of the View of the Church of Kanzō Uchimura and Its Significance for Japanese Christianity* (Tokyo: Kyōbunkan, Christian Literature Society, 1958); and Ray A. Moore, *Culture and Religion in Japanese-American Relations: Essays on Uchimura Kanzō, 1861-1930*. vol. 5 of *Michigan Papers in Japanese Studies* (Ann Arbor: Center for Japanese Studies, University of Michigan, 1981).

number of deities to be worshipped increased day by day, till I found my little soul totally incapable of pleasing them all."⁵

In 1876, at the age of sixteen, Uchimura entered the Sapporo Agricultural College (Sapporo Nōgakkō 札幌農学校) in Hokkaidō.⁶ The school had just been opened a year earlier by the Japanese government in order to train people to work in the frontier region. The school offered free tuition and a generous stipend in order to attract promising young men to Hokkaidō. Since Uchimura's family had lost its samurai's stipend after the Restoration, this school offered Uchimura an attractive opportunity to pursue a higher education and have a career as a civil servant. The Sapporo Agricultural College hired William S. Clark, the former President of the Massachusetts Agricultural College in Amherst, to be the first President of the new school. Clark insisted on providing a Christian education to his students and brought some copies of the Bible with him to Japan. Under his short eight-month term at the school, Clark managed to convert all of his students to Christianity by having them sign the "Covenant of Believers in Jesus." Although Clark had left by the time Uchimura entered the Sapporo Agricultural College,

⁵ Uchimura Kanzō, *How I Became a Christian: Out of My Diary* (1895) in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1980) vol. 3(English sect.), 12-13. Of the 40 volumes of *Uchimura Kanzō zenshu*, vol. 3 alone is divided into two sections, Japanese and English, each with its own pagination. My notes distinguish between the Japanese and English sections, by indicating vol. 3 (English sect.) or vol. 3 (Japanese sect.), followed by the appropriate page reference."

⁶ Hokkaidō is the northernmost island that constitutes the four main Japanese islands. Historically known as Ezo-chi 蝦夷地 or "the land of barbarians," this semi-arctic island was mostly inhabited by the Ainu hunters and gathers. In 1869, the newly established Meiji government renamed the island as Hokkaidō and started its "development." To support the venture, the Sapporo Agricultural College (today's Hokkaidō University) was established and opened its door to first students in 1875. Uchimura was one of twenty-one students that entered the college in 1876. Only twelve of Uchimura's classmen graduated due to the high dropout rate in the cold frontier region. One of the most notable classmates of Uchimura was Nitobe Inazō, the author of *Bushidō: The Soul of Japan* (1905). For More information on Sapporo Agricultural College, see Hiroko Willcock, "Traditional Learning, Western Thought, and the Sapporo Agricultural College: A Case Study of Acculturation in Early Meiji Japan," *Modern Asian Studies*, Vol. 34, No. 4 (October 2000), 977-1017.

the extremely enthusiastic students he had converted, now the college's upperclassmen, coerced Uchimura to sign the Covenant. Uchimura later recalled:

The public opinion of the college was too strong against me, which it was beyond my power to withstand. They *forced* me to sign the covenant . . . I finally yielded and signed it. I often ask myself whether I ought to have refrained from submitting myself to such a coercion. I was but a mere lad of sixteen then. . . . So, you see my first step toward Christianity was a forced one, against my will, and I must confess, somewhat against my conscious, too.⁷

Despite his forced conversion, Uchimura came to appreciate the teachings of Christianity, especially since its monotheistic doctrine provided him liberation from the innumerable gods he had tried so hard to please while growing up. Baptized by an American Methodist Episcopal missionary in 1878, Uchimura adopted the Christian name "Jonathan." Uchimura and his friends also started to have services at their own "little church" that they formed in their dorm rooms, taking turns at giving the sermon.⁸

After graduating from the Sapporo Agricultural College in 1881, Uchimura gained a governmental position overseeing the fisheries of Hokkaidō. At the same time, Uchimura and his friends were working to establish a native Japanese church that would not be affiliated with any foreign missionaries or other Christian denominations. They initially borrowed money from the American Methodist Mission, but paid off the debts, thereby creating the only church in Japan that at that time was "financially . . . ecclesiastically, and theologically" independent from foreign Christian denominations.⁹

⁷ Uchimura, *How I Became a Christian* in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol.3 (English sect.), 15.

⁸ Uchimura, *How I Became a Christian* in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol.3 (English sect.), 21-32.

⁹ Uchimura, *How I Became a Christian* in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol.3 (English sect.), 66.

After a failed six-month marriage in 1883, Uchimura left for the United States in 1884. This trip, his one and only visit outside of Japan, was likely the pivotal moment that helped form Uchimura's understanding of East and West. Prior to this visit, Uchimura idealized the United States as "Christendom" and the land of Puritans, but upon his arrival he witnessed many practices, such as mammonism and racism, which were contrary to the teachings of Jesus, providing a rude awakening that America was not what he had imagined. While Uchimura eventually met some remarkable individuals and learned to admire specific aspects of the United States and Western civilization, the pervasive shortcomings of Western society he perceived led to a very critical view of the West that gives Uchimura's writing a distinctly ambivalent and irresolute character.¹⁰

Soon after his arrival in San Francisco in late November 1884, he headed for Elwyn, Pennsylvania (a suburb of Philadelphia), where he was to work for a mental hospital run by Christian philanthropists. After eight months of service at the hospital, Uchimura left for Amherst College in Massachusetts. There he met the president of the college, Julius H. Seelye, whom Uchimura admired throughout his life as the embodiment of a "Christian gentleman." Uchimura was given a free dormitory room at Amherst College and was admitted as a special

¹⁰ Uchimura started to publish in 1880, when he was nineteen years old. His early publications between 1880 and 1885 were on biology, fisheries, and agriculture. There are no works during this period that indicate his view of the West prior to his visit to the United States in 1884-1888, but his idea of the United States is recorded briefly in his autobiographical account, *How I Became a Christian* in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 3(English sect.). While in the United States, Uchimura contributed to some American publications. Uchimura's writings at this stage were intended to inform Western audiences about Japan, and they reflect his frustrations with Western misunderstandings of Japan. See, Uchimura, "Moral Traits of the 'Yamato-Damashii' (Spirit of Japan)," *The Methodist Review*, January 1886, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 1, 113-135; "The Missionary Work of William S. Clark," *The Christian Union*, 22 Apr. 1886, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 1, 136-141; "Japanese Poetry," *The Amherst Literary Monthly*, April 1886, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 1, 142-146. There is also a handwritten piece written while at Amherst College c. 1886-1887, "A Church Question in Japan," in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 1, 155-168.

status student in September 1885. After graduating from Amherst College with a Bachelor's degree in 1887, Uchimura enrolled in Hartford Theological Seminary in Connecticut. His study at the seminary lasted for only four and a half months, probably due to a combination of health concerns and the disappointment he felt in the seminary.¹¹

In 1888, Uchimura returned to Japan and started a new career as a school teacher. He was first hired at the Christian school, Hoku'etsu Gakuin北越学館 in Niigata Prefecture, but due to a disagreement with the foreign missionaries there, he resigned from the school at the end of the same year. In 1890, Uchimura obtained a new teaching position at Dai Ichi Kōtō Chūgakkō 第一高等中学校 [First Higher Middle School, the preparatory school for Tokyo Imperial University], but his appointment as a teacher was short lived since it was in January of 1891 when Uchimura caused the great scandal by refusing to bow to the Imperial Rescript for Education.¹²

Around 1893, after not being able to find a stable teaching position after the Rescript incident, Uchimura became a writer and began publishing books and articles in both English and Japanese. Among the important works he wrote at this early stage were *Kirisuto shinto no nagusame* 基督信徒のなぐさめ [*Consolation of a Christian*] (1893), *How I Became a Christian* (1893), *Dendō no seishin* 伝道之精神 [*The True Spirit of the Christian Ministry*] (1894), and *Japan and the Japanese* (1894). In 1897, Uchimura's mastery of the English language and his

¹¹ Uchimura, *How I Became a Christian* in *Uchimura Kanzō Zenshū*, vol.3 (English sect.), 90-143; Miura Hitoshi, *The Life and Thought of Kanzo Uchimura*, 28-53.

¹² Miura Hitoshi, *The Life and Thought of Kanzo Uchimura*, 35-39; Uchimura married his second wife, Kazuko, in 1889, but the marriage did not last long since she passed away in 1891. Uchimura married his third wife, Shizu, in 1892, with whom he had a daughter, Rutsuko (Ruth, 1894-1912), and a son, Yūshi (1897-1980).

critical attitude earned him a position as the English editor for the satirical newspaper *Yorozu Chōhō* 萬朝報.¹³ While Uchimura resigned from his editor position at *Yorozu Chōhō* after only a year, he continued his activity as a journalist and writer for the rest of his life, launching the *Tokyo Dokuritsu Zasshi* [Tokyo Independent Magazine, 1898-1900], *Seisho no Kenkyū* [Biblical Studies, 1900-30], *Mukyōkai* [Non-Church, 1901-1902] as well as contributing articles to *Yorozu Chōhō* (1900-1903).¹⁴

In 1903, Uchimura began opening his own home for Bible study gatherings, and spent much of his quiet time as a writer and teacher of the Bible. In the midst of World War I, around 1917, Uchimura somewhat abruptly shifted his focus from small-scale, home-based Bible study to large-scale mass evangelism, emphasizing the impending return of Christ. Known as the Second Coming Movement (Sairin undō 再臨運動), Uchimura collaborated with other Christian leaders and gave a series of lectures to large audiences across Japan in 1918 and 1919.¹⁵ In 1919, Uchimura returned to regular weekly Bible study in Tokyo, but instead of returning to the small home-based operation of the past, he now sought a much larger audience and began holding services in an eight-hundred person lecture hall located across from the Imperial Palace. Uchimura's ministry ended with his death in 1930, but he is remembered to this day as the most famous Japanese Christian leader of modern Japan.

¹³ Around 1900, *Yorozu Chōhō* was "the largest daily newspaper" in Japan. Irokawa Daikichi, *The Culture of the Meiji Period*, Translation edited by Marius B. Jansen (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), 214.

¹⁴ Uchimura resigned from *Yorozu Chōhō* in 1903 when the owner of the newspaper decided to take a pro-war stance in the conflict with Russia. His two anti-war, socialist colleagues, Kōtoku Shūsui and Sakai Toshihiko also resigned at this time.

¹⁵ Howes, *Japan's Modern Prophet*, 237-254, 257-279.

Uchimura's Understanding of World History and Geography

To appreciate Uchimura's view of East and West, it is critical first to examine his understanding of history and geography. As a voracious reader with wide interests, Uchimura read many books in English on geography, history, and linguistics. Among the books identified by Uchimura as influencing him were Arnold Guyot, *Earth and Man, Lectures on Comparative Physical Geography in its Relation to the History of Mankind* (1849), Baron Bunsen, *God in History or The Progress of Man's Faith in the Moral Order of the World* (1868), and Charles Loring Brace, *Gesta Christi: Or, A History of Humane Progress Under Christianity* (1882) to name a few.¹⁶ Uchimura synthesized these works and offered his own interpretation of world geography and history in two books, *Chirigakukō* 地理学考 [*Thoughts on Geography*] (1894), also published as *Chijinron* 地人論, [*On Earth and Man*] (1898), and *Kōkoku shidan* 興国史談 [*Stories of the Rise of Nations*] (1899).¹⁷ These works indicate that Uchimura viewed geography and history to be reflections of the design of God or Providence (*setsuri* 摂理).

In Uchimura's mind, the Eastern and the Western worlds were two historically distinct regions with completely different courses of development. Based on his perception of historical

¹⁶ Arnold Guyot, *Earth and Man, Lectures on Comparative Physical Geography in its Relation to the History of Mankind*, Revised ed. (New York: C. Scribner, 1890 [1849]); Christian Karl Josias Bunsen, *God in History or The Progress of Man's Faith in the Moral Order of the World*, 3 vols. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co, 1868); Charles Loring Brace, *Gesta Christi: Or, A History of Humane Progress Under Christianity* (New York: Armstrong, 1882).

¹⁷ *Chijinron* (1894) and *Kōkoku shidan* (1899) are the two works that expressed Uchimura's views of history most clearly. Though they were written relatively early in his career, Uchimura appeared to have held the same basic concepts throughout his life. For example, in 1924 Uchimura stated "Egypt and Babylonia provided the world with the first material civilization. Phoenicia helped ancient civilization with commerce. Greece produced art, literature and philosophy, and Judea provided the religion which has not gone out of use until today. . . ." Uchimura, "Nihon no tenshoku [The Mission of Japan]," *Seisho no kenkyū*, 10 November 1924 in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 28, 400, quoted in Miura Hitoshi, *The Life and Thought of Kanzo Uchimura*, 114.

experience, Uchimura drew a line between East and West at the Pamirs or "Roof of the World."¹⁸ The East, therefore, included India, Southeast Asia (what Uchimura called *Shina-Indo* 支那印度 and considered as part of India), and East Asia such as China, Korea, and Japan. The Western world, on the other hand, included regions west of "the roof" in the Northern Hemisphere, including West Asia (Persia, Arabia, Mesopotamia etc.), Europe and North America.

In the Western world, Uchimura saw a "westward march of civilization" where civilization passed through groups of "historical peoples (*rekishi teki jinshu* 歴史的人種)" who "inherited, preserved, and improved civilization by adding unique positive features of the people, and passed onto the next group."¹⁹ Uchimura accepted the notion of West Asia being the cradle of civilization, the land in which civilization spent its three-thousand-year "early childhood (*Yōnen jidai* 幼年時代)."²⁰ Mesopotamia, Egypt, and Persia were included in his West Asia, although Uchimura admitted that Egypt was technically part of the African continent. The Egyptians, along with the Moroccans, Libyans, and Abyssinians (i.e. Ethiopians) were identified as a "white race (*hakuseki jinshu* 白哲人種)," more specifically, he attributed them to being part of the Hamitic branch that descended from Ham, one of Noah's three sons.²¹ In contrast to his

¹⁸ Uchimura, *Chirigakukō*, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 2, 440.

¹⁹ Uchimura, *Kōkoku shidan* 興国史談 in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 7, 267. Translated from . . . 文明を承継ぎ、之を保存し、之を改良し、之に其の国民の美質を加え、終に亦之を次の国民に引渡すのである. . .

²⁰ Uchimura, *Chirigakukō*, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 2, 398, 401. A similar concept can be found in Arnold Guyot's *Earth and Man*, 299-304.

²¹ Uchimura did not make it clear where exactly civilization first developed; he discussed Egypt before moving onto "Babylonia (Mesopotamia)" but he seemed to have accepted some scholars' assertion that

view of an ethnically homogeneous Egyptian civilization, Uchimura saw Babylonia (i.e. Mesopotamia) to be a synthetic civilization (*gōsei teki bunmei* 合成的文明) that included Mongoloid, Hamitic, and Semitic elements. According to Uchimura, Babylonian civilization was started by the Mongoloids, onto which "knowledge" was added by the Hamites and religious sentiments were brought by the Semites (including Assyrians).²² The Aryans, including the Medians and Persians, came next and synthesized the Mongoloid, the Hamitic, and Semitic elements, before the "civilized" knowledge was passed onto the Aryans of Europe, who brought it first to the Greeks, before it was passed onto the Romans and then Germanic groups.

The arrival of civilization in Europe meant that humanity had entered its young adulthood (*seinen jiki* 青年時期). From Uchimura's perspective, it was in Europe where humans developed a sense of freedom and independence, whereas during their childhood, humans needed discipline in the form of the "despotic" governments often found in West Asia. Uchimura viewed European geography, with its numerous mountains and intricate coastlines, as a mechanism that tended to divide people into smaller political entities rather than large scale empires. He believed that these small entities were conducive to human development because they encouraged competition.²³ While Uchimura saw Europe as a major step forward for civilization, it was not where he felt the ideas of freedom and independence were actually fully practiced; it was in North America where these ideals came to full realization.²⁴

"Babylonian" civilization was older than that of Egypt. Uchimura, *Chirigakukō*, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 2, 398-402; *Kōkoku shidan* in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 7, 285-299.

²² Uchimura, *Kōkoku shidan* in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 7, 297.

²³ Uchimura, *Chirigakukō*, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 2, 406-419.

²⁴ Uchimura, *Chirigakukō*, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 2, 402-440.

Much of Uchimura's concepts and ideas reflected nineteenth-century Western biases. He described the White Race as a "historical race" that was "superior" to the "Turanian" or non-white races.²⁵ Uchimura accepted the notion that all supposedly white races were derived from Noah and his three sons: Japheth, Shem, and Ham. Out of the three white races, Uchimura ranked the decedents of Japheth (i.e. Europeans) to be "most excellent," followed by the decedents of Shem (Jews, Arabs, Assyrians, etc.), and finally Ham (Egyptians, Abyssinians etc.).²⁶ Of the "Turanian" races, he placed the yellow race above the brown, black, and copper races, and felt that the yellow race had the potential to join civilization since the "yellow" Hungarians and Finns had done so already.²⁷ Uchimura believed it was possible for the yellow race to transcend their "Turanian" quality and become part of the "historical race" in a way that they could contribute to the advancement of civilization.²⁸ On the other hand, he felt that the brown, black and copper races, were destined never to join with the "historical races."²⁹ Interestingly enough, Uchimura stated that the "black races" should not be underestimated and he noted their good political sense, especially among those who were brought to the Western hemisphere. Uchimura specifically mentions François-Dominique Toussaint L'Ouverture (1743-

²⁵ Uchimura explains that "Turanian" means "non-Iranian" i.e. non-Aryan race.

²⁶ Uchimura, *Kōkoku shidan* in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 7, 363-378.

²⁷ Uchimura's understanding of different races was not always consistent. In *Kōkoku shidan* (1898), the Hamitic people are presented as a "white race," but in *How I Became a Christian* (1893), he identified African Americans as being "Hamitic." See *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol.3 (English sect.), 81-84.

²⁸ Uchimura, *Kōkoku shidan* in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 7, 273, 364-365. See also Uchimura, "Hungary and Turkey," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 22 February 1898, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 5, 287-289.

²⁹ Uchimura, *Kōkoku shidan* in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 7, 363-378.

1803), Jean-Jacques Dessalines (1758-1806), Frederick Douglas (c.1818-1895), and Booker T. Washington (1856-1915) as notable black leaders.³⁰

Uchimura accepted a Providential view of history and geography where Earth's physical features were designed by God with various regions having divinely assigned roles. He saw that civilization was predetermined to move westward from West Asia to Europe and then onto North America, because God designated it to be so. For Uchimura, the way Asia Minor extrudes into the Aegean Sea reflected the divine design to send civilization from Asia to Europe. The Greek's location across from the Asia Minor placed them exactly where they needed to be to serve as an intermediary between Asia and Europe. Once the Romans united Europe it allowed them to bring Greek and Jewish cultural elements together. Spain had a divinely assigned role to find the New World whereupon England was tasked with spreading Christian civilization across the Atlantic to the New World allowing for the creation of the United States.³¹

In a similar manner in which he described the divine plan where Western civilization moved westward (*seizen* 西漸) from West Asia to North America, Uchimura also described Eastern civilization as spreading in an eastward (*tōzen* 東漸) direction, but it does not appear that he put as much thought into the eastward march of the Eastern Civilization.³² This lack of detailed analysis was probably due, at least in part, to the fact that the source materials Uchimura acknowledged tended to deemphasize non-Western regions. In many cases it appears that he used the East as nothing more than a binary opposite of the West. Rather than seeing the East as

³⁰ Uchimura, *Kōkoku shidan* in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 7, 273.

³¹ Uchimura, *Chirigakukō*, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 2, 352-480.

³² Uchimura, *Chirigakukō*, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 2, 396.

a homogeneous entity, Uchimura recognized two distinct, and often contrasting, cultural elements of Eastern civilization split between India and China. Uchimura's understanding of Indian and Chinese culture never led him to see the cultural flow from India to China; rather he simply perceived a general eastward movement of civilizations from the two distinct centers. Both India and China were presented as ancient civilizations that suffered from stagnation and atrophy. Despite Indian civilization being built by the Aryan race, it was Uchimura's belief that the country's long history of outside invasion and continuous upheaval hindered it from establishing strong political or economic institutions. Instead of focusing on the materialistic aspects of life, Indians concentrated on spiritual matters, devoting their energy into the contemplation of metaphysical affairs. Taking a different path, the "Turanian" Chinese created a very secular society with strong political system, but devoid of spiritual life. It is clear that Japan had absorbed both Indian (i.e. Buddhism) and Chinese (Confucian) cultural elements resulting from the eastern flow of cultural ideas, but Uchimura apparently chose not to establish any strong theory of the "march of civilization" in the East comparable to that which he perceived in the West.³³

Since Chinese influence over Japan was far greater than that of India, when Uchimura talked about the "East," what he meant was usually China and more specifically China's Confucian tradition. Uchimura understood China to constitute the quintessential East, forming his antithesis of the West. He considered Chinese civilization to be essentially conservative, a continuation of "antediluvian" (*kōzui izen* 洪水以前) civilization, whereby China simply continued the ancient Mongoloid civilization characterized by materialism (*busshitsu teki* 物質

³³ Uchimura, *Chirigakukō*, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 2, 440-454.

的) and utilitarianism (*jitsuri shugi* 実利主義).³⁴ China represented a stage of human society that existed prior to the development of spiritual matters, therefore Uchimura did not see much that China had contributed to the overall advancement of humanity. When Uchimura talked of civilization in a historical context, what he referred to was the westward moving civilization that disseminated Christianity and operated according to God's plan. In his words, ". . . Egypt and Babylon started civilization, Phoenicia dispersed it, Judea purified it, Greece polished it, Italy preserved it, Germany reformed it, England tempered it, and America executed it."³⁵ The West was where God's work had been carried out so far and where Uchimura felt Japan's future awaited it as the next stop on the westward march of civilization. Thus, despite the occasional appearances of the term Eastern civilization (or Chinese or Indian civilization), the East held little of value for Uchimura Kanzō, and he urged his fellow Japanese to embrace the civilization that was spreading across the Pacific so that Japan could fulfill its mission as a bridge to bring together East and West.

Japan and the Westward March of Civilization

"The law of westward march was not to be reversed when civilization reached Japan," wrote Uchimura in 1892.³⁶ Clearly, Uchimura accepted the popular westward march theory and added his own twist by extending the march of civilization to Japan. The fact that "civilization"

³⁴ Uchimura, *Kōkoku shidan* in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 7, 286, 296, 365; See also, Uchimura, "Shina shugi 支那主義 [China-ism]," *Tokyo Dokuritsu Zasshi*, 25 July 1899, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 7, 202-203

³⁵ Uchimura Kanzō, "Japan's Future as Conceived by a Japanese (Japan: Its Mission)," in *The Japan Daily Mail*, 5 February 1892, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 1, 245.

³⁶ Uchimura Kanzō, "Japan's Future as Conceived by a Japanese (Japan: Its Mission)," *The Japan Daily Mail*, 5 February 1892, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 1, 251.

was introduced to Japan by Commodore Perry of the United States, rather than a European country, probably appeared as proof that the westward march was continuing.³⁷ Uchimura saw Japan's heavenly assigned role as that of an arbiter that would "reconcile the East with the West; to be the advocate of the East and the harbinger of the West."³⁸ He believed that only Japan was capable and ready to receive "civilization" from the United States due to its central location, physical geography, and historical experience. Uchimura believed Japan's physical geography had more in common with Europe than continental Asia, allowing the Japanese to appreciate European concepts better than their continental neighbors. He also felt that the Japanese had historically absorbed foreign elements, such as Confucianism from China and Buddhism from India, allowing them to understand both Eastern and Western worlds. Combining the geographical conditions and historical experiences together only confirmed in Uchimura's mind that he understood God's plan for humanity and the role that Japan was assigned to play.³⁹

From Uchimura's point of view, how Japan would take up its heavenly assigned role was a matter that would determine not only Japan's future but also the future of the rest of Asia. Uchimura thought it was Japan's responsibility to receive "civilization" from the West and to improve it before sending it on to their neighbors. As an intermediary between East and West,

³⁷ Uchimura did not say anything about the 16th century introduction of Christianity to Japan by Jesuit missionaries. Although it is estimated that 300,000 Japanese adherents of Catholicism existed during the sixteenth century, Christianity was banned once a centralized government was established. In 1587, Toyotomi Hideyoshi (1536-1598) expelled Catholic missionaries from Japan, and in 1626, the Tokugawa Shogunate completely banned Christianity, an edict that continued until 1873 when the Meiji government officially lifted the ban. For more information, see C. R. Boxer, *The Christian Century in Japan, 1549-1650*; Sansom, *The Western World and Japan*.

³⁸ Uchimura Kanzō, "Japan's Future as Conceived by a Japanese (Japan: Its Mission)," *The Japan Daily Mail*, 5 February 1892, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 1, 252.

³⁹ Uchimura Kanzō, "Japan's Future as Conceived by a Japanese (Japan: Its Mission)," *The Japan Daily Mail*, 5 February 1892, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 1 243-254; *Chirigakukō*, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 2, 454-468; *Japan and the Japanese* (1894) in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 3 (English sect), 172-183.

Uchimura saw Meiji Japan as belonging to neither East nor West, but as a hybrid (*konketsuji* 混血児 mixed blood child) of the two. His own identity was to be a "*Weltmann*" or "world citizen"—"neither Japanese nor an Easterner."⁴⁰ Uchimura adamantly denounced narrow minded nationalism and argued that "true patriotism" was "to love own country for the sake of the universe."⁴¹ For him, all humanity was his *dōhō* ("of the same womb"), as he stated:

If I think that only Japan is my county, I would be disheartened, but I am a world citizen and not just a Japanese citizen. . . . If I think only Japanese people are my *dōhō*, then I would be disheartened, but if I think all those who differentiate truth from falsehood are my *dōhō*, regardless of skin color or language, then I will not be disheartened. . . . I do not have to be disheartened as part of the whole of humanity. . . .⁴²

Uchimura believed that Japan was to play the critical role in bringing all of humanity together to enjoy the fruits of civilization, so it was imperative that civilization's march westward was continued in order to fulfill God's plan. While Uchimura's faith in God did not waver, his belief that his fellow countrymen could properly carry out their role was much less certain.

Uchimura thought that Japan as of the early twentieth century was doing an inadequate job of fulfilling the task of carrying the torch of civilization. Prior to the surge in Christian

⁴⁰ Uchimura's comment that he was "neither Japanese nor an Easterner (*Nihonjin demo Tōyōjin demo nai* 日本人でも東洋人でもない)" appears in "Bunkyū umare no kan 文久生れの感 [Thoughts on Born in Bunkyū Era]," *Tokyo Dokuritsu Zasshi*, 5 April 1900, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 8, 110.

⁴¹ Uchimura, *Chirigakukō* in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 2, 365. Translated from 真の愛国心とは宇宙の為に国を愛することなり. . . .

⁴² Uchimura Kanzō, "Kibō no kuiki 希望の区域 [Limits on Hope]," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 2 March 1901, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 9, 67-68. Translated from 日本国許りが我が国であると思えば失望する、然し我は世界の市民で有って日本国許りの市民では無い. . . . 日本人許りが我が同胞であると思えば我は失望する、然れども人たる者はその皮膚の色の如何に関はず、其言語の何たるにはらず、総て真を真とし、偽を偽とする者は我が同胞であると思えば我は決して失望するに及ばない. . . . 我は人類全軀に就て決して失望するに及ばない. . . .

popularity around 1906, Uchimura's major criticism was that Japan had adopted "Christian civilization without Christianity."⁴³ He could not conceive of Western civilization and its political, social, and intellectual accomplishments apart from Christianity which he felt was the very essence of its existence. In his mind, human beings were made up of a body (*niku* 肉) and a soul (*rei* 霊); likewise, civilizations consisted of material culture and spiritual principle.⁴⁴ He was convinced that no civilization could survive without religion or spirituality. Uchimura's study of history indicated to him that societies without spirituality were doomed and would eventually perish. Once, Uchimura drew a parallel between contemporary Japan and the Neo-Babylonian Empire (626–539 BCE):

Babylonian civilization, bestial civilization, civilization that should not be called civilization, civilization without principle, civilization of rich-country-strong-military [*fukoku kyōhei teki bunmei* 富国強兵の文明], civilization that prevented development of individuals—Indeed; this is a good example of a doomed civilization. Civilizations of this kind that aim at bodily comfort, even if they have railroads, telegraphs, telephones, or imitate the constitution of Solon, and establish a parliament, will share the destiny of Babylonian civilization. Every time we read Babylonian history, we should never fail to see the parallel with our own [society].⁴⁵

⁴³ Uchimura, "Japan's Case," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 4 April 1897, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 4, 95. See also Uchimura, "Nihonkoku no dai konnan 日本国の大困難 [The Great Trouble of the Japanese State]." *Seisho no kenkyū*, 10 March 1903, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 11, 147-156.

⁴⁴ An example of Uchimura's discussion of "body and soul" can be found in Uchimura, "Tōhoku dendō 東北伝道 [Mission to the Northeast]," *Seisho no kenkyū*, 10 July 1906, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 14, 196-233.

⁴⁵ Uchimura, *Kōkoku shidan*, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 7, 325. Note that Uchimura called the Babylonian civilization *fukoku kyōhei teki bunmei* 富国強兵の文明 or "civilization of rich-country-strong-military." "Rich country and strong military (*fukoku kyōhei*)" was Meiji government's slogan. Translated from バビロン文明、禽獸的文明、文明の名を下すからざる文明、主義のなき文明、富国強兵の文明、個人的発達を計らざりし文明——是れ実に死的文明の好標本であって、是に類する文明は、鉄道、電信、電話あるにもせよ、然りソロンの憲法を真似て国会を開設にもせよ、肉体の快樂を目的をする文明は皆バビロン文明を運と共にすべきものであって、我等はバビロニア史を読む毎に我等直接の事物に思ひ当たらない事はない。

Neo-Babylonian civilization represented a utilitarian (*jitsuri jitsu'eki* 実利実益) civilization that pursued only material matters and neglected its spiritual side. His analysis of Meiji Japan presented a modern Japanese state with the outward appearance of civilization through the latest technology and political institutions, but it failed to adopt the Christian spirit of civilization and was therefore devoid of any critical life force just as the Neo-Babylonian civilization had been.⁴⁶

More specifically, Uchimura identified the concept of spiritual freedom as the critical essence that allowed Western civilization to have great artists, writers, scientists, philosophers, and politicians. For him, freedom was something only obtainable through the Creator: "The essence of freedom lies in a man's direct communion with God. Perfect freedom is unthinkable without an authority higher than that set up by men."⁴⁷ Uchimura argued that only God was truly free since he was the only omnipresent being, and thus only God had an ability to grant freedom to humans in the true sense of the word. For Uchimura, "freedom that did not come from God was not true freedom."⁴⁸ As far as he was concerned, the Japanese people would be unable to understand the concept of liberty until they recognized its true source as being God. Uchimura regarded the standard Japanese understanding of freedom, which was largely influenced by secular Enlightenment thinkers, to be faulty and inadequate. He was particularly not fond of the classical-liberal and utilitarian thinkers that had become popular in Meiji Japan such as Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832), John Stuart Mill (1806-1873), and Herbert Spencer (1820-1903), since he

⁴⁶ Uchimura also stated "Never in her history was Japan so vacant in her soul as at present" in "Spring Meditations," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 13 May 1897, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 4, 158-159.

⁴⁷ Uchimura, "Japan's Case," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 4 April 1897, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 4, 95.

⁴⁸ Uchimura, "Jiyū no kami 自由の神 [The God of Freedom]," *Tokyo Dokuritsu Zasshi*, 10 August. 1898, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 6, 78. Translated from 神より来らざる自由は、自由にして自由にあらず

thought they were all harmful to the cause of "justice." Uchimura complained that the philosophies of Bentham and Spencer reduced justice to "the largest possible amount of sausage that any nation or individual can turn out for the market."⁴⁹ From Uchimura's standpoint, freedom was a matter of the spirit rather than body, and freedom of spirit was attained only when people recognized that only their Creator could grant such a blessing.

Thus, Uchimura urged his fellow Japanese to embrace Christianity. It was clear to him that Meiji Japan had become a land that combined Western knowledge (*Seiyō chishiki* 西洋知識) and Eastern morality (*Tōyō dōtoku* 東洋道德), a combination that Uchimura considered to be dangerous.⁵⁰ What Uchimura meant by Eastern morality was what he referred to as *Shina shugi* 支那主義 or "China-ism," based on the Confucian definition of morality that emphasized the virtues of loyalty and filial piety. As the conservatives continued to exert a strong influence during the Meiji era, as seen by the example of the issuing of the Imperial Rescript on Education (1890), Uchimura lamented the situation since he believed that China-ism was doomed and detrimental to Japan's future.⁵¹ Confucianism, which emphasized the way of antiquity, social hierarchy, and ritualistic behaviors, represented a system of conservatism that prevented Japan from fully embracing "civilization." The secular nature of Confucianism stood as the direct opposite of Christian spirituality.

⁴⁹ Uchimura, "The Yoroze's Inconsistency," *Yoroze Chōhō*, 13 July 1897, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 4, 245.

⁵⁰ Uchimura, "Monbu shō ga fuyō ni narishi riyū 文部省が不用になりし理由 [The Reason Why the Ministry of Education is No Longer Needed]," *Yoroze Chōhō*, 10 August 1903, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 11, 352-353.

⁵¹ Uchimura, "Shina shugi 支那主義 [China-ism]," *Tokyo Dokuritsu Zasshi*, 15 June 1900, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 8, 238-240.

Not only was Confucianism depriving Japan of its vital spiritual essence, it also hindered the nation's progress as a civilization in how it segmented society. Uchimura believed that "progress" meant the "progress of liberty" and "the degree to which power was distributed to the lower class."⁵² He understood Christianity to be oriented toward commoners (*heimin teki* 平民的) since Jesus was only a carpenter that mingled with the common people.⁵³ Christianity's lower class orientation shapely contrasted with the Confucian emphasis on propriety based on superior-inferior relationships: "Eastern civilization regressed because it exalted the high [elites]; Western civilization progressed because it exalted the low [down-trodden]."⁵⁴

Japan's adoption of Christianity was a matter of life and death for civilization, since Uchimura believed that Christian civilization without Christianity was the same as a body without a soul. The main difference he observed between East and West was a distinct faith in God by Westerners while that sharply contrasted with the complete lack of spirituality among Easterners or East Asians. Faith in God gave the Westerners a spirit of freedom and independence that manifested itself in Western society's artistic, scientific, and political accomplishments. The outward appearance and trappings of Western civilization, such as a

⁵² Uchimura, "Seijika no mē 政治家の銘 [Things that Politicians Should Keep in Mind]," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 2 January 1898, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 5, 219. Translated from 進歩とは権力が下民に行き渡る度合を言うなり。See also, Uchimura also stated, "Progress of Liberty that we measure Man's progress," in "Thoughts and Reflections," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 22 August 1897, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 5, 29.

⁵³ Uchimura, "Wagashi Yaso Kirisuto 我が師耶蘇基督 [My Teacher, Jesus Christ]," *Tokyo Dokuritsu Zasshi*, 15 July 1899, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 7, 172; "Heijin no shūkyō 平人の宗教 [Commoner's Religion]," *Seisho no kenkyū*, 20 May 1901, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 9, 171; "Kirisutokyō teki seiji 基督教的政治 [Christian Politics], *Seisho no kenkyū*, 25 January 1903, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 11, 13-15.

⁵⁴ Uchimura, "Seijika no mē," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 2 January 1898, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 5, 219. Translated from 東洋文明は上を崇めしが故に退歩し、西洋文明は下を崇めしが故に進歩せり

"German army, British navy, Italian arts, and French dress," were not enough to make Japan civilized.⁵⁵ "Never before in their History were the Japanese so superficial in their intellectual acquisitions as at present. . . . Nothing cripples intellects so much as the lack of faith" commented Uchimura.⁵⁶ What Japan needed was to adopt Christianity, and therefore understand the core essence of the Western spirit: "to know Europe is to know its spirit, the very fundamental that gave Dante and Shakespeare to the world. . . ."⁵⁷ Uchimura sought to spread the Gospel of Christ so that Japan could fulfill its heavenly assigned mission of bringing civilization to the rest of Asia.

The Modern Western States

Clearly, Uchimura considered Western civilization to be historically superior to the Eastern equivalent and admired its historical legacy, but he did not let this appreciation blind him to the negative aspects of modern Western society. John Howes, the author of *Japan's Modern Prophet: Uchimura Kanzō, 1861-1930*, states "As a specialist on foreign affairs in the *Yorozu*, Uchimura had recommended Western ways to readers," but such an assessment appears to be too simplistic. Indeed, even during the years he contributed to *Yorozu Chōhō* (1897-1903), he was very critical of the West and his "recommendation" was highly qualified.⁵⁸ Surely, he urged the

⁵⁵ Uchimura, "Shina shugi," *Tokyo Dokuritsu Zasshi*, 15 June 1900, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 8, 238-240.

⁵⁶ Uchimura, "Notes," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 17 April 1897, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 4, 117.

⁵⁷ Uchimura, "What it is to know Europe," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 25 January 1898, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 5, 246.

⁵⁸ Howes, *Japan's Modern Prophet*, 320.

Japanese to be rid of the "oriental" mindset and to "Europeanize" from "the very core" of their hearts,⁵⁹ but considering the criticism he displayed toward the Western countries and Westerners, what he meant is perhaps better described as the adoption of "Christianity" rather than "Western ways." In fact, Uchimura even expressed the thought that the term "European civilization" (by which he meant Western civilization) was in a sense a misnomer since people tended to think of it as something peculiar to Europe and Europeans: "European civilization is a civilization that reached its high development on the soil of Europe. It was only accidentally, however, that it did so, because under proper circumstances, it can grow and prosper in any other soil."⁶⁰ Uchimura's feelings toward the West can be described as ambivalent at best; he admired some Westerners such as Oliver Cromwell, Thomas Carlyle, Charles Darwin, David Livingstone, William Wordsworth, Walt Whitman, Ralph Waldo Emerson, William Gladstone, and his beloved teacher, Julius Seely, but he was also very critical of modern Western society, its culture, and its foreign policy.

Uchimura's Experience in the United States

Uchimura's criticism of modern Western societies started as early as 1884, when he made his only trip to a Western country, the United States. "My idea of the Christian America was lofty, religious, Puritanic. I dreamed of its templed hills, and rocks that rang with hymns and praises. Hebraisms, I thought, to be the prevailing speech of the American commonality, and cherub and cherubim, hallelujahs and amens, the common language of its street," wrote

⁵⁹ Uchimura, "Notes," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 24 April 1898, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 5, 395-396.

⁶⁰ Uchimura, "Foreign Policy of Japan Historically Considered," *The Japan Weekly Chronicle*, 3 March 1904, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 12, 93.

Uchimura recalling his visit to the United States in 1884-1888.⁶¹ His image of "the Holy Land," however, was immediately shattered when he reached the United States. He was shocked at the "open violations of the Third Commandment" when Americans uttered the name of God in "deep profanity." He was also highly disturbed by the display of "mammonism" and crimes of pick-pocketing and robbery that he and his countrymen experienced in "Christendom."⁶²

Though Uchimura generally accepted the superiority of the white race as expressed in Western publications, he was appalled by the mistreatments of various ethnic groups by whites in the United State. He expressed his view that racism toward Native Americans, African Americans, and Chinese was "more like heathendom" than any other aspect of American life, probably because it appeared to be contrary to Jesus' instruction that "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."⁶³ "After 'a century of dishonor,'" wrote Uchimura, "the copper-colored children of the forest from whom the land was wrested by many a cruel and inhumane means, are still looked upon by the commonality as no better than buffaloes or Rocky Mountain sheep, to be trapped and hunted like wild beasts." As for African Americans, he observed racial segregation as white Americans kept "their Jephetic vanity by keeping themselves at respectable distances from the race which they bought with their own blood." He noted prejudice against Chinese immigrants and called anti-Chinese legislation "anti-Biblical, anti-Christian, anti-evangelical,

⁶¹ Uchimura, *How I Became a Christian*, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 3 (English sect.), 79.

⁶² Uchimura, *How I Became a Christian*, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 3 (English sect.), 79-83.

⁶³ Matt 19:19 KJV

and anti-humanitarian." He also noticed that some white Americans were "peculiarly sensitive as to their Saxon birthright" and did not like to be mistaken for "Irish."⁶⁴

Uchimura cited many "other unchristian features of Christendom" in America, such as a legalized lottery, gambling, lynching, rum-traffic, denominational rivalries within Christianity, etc. Recalling his reactions to these vices, Uchimura wrote,

Is this the civilization we were taught by missionaries to accept as an evidence of the superiority of Christian Religion over other religions? . . . If it was Christianity that made the so-called Christendom of to-day, let Heaven's eternal curse rest upon it! Peace is the last thing we can find in Christendom. . . . O heaven, I am undone! I was deceived!⁶⁵

Uchimura's distress at finding the discrepancies between his expectations of Christendom and its reality in the United States was so vast that he swore he would "never defend Christianity upon its being the religion of Europe and America."⁶⁶

Westerners in Foreign Lands and Imperialism

As for most Westerners in Japan, be they American, British or any other nationality, Uchimura was generally not impressed by their behavior and he often complained about them during his time as the English-section editor of the *Yorozu Chōhō* (1897-1898). He particularly disliked those he called "globe-trotters" who briefly visited Japan and then left to spread inaccurate information about the country to the rest of the world. These Westerners usually visited only "corrupted treaty-ports and pleasure houses," and never bothered to see "true Japan"

⁶⁴ Uchimura, *How I Became a Christian*, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 3 (English sect.), 83-89.

⁶⁵ Uchimura, *How I Became a Christian*, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 3 (English sect.), 89-90.

⁶⁶ Uchimura, *How I Became a Christian*, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 3 (English sect.), 90.

where "real Japanese" people lived. Worse yet, these "globe-trotters" morally corrupted the Japanese by turning some of them into prostitutes and pimps for the sake of money.⁶⁷ Even if they were not "globe-trotters," Uchimura complained that westerners generally behaved arrogantly and insolently, expecting the Japanese to act in "mute, humiliating, [and] slavish submission."⁶⁸ Moreover, by the granting of extraterritoriality through treaties, foreigners oftentimes got away with crimes because they were "protected" by the gunboats of "Christian government."⁶⁹ The bad behavior of these Westerners gave Christianity a bad name since non-Westerners tended to equate the West with Christianity. Uchimura saw the problem to be that so-called Christians and Christian states were not actually practicing the lessons that Jesus taught.

Uchimura was appalled by the foreign policies of some Western countries. He saw that Western countries did not stand up for the cause of justice; instead they made decisions based upon whatever was most beneficial to them, allowing and promoting behavior Uchimura perceived to be "un-Christian." He complained of the Western power's intervention in the Greco-Turkish War of 1897 on behalf of Turkey saying that they were "afraid of war among

⁶⁷ Uchimura, "Licentious Foreigners," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 27 February 1897, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 4, 24-25; "Sins of the Globe Trotter," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 10-11 March 1897, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 4, 47-50; "Once More the Sins of the Globe-Trotter," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 23 March 1897, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 4, 66-67; "The Globe-Trotter," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 22 May 1897, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 4, 173.

⁶⁸ Uchimura, "To the Hyogo News," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 22 May 1897, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 4, 172-173.

⁶⁹ Uchimura, "What We Can Do," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 17 February 1897, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 4, 6. Uchimura's criticisms of Westerners can be also found in "[We as news-paper men, etc.]," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 23 February 1897, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 4, 16-17; "A Master in Vice," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 2 March 1897, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 4, 30-31; "The Devil's View of Japan," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 12 March 1897, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 4, 54-55; "Unreasonable Complaints," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 14 May 1897, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 4, 161-162; "John Bullism," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 29 May 1897, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 4, 187-189; "A Water-Pouring Argument," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 16 June 1897, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 4, 213-214, etc.

themselves, afraid of a sudden fall of their stocks, [and] afraid of losing their ignoble case."⁷⁰ He was highly critical of the German occupation of Jiaozhou Bay in China following the murder of two missionaries:

It seems to be in strict accordance with the Hohenzollern (we say not *German*) form of Christianity to send a squadron to punish a heathen nation for killing a few of its Christian missionaries. Such a splendid pretext for robbing other men's land was never dreamed of by the holy apostles themselves. The Bible and battleships seem to agree very well with each other. We do not wonder why Christianity is making such a splendid progress in the Far East.⁷¹

Not only was the German occupation of Jiaozhou "un-Christian," he was disturbed by the manner in which the other "Christian" states supported Germany and/or joined it in the partitioning of China.⁷²

Uchimura was even disillusioned by Great Britain and the United States, the two countries he had once called "most free and the most justice-loving nations of the world."⁷³

⁷⁰ Uchimura, "Peace, Peace!," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 19 March 1897, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 4, 64-65; See also, "Hail To Greece," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 28 February 1897, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 4, 26-28; "Sympathy for Greece," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 5 June 1897, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 4, 197-199.

⁷¹ Uchimura, "German Occupation of Kiao-Chow," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 24 November 1897, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 5, 163-165. See also, "Decline of German Language," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 23 November 1897, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 5, 160-162; "Anti-Christian Christianity," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 25 November 1897, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 5, 166; "Notes and Comments," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 1-3 December 1897, *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 5, 167-174.

⁷² Uchimura was also very critical of Japan's role in the partition of China. During the Sino-Japanese war (1894-1895), Uchimura believed that Japan's actions were justified and even defended Japan's position to foreigners by writing "Justification for the Korean War," *The Japan weekly Mail*, 11 August 1894, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 3 (English sect.), 38-48. See also, "*Sekai rekishi ni chō shite Ni-Sshi no kankei o ronzu* 世界歴史に徴して日支の關係を論ず [Sino-Japanese Relations in World History]," *Kokumin Shinbun* 国民新聞, 27 July 1894, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 3 (Japanese sect), 30-37. Soon after the war, however, Uchimura deeply regretted writing the piece and expressed his disapproval of Japan's policies. He was convinced that the Sino-Japanese War created the condition that led to the partition of China. See, "Thoughts and Reflections," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 15 August 1897, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 5, 16-17; "A Retrospect," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 14-16, December 1897, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 5, 191-196, etc.

⁷³ Uchimura, "Editorial Notes," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 20 May 1898, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 5, 415-416.

Convinced of the just cause of the Boers, Uchimura mourned for their loss of independence in 1902, and commented that "England professed to love liberty. She loves it in herself, but not in others."⁷⁴ Uchimura was troubled by the Anglo-Japanese Alliance signed shortly before the conclusion of the Boer War, because not only did he believe that it contributed to the demise of the South African Republics by ending the British policy of "splendid isolation," but he also no longer trusted Britain as an ally.⁷⁵ At the beginning of the Spanish-American War (1898), Uchimura sided with the United States, believing that the United States was fighting for the just cause of helping Cuba gain its independence from Spain, but he was disappointed at the outcome of the war when the United States gained control of the Philippines and Puerto Rico.⁷⁶ Uchimura considered the Republican Party to be aggressive imperialists, while he viewed the Democratic Party as more idealistic and "more in accordance with the fundamental idea of Democracy. . . ."⁷⁷ He was particularly disturbed by the degradation of the United States under President Theodore Roosevelt (pres. 1901-1909) where "mammonism" prevailed and entrepreneurs controlled the government. He lamented that the United States was no longer the

⁷⁴ Uchimura, "Death of Republics," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 6 June 1902, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 10, 186; See also, "Bōa o nagusamu ボーアを慰む [Consolation for the Boers]," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 5 June 1902, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 10, 182-183; "Nihonkoku no daizaiaku 日本国の大罪悪 [The Great Crime of the Japanese State]," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 6 June 1902, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 10, 184-185; "Imposture," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 8 June 1902, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 10, 188-189.

⁷⁵ Uchimura, "Eikoku ni taisuru Nihonjin no dōjō 英国に対する日本人の同情 [Japanese Sympathy toward Great Britain]," *Tokyo Dokuritsu Zasshi*, 25 March 1900, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 8, 95-99.

⁷⁶ Uchimura, "The Spanish-American War," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 26 April 1898, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 5, 397-399; "America's Motive for War," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 14-15 May 1898, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 5, 410-414.

⁷⁷ Uchimura, "Two American Parties," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 4 July 1897, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 4, 235-236; "Beikoku no daraku to sono kyūsai 米国の墮落と其救済 [Corruption of the United States and its Remedies], *Seisho no kenkyū* 聖書之研究, 22 September 1904, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 12, 27-430.

land of Puritans, Washington, or Lincoln, and felt that the only hope he saw left in American politics was the existence of the Democrats.⁷⁸

Uchimura perceived the imperialism and militarism of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to be contrary to Jesus' teaching about non-resistance: "ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also."⁷⁹ Worse yet, the Christian churches had sided with the imperialists and provided justifications for militarism in the name of foreign missions:

Peter tried to protect Jesus by drawing his sword, but Jesus admonished, "Put away your sword; all those that draw the sword will perish by the sword. Great Britain, the United States, Germany, Russia, and all the so-called Christian states have large armies and navies, and they claim to protect Christian civilization. There are also Christian churches that bless the war flags, pray for victory, and seek to spread the gospel of Christ in foreign lands under [military] protection. There are many strange things in this world, but none is as strange as the foreign missionary activities of the so-called Christian states."⁸⁰

Christianity that went side by side with the army and navy into foreign lands" was not the version of Christianity that Uchimura advocated; it was a corrupted version that misused the Cross and failed to follow the teachings of Jesus.

⁷⁸ Uchimura, "Yono jōtai to gojin no kibō 世の状态と吾人の希望 [Current Conditions and Our Hope]," *Seisho no kenkyū*, 20 June 1902, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 10, 201-210.

⁷⁹ Matt 5:39 KJV

⁸⁰ Uchimura, "Gaikoku Dendō 外国伝道 [Foreign Mission]," *Seisho no kenkyū*, 10 June 1908, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 15, 478-479. Translated from ペテロ剣を抜きてイエスの身を護らんとせり、イエス、彼を誡めて曰く、汝の剣を鞘に納めよ、凡て剣を取る者は剣にて亡ぶべしと、英国と米国、独国と露国と、其他すべての所謂基督教国は大軍を備え、大艦を浮べて基督教的文明を護ると称す、而して基督教会なるものありて、軍旗を祝福し、勝利を祈り、其保護の下にキリストの福音を異郷の民に伝へんと欲す、世に奇怪の事多しと雖も、今の所謂基督教国の外国伝道の如きはあらざるなり。

Not only were the Western countries or so-called Christendom destructive of "Heathendom" via mechanisms of imperialism, but they also "killed" the local societies through "strong rums and whiskies; by poisoned tobacco; by foul diseases; by its atheism, nihilism and other destructive isms."⁸¹ Being a non-drinker and a promoter of Temperance, Uchimura was especially critical of the sales of liquor to the "heathens" by "Christians."⁸² All these shortcomings and degradations of Western society that Uchimura pointed out, whether mammonism, imperialism, or promiscuity, indicated that Uchimura's concerns about the promotion of "Western ways" was a qualified one. Uchimura found that most Westerners and their countries acted upon the principles of hypocrisy rather than on truth and justice. To be sure, the West was not hopeless in his eyes since Uchimura still perceived the voice of consciousness, spirit of freedom, and the workings of some remarkable gentlemen as being derived from the true essence of Christianity. While Uchimura strongly promoted the concepts and adoption of Christianity, he was strongly opposed to the "Western ways" that had become so common place during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries: "Let Christendom kill and steal, in such downright contrast to the teaching of the Religion by which they name themselves; but let us not

⁸¹ Uchimura, "Christendom versus Heathendom," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 17 March 1897, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 4, 59-60.

⁸² Uchimura's arguments for temperance can be found in Uchimura, "*Yo no sake o nomazaru riyū* 余の酒を飲ざる理由 [Reasons Why I do not Drink]," *Hinomaru* 日の丸, 30 June 1889, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 1, 175-178; "A Temperance Island of the Pacific," *The Advance*, 17 Dec. 1891, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 1, 224-232; "*Sake o nomazaru riei* 酒を飲まざる利益 [Benefits of Non-Drinking]," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 31 August 1902, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 10, 280-281; "*Kokka Kinshuron* 国家禁酒論 [Temperance of a Nation]," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 9-11 October 1902, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 10, 305-308; "*Nihonkoku no nidaiteki* 日本国の二大敵 [Two Great Enemies of Japan]," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 23 October 1902, *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 10, 311-312; "*Sake to fuhai* 酒と腐敗 [Alcoholic Beverages and Corruption]," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 28. October 1902, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 10, 336-337, etc.

kill and steal."⁸³ As for Japanese, Uchimura promoted not only the acceptance of the Christian religion, but also the purification of that religion by returning to the Bible and the original teachings of Jesus, Peter and Paul.

Uchimura, Foreign Missionaries and Non-Church Christianity

As has been explained, Uchimura did not advocate the wholesale adoption of Western civilization, nor did he promote the adoption of Christianity as practiced in the West. Indeed, he was highly critical of foreign Christian missionaries, especially those from the United States and Great Britain, and openly urged his fellow Japanese not to follow them. One of the primary issues that Uchimura held against the foreign missionaries, as well as Western (American) Christians, appears to have been their apparent sense of superiority and lack of respect toward "heathens." From his vantage point he could see the arrogant and paternalistic view that the missionaries had toward the pitiful heathens where they felt that the local people had no hope of salvation except by following their teachings and advice so that they could be led from darkness and damnation into salvation and enlightenment. Uchimura recalled his experiences in the United States when he was forced to take part in "mission shows" to earn enough money to survive:

. . . the worst lot in these shows falls to some specimen of converted heathens who happen to be there. They are sure to be made good use of, as circus-men make use of tamed rhinoceros. They are fetched up for shows; and such wonderful shows! Till but recently bowing before woods and stones, but now owning the same God as that of these white people! . . . And these rhinoceros who like to be seen and petted gladly obey the behest of these people, and most awkward manner, tell them how they ceased to be

⁸³ Uchimura, "A Retrospect," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 14-16 December 1897, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 5, 196.

animals and began to live like men. But there are other rhinoceros who do not like to be robbed of their internal peace by being made shows to the people, all of whom cannot comprehend through what torturous and painful processes were they made to give up the rhinoceros-life.⁸⁴

His comparison of the "heathen-convert" to "tamed rhinoceros" in a circus reveals how uncomfortable Uchimura felt being in these shows where he was supposed to project what American Christians wanted to see rather than what he truly felt inside. The manner in which American Christians held an attitude toward the "heathens" that they were completely ignorant, helpless and even bestial without the guidance of "white" missionaries severely bothered Uchimura:

Indeed, there are some people who seem to imagine that the cause of the Mission can be upheld only by picturing the darkness of heathens in contrast to the light of Christians. So they make a diagram showing heathens in jet-black squares, and Protestant Christians in white squares. Missionary Magazines, Reviews, and Heralds, all abound with accounts of wickednesses, degradations, and the gross superstitions of heathens, while scarcely any accounts of their nobleness, godliness, and highly Christlike characters make its way into their columns. . . . The fact is, if we heathens are but slightly better than gibbons and chimpanzees, the Christians may give up their mission works as total failures. It is because we know something about Right and Wrong, Truth and Falsehood, that we are readily brought to the Cross of Christ.⁸⁵

Based on the behavior he experienced with the foreign missionaries, Uchimura came to believe that native converts would make far better missionaries than foreigners that lacked any respect for the people they were trying to convert. Uchimura also felt that foreign missionaries were imposing not only their religious beliefs, but also "their own manners and customs" such as "free

⁸⁴ Uchimura, *How I Became a Christian*, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol.3 (English sect.), 115.

⁸⁵ Uchimura, *How I Became a Christian*, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 3 (English sect.), 116-117.

marriage" and "women's rights," ideas which Uchimura did not think were part of the gospel.⁸⁶

Ultimately, Uchimura felt that Christianity had to be indigenized, and that only Japanized Christianity propagated by Japanese believers could save Japan from its own path to self ruin and destruction.

The strong connection of many foreign missionaries to their secular governments made Uchimura very uneasy since it created a situation where the missionaries were essentially government agents that functioned as an instrument of imperialism. Uchimura recognized the sincere motives and high ideals of some Western missionaries, but the fact that they belonged to the powerful Western states made Uchimura particularly wary of them. He was disturbed by the sheer number of instances where colonization followed closely on the heels of foreign missionaries, marking their presence a danger to Japan or any other region where they were active. Uchimura admired the famous British medical missionary and explorer of Africa, David Livingstone (1813-1873), but he was also aware how the fruits of Livingstone's hard-work were exploited by imperialists such as Cecil Rhodes (1853-1902).⁸⁷ In regards to missionaries, Uchimura commented that "Missionaries now go forth, not alone with divine protection, but with the protection of armies and navies. No wonder they do not succeed in their work."⁸⁸ Uchimura

⁸⁶ Uchimura, *How I Became a Christian*, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 3 (English sect.), 159; "Waga risō no Kirisutokyō 我が理想の基督教 [Christianity of My Ideal]," *Seisho no kenkyū*, 20 May 1901, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 9, 174-180.

⁸⁷ Uchimura, "Waga risō no Kirisutokyō," *Seisho no kenkyū*, 20 May 1901, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 9, 174-180.

⁸⁸ Uchimura, "Missionary Problem—The Cause of Failure," *The Japan Chronicle*, 27 June 1908, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 15, 496-497.

was also critical of the missionaries who failed to stand up for justice, kept silent on "the sins of their own governments" and the sins of their own immoral countrymen.⁸⁹

In addition, Uchimura came to understand that whatever version of Christianity foreign missionaries brought with them, it was going to be a version he felt had been corrupted and therefore far removed from the vision of Jesus' teachings that he believed in. Since American missionaries constituted the largest group of Westerners in Japan, Uchimura was most disparaging of them and their various versions of Christianity. His attitude toward foreign missionaries and their compromised versions of Christianity was consistent throughout the Meiji era with Uchimura arguing that the only type of Christianity that could save Japan would be an indigenized version that was "born among the Japanese," and not one brought by foreign missionaries or any of their denominations.⁹⁰ In his early days as a Christian, he witnessed "the evils of denominationalism" among the foreign missionaries in Hokkaido.⁹¹ While living in the United States, Uchimura encountered even more denominations:

America is a land of sects, where each tries to augment its numbers at the expense of others. Already such strange isms as Unitarianism, Swedenborgism, Quakerism, etc., to say nothing of others with which I was already familiar, were being tried upon me. The poor-heathen-convert is at loss which to make his own; so I made up my mind to accept none of them.⁹²

⁸⁹ Uchimura, "Of Christian Missionaries, Christendom, etc.," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 22 December 1897, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 5, 199-201; "A Missionary Journal," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 19 February 1898, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 5, 280-282.

⁹⁰ Uchimura, "*Nihon o suku'u no Kirisutokyō* 日本を救ふの基督教 [A Christianity that Saves Japan], *Tokyo Dokuritsu Zasshi*, 5 May 1899, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 7, 60-61.

⁹¹ Uchimura, *How I Became a Christian*, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 3 (English sect.), 40.

⁹² Uchimura, *How I Became a Christian*, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 3 (English sect.), 102-103.

Not only did he view interdenominational rivalries as petty disputes over non-essential issues, he was also turned off by their constant competition to gain more converts at the expense of the core teachings of Christianity. He felt that foreign missionaries were not really concerned about the salvation of souls as much as they were concerned about the number of new converts they could add to their own denominations. He was deeply disturbed by the fact that much of American Christianity measured its success based on statistics and material achievements, such as numbers of churches and members, and could care less about real substantial spiritual issues.⁹³

Additionally, Uchimura was disheartened by the amount of "mammonism" seen not only among the general American population but also throughout the ranks of those who were supposedly engaged in a religious career. Recalling his experiences at Hartford Theological Seminary in Connecticut, Uchimura stated:

. . . I observed its benefits talked about within the walls of my seminary. "One thousand dollars with parsonage," "twenty dollars' sermon upon Chicago anarchy," and similar combination of such words and phrases sounded very discordantly to my ears. That sermons have market-values, as porks [sic] and tomatoes and pumpkins have. . . .⁹⁴

Uchimura viewed American and European "mammonism" be the result of failing to follow Jesus' words, "Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on."⁹⁵ He also viewed American Christianity to be present-oriented

⁹³ Uchimura, "Observation of Christian Mission," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 7-10, 15-16 April 1897, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 4, 98-106; "Amerikateki Kirisutokyō 亜米利加的基督教 [American Christianity]," *Seisho no kenkyū*, 21 July 1904, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 12, 242-243; "Kaiko to zenshin 回顧と前進 [Retrospect and Prospect]," *Seisho no kenkyū*, 10 January 1908, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 15, 373-376.

⁹⁴ Uchimura, *How I Became a Christian*, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol.3 (English sect.), 139.

⁹⁵ Matt 6: 25 KJV. See also Luke 12:22.

(*gensei teki* 現世的) rather than after-life-focused (*raisei teki* 来世的) as Jesus required when he said, "seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness."⁹⁶

Uchimura became especially critical of the United States and American Christianity in the years after the Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905). In 1906, Uchimura identified the United States and Russia as enemies of Japan; Russia for its expansionism and the United States for moral corruption. The United States, according to Uchimura, was a friend of Japan diplomatically, but its "materialism would rot us [the Japanese] from inside."⁹⁷ To be sure, he clarified that he did not have any problems with Americans and Russians as individuals, but he was alarmed by the nation's general tendencies of expansionism and materialism and what it could mean to both Japan and Asia. He saw how the Americans emphasized matters of the "flesh" over those of the soul, which he found incompatible with the teaching of Jesus. Uchimura considered that Americans in general lacked piety, even more so than the Europeans. America was no longer the land of his beloved Puritans; it was the land of corrupted Christianity.⁹⁸ Uchimura considered the American Christianity and its various mission strategies that seemed to be focused on collecting money, social occasions, political influence, dividing territory into districts, and their use of rhetoric to be "nationalistic, social, political, institutional,

⁹⁶ Matt 6:33 KJV; Uchimura, "Kirisuto no nidai kyōkun キリストの二大教訓 [Two Great teachings of Christ]," *Seisho no kenkyū*, 18 August. 1904, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 12, 329-335.

⁹⁷ Uchimura, "Rokoku to Beikoku 露国と米国 [Russia and the United States]," *Seisho no kenkyū*, 15 September 1906, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 14, 247; "Dendōshi no shosei mondai 伝道師の処世問題 [Various Problems of the Missionaries]," *Seisho no kenkyū*, 10 October 1906, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 14, 308-309.

⁹⁸ Uchimura, "Kaiko to zenshin," *Seisho no kenkyū*, 10 January 1908, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 15, 373-376; "Pyūritan no shōmetsu ピューリタンの消滅 [Disappearance of the Puritans]," *Seisho no kenkyū*, 15 September 1906, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 14, 248; "Ōsaka kōen no yōten 大阪講演の要点 [Main Points of (Uchimura's) Lecture in Osaka]," *Seisho no kenkyū*, 10 December 1906, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 14, 387.

statistical, bureaucratic, and tactical" as well as "pecuniary" and "mechanical."⁹⁹ These characteristics of American Christianity went against the "individualistic and spiritual" Christianity he sought to disseminate throughout Japan in order to continue the progress of civilization to Asia.

Uchimura thought that the solution to the problems facing modern Christianity was to form a "Non-Church" version of Christianity that would be developed with Japan as the center of the movement.¹⁰⁰ For Uchimura, the Non-Church movement meant trying to return back to the pristine state of Christianity as propagated by Jesus. He considered Western Christianity to have become "paganized" since it had incorporated many Roman and Greek elements in its earliest days of existence.¹⁰¹ "Popes, Bishops, Thirty-nine Articles, Surplices, Crucifixes, Dogmas,

⁹⁹ Uchimura, "Beikokujin no dendōhō 米国人の伝道法 [Missionary Methods of the Americans]," *Seisho no kenkyū*, 10 August 1906, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 14, 231-234; Translated from 国家的、社交的、政治的、制度的、統計的、役人的、軍略的. Uchimura also called the American Christianity, *kinsen teki* 金銭的 "pecuniary" and *kikai teki* 機械的 "mechanical."

¹⁰⁰ At what point Uchimura turned to Non-Church Christianity is debated among scholars. For more discussion see Miura Hiroshi, *The Life and Thought of Kanzo Uchimura*, 28-29 and 34. As early as 1891, he stated that he did not belong to any church. See Uchimura, "Waga shinkō no hyōhaku 我が信仰の表白 [Professing of My Faith]," *Rokugō Zasshi* 六号雑誌, 15 November 1891 in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 1, 212-212. The first use of the term "*Mukyōkai* [Non-Church]" appears in his 1893 book, *Kirisuto shinto no nagusame* [Consolation of a Christian], in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 2, 36. Although he attributed the original concept for Non-Church Christianity to be derived from the works of Søren Kierkegaard, a Danish philosopher, he appears to have not acknowledged Kierkegaard's work until 1909. See Uchimura, "Sekai ni okeru Mukyōkai shugi 世界に於ける無教会主義 [The Non-Church Movement Around the World]," *Seisho no kenkyū*, 10 October 1909, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 16, 489-490; "*Denmarukukoku no hanashi* デンマーク国の話 [Stories of Denmark]," *Seisho no kenkyū*, 10 November 1911, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 18, 306.

¹⁰¹ Uchimura, "Jukyō to Kirisutokyō 儒教と基督教 [Confucianism and Christianity]," *Seisho no kenkyū*, 10 September 1911, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 18, 229; "Kirisutokyō no saidai mondai; Edowin Hacchi shi no Hibāto koen o yomu 基督教の最大問題：エドウィン・ハッチ氏のヒバート講演を読む [The Biggest Problem of Christianity: The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church by Edwin Hatch, D.D.]," *Seisho no kenkyū*, 10 October 1911, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 18, 264-276; "Dokushi yoreki 読史余瀝 [Reflection on Reading History]," *Seisho no kenkyū*, 10 October and 10 November 1908, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 16, 81-83.

Theologies, and all the paraphernalia and 'coverings' of Christianity," argued Uchimura, were "Husk-Christianity," the outer layers that did not truly matter. "Kernel-Christianity," on the other hand, was "the man Jesus himself," the very core of Christianity.¹⁰² For Uchimura, following the way of Jesus constituted the major part of being a Christian. "We go to Jesus of Nazareth *directly*, and aim to live and be made like Him," wrote Uchimura.¹⁰³

He argued that Jesus did not build churches nor did he belong to a particular denomination; Jesus did not have any factional ties but rather he established direct communication with God.¹⁰⁴ As Jesus preached outdoors, and did not confine himself in a "church," Uchimura declared that this universe itself served as the church of Non-Church Christians:

The universe God created and nature; that is the church of this world for us, Non-Church Christians. Its ceiling is the blue sky with its ceiling board sprinkled with stars. Its floor is the green field and colorful flowers, *tatami* mats. Its musical instruments are pine treetops, and its musicians, birds of the forest. Its altar is the mountaintop, and its preacher is God himself. . . .¹⁰⁵

¹⁰² Uchimura, "Husk and Kernel," *The Japan Chronicle*, 16 July 1908, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 15, 498-499.

¹⁰³ Uchimura, "Christianity in Japan: A Response," *The Japan Chronicle*, 13 Nov. 1909, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 17, 30.

¹⁰⁴ Uchimura, "Mukyōkai 無教会 [Non-Church]," *Seisho no kenkyū*, 10 October 1901, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 9, 370; "Yono mitaru Iesu Kirisuto 余の見たるイエスキリスト [Jesus Christ Whom I See]," *Seisho no kenkyū*, 21 July 1904, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 12, 241.

¹⁰⁵ Uchimura, "Mukyōkai ron 無教会論 [Theory on Non-Church]," *Mukyōkai*, 14 March 1901, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 9, 73. Translated from 神の造られた宇宙であります、天然であります、是れが私共無教会信者の此世に於ける教会であります、其天井は蒼穹であります、其板に星が鑲めて有ります、其床は青い野であります、その畳は色々な花であります、其楽器は松の木梢であります、其楽人は森の小鳥であります、其高壇は山の高根でありまして、其説教師は神様御自身であります. . . .

A lover of nature poets, such as William Wordsworth (1770-1850) and Walt Whitman (1819-1892), Uchimura appeared to have been influenced by European Romanticism and American Transcendentalism. As a student of biology and agriculture in his college days, Uchimura also appreciated "nature" (*ten'nen* 天然) as the reflection of God's design, and something that contained "the deepest Truth."¹⁰⁶

Uchimura viewed churches as obstacles that confined the soul and restrict freedom of spirit, which for him was the very essence of Christianity. For him, Jesus was the "Lord of liberty," and he believed that true freedom came from God alone.¹⁰⁷ Like the American transcendental philosopher, Ralph Waldo Emerson (1803-1882), whose works Uchimura had read and greatly admired, he emphasized the freedom and independence of one's mind and spirit.¹⁰⁸ Indeed, Uchimura was generally sympathetic to those who had independent minds and stood for what they truly believed in, including those who were rejected by the church as heretics or atheists. Among those whom Uchimura admired and defended with his pen were such notables as Baruch Spinoza (1632-1677), Thomas Paine (1737-1809), Stephen Girard (1750-1831), and Charles Darwin (1809-1882), all of which were considered "heretics" by the established church. From Uchimura's perspective, these individuals represented those who truly

¹⁰⁶ Uchimura, "Shinngaku ka Nōgaku ka 神学耶農学耶 [Theology or Agricultural Science]," *Seisho no kenkyū*, 10 October 1906, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 14, 294-297; "Yomubeki mono, manabubeki mono. nasubeki koto 読むべきもの、学ぶべきもの、為すべきこと [Things We Should Read, Things We Should Learn, and Things We Should Do]," *Seisho no kenkyū*, 10 January 1908, *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 15, 323.

¹⁰⁷ Uchimura, "Shitsubō to kibō 失望と希望 [Disappointment and Hope]," *Seisho no kenkyū*, 10 February 1903, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 11, 58; "Nihonkoku no dai konnan," *Seisho no kenkyū*, 10 March 1903, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 11, 150.

¹⁰⁸ Ralph Waldo Emerson's representative works include, *Nature: Addresses, and Lectures* (Boston, etc: Houghton, Mifflin and co, 1893 [1836]) and *The American Scholar. Self-Reliance. Compensation* (New York: American Book Co, 1893), etc.

embraced the spirit of independence to the extent that even when facing oppression by the church for their views and ideas, they refused to cower down and comply with conventional established doctrine. Though Uchimura differed from Emerson in his rejection of Unitarianism, he still considered Emerson as an individual who truly understood the spirit of Protestantism.¹⁰⁹

Uchimura viewed the state of Christianity in the early twentieth century to be so degenerated that he envisioned the need for a second great religious reformation to occur.¹¹⁰ For him, Japan, the next phase of the "westward march of civilization" according to God's Providence, seemed to be perfectly located for the second reformation to occur. Precisely because Japan did not have a long history of Christianity and its dogmatic institutions, Uchimura saw Japan to be perfectly suited to help return Christianity to its original form; Non-Church Christianity. Instead of the "paganized Christianity" now hopelessly corrupted with denominationalism, mammonism, militarism, and imperialism that developed in the Western world, Uchimura sought to revive the Christianity of Jesus, Peter, and Paul by going back to the words of the Bible. He firmly believed that Non-Church Christianity was the Christianity of the future and the necessary next stage in Christian evolution:

In the beginning was the Jewish Church and then there emerged the Roman [Catholic] Church. Protestant churches came next, and finally came the Non-Church. Non-Church is a further developed version of the Protestant churches. In the end, Christianity should rid itself of all [differences in] outward forms. Now Non-Churches are emerging all over the world, and those of us who are sent to this world in this latter-day do not have to

¹⁰⁹ Uchimura "Purotesutanto shugi プロテスタント主義 [Protestantism]," *Seisho no kenkyū*, 10 September 1909, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 16, 430-431.

¹¹⁰ Uchimura, "Daini no shūkyō kaikaku 第二の宗教改革 [The Second Religious Reformation]," *Seisho no kenkyū*, 10 January 1906, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 14, 413; "Daini no shūkyō kaikaku 第二の宗教改革 [The Second Religious Reformation]," *Seisho no kenkyū*, 10 October 1908, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 16, 77.

belong to any Protestant denominations such as those established by Luther, Calvin, and Wesley.¹¹¹

Non-Church meant the end of denominationalism within Christianity. It also meant a better world by embracing the concept of non-resistance as taught by Jesus. Uchimura envisioned Japan's role to be one of improving "civilization" by removing the denominational differences of Christianity and returning it to an earlier state so that it could then be passed onto the rest of the world. Japan was to purify Christianity and "replace the cold Christianity of Europe and America that maintained itself with logic, laws, and rituals with a new warm Christianity based on spirit, life, and love."¹¹²

Conclusion

Uchimura Kanzō was one of the greatest Christian leaders, if not the greatest, of Japan. His concerns, however, were far greater than just the salvation of Japan; he envisioned Japan as playing the key role in the future of Christianity and all of humanity. Like many Japanese intellectuals of the Meiji era, Uchimura utilized the East-West discourse to understand his country's role as it traversed this era of dramatic change. As a Christian, Uchimura's understanding of the Eastern and Western worlds was based on a Providential view of history

¹¹¹ Uchimura, "Saishin no kyōkai 最新の教会 [The Newest Church]," *Seisho no kenkyū*, 10 May 1906, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 14, 132. Translated from 始めに猶太教会あり、次ぎに羅馬教会あり、次ぎに新教会あり、終りに無教会あり、無教会は新教会の更に進歩したる者なり、基督教は終にすべての外形を脱却すべきものなり、而して今や世界各国に於て無教会は起こりつゝあり、我等此末日に世に遣われし者は、ルーテル、カルビン、ウェスレー等の創設にかかる新教会何れの教派にも属するの要なきなり。

¹¹² Uchimura, "Atarashiki imashime 新らしき誠め [New Commandment]," *Seisho no kenkyū*, 10 November 1906, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 14, 355. Translated from かの冷たき理論と法則と儀式とを以て維持せんとする欧米流の基督教に代ふるに温かき、霊と生命を愛とを以てする新たなる基督教。 . .

and geography that he adopted from the works of Western writers. Uchimura fully embraced the theory of a westward march of civilization based on God's plan, but he differed from the Western writers by believing that the march was destined to extend across the Pacific from the United States to Japan. He was firmly convinced that it was Japan's heavenly assigned role to improve and purify Christianity and "civilization" before passing it onto the rest of Asia. He viewed the East, all the lands east of the Pamirs or Roof of the World, to be restricted by static societies that were the continuations of outdated ancient civilizations, while he saw the West as a region of civilization and progress. As a result, Uchimura offered little in the way of contemplation or discussion on the East since he had determined it had little to offer the rest of the world. He observed that Japan received the concepts of civilization from the United States, but he found that the Japanese only adopted the material aspects of Western civilization while retaining a Confucian morality instead of adopting Christianity. Uchimura considered this combination to be detrimental to Japan, because he viewed the "spirit" as a vital part of societies, much like humans needed both a body and a soul. He was especially alarmed by the retention of Confucian concepts because of their strong secular orientation. Indeed, Uchimura considered the Mongoloid race ("Turanian" / non-Aryan) from which Confucianism originated to be a utilitarian people that lacked spirituality and were underdeveloped due to their lack of "soul." Western society, on the other hand, had enjoyed God's guidance so far and benefited from a strong concept of the Creator from whom true freedom was dispensed. Uchimura believed that it was the Creator and the freedom and spirit provided through him that allowed the West to make tremendous strides in the development of civilization, and that it was therefore necessary for

Japan to accept the same principles so that it too could benefit from them as it strived to bring civilization to a new level.

Uchimura argued that Japan's problem was that Japan adopted "Christian civilization without Christianity" and material culture without "spirit." He urged the Japanese to embrace Christianity and Jesus' teaching, but he did not advocate the adoption of Western Christianity since he saw it to be hopelessly corrupted and degraded by changes made in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Indeed, Uchimura's own observations while living abroad and with Westerners in Japan clearly showed him how far Western countries had wandered from the Bible and how contrary their actions were to the teachings of Jesus. Instead of following Jesus' directives about "love," "non-resistance," and non-materialism, he observed racial prejudice, imperialism, mammonism, and denominational rivalries that resulted in hate, aggression, and materialism. Rather than urging Japan to adopt "Western ways," he urged the Japanese to embrace true Christianity, or more specifically non-Western, non-denominational, Non-Church Christianity. Uchimura, a self-proclaimed world citizen, envisioned Japan's heavenly assigned role to be the leader of the Non-Church movement and the catalyst for a second religious reformation that would eliminate differences and denominations and return Christianity back to an unspoiled state based solely on the Bible as he believed Jesus intended it to be. Today, Uchimura Kanzō rests under a grave with an inscription that reads:

I for Japan;
Japan for the world;
The World for Christ;
And All for God.¹¹³

¹¹³ Miura Hiroshi, *The Life and Thought of Kanzo Uchimura*, 53.

Such was the vision of a Japanese Christian who saw God's divine design in the coming of Western civilization to Meiji Japan.

CHAPTER 5

OKAKURA KAKUZŌ (1863-1913)

EAST AND WEST MEET IN ART

In 1902, a man dressed in an exotic cloak and hood was seen traveling in India. He looked out of place; possibly Chinese, perhaps a Daoist sage of some sort. Accompanying him was Surendranath Tagore, a nephew of renowned Bengali poet, Radindranath Tagore (1861-1941).¹ The strange man was a guest of the Tagore family, Japanese art critic and founder of the Japan Art Institute (日本美術院 *Nihon Bijutsu in*), Okakura Kakuzō (1863-1913). While in Calcutta, Okakura met the frail Swami Vivekananda (1863-1902) and his disciple, an Irish woman known as Sister Nivedita (1867–1911) as well as members of Anushilan Samiti, a secret Bengali anti-British organization. Okakura's travel through India and his interactions with Bengali intellectuals confirmed his conviction that India and Japan shared a common artistic heritage. Shortly after this trip Okakura published his influential book entitled *The Ideals of the East* with its famous opening sentence: "Asia is One."²

Originally published in English, this famous phrase and his connections to Bengali revolutionaries resulted in Okakura being remembered as Japan's foremost Pan-Asianist. Okakura's writings were popularized during the 1930s and 1940s since his proclamation of Asian unity appeared to provide ideological support for the Japanese war effort that claimed to

¹ For an interesting discussion of Okakura's choice of dress, see Christine E. Guth, "Charles Longfellow and Okakura Kakuzō: Cultural Cross-Dressing in the Colonial Context," *Positions* 8: 3 (Winter 2000): 605-636.

² Okakura Kakuzō, *The Ideals of the East with Special Reference to the Art of Japan* (London: J. Murray, 1903), 1.

"liberate" fellow Asians from Western colonial control and establish the "Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere (*Dai To-A kyōei ken* 大東亜共栄圏)." He did not, however, write *The Ideals of the East* as political propaganda to justify Japanese aggression; he wrote it for Westerners as an exposition of Japan's aesthetic heritage. After his sojourn in India, Okakura split his time between the United States (mostly in Boston) and Japan (mostly in Izura五浦, Ibaraki Prefecture). While in the United States, Okakura was usually seen wearing *kimono* and *hakama*, the traditional Japanese attire, even though most Japanese men would not dare to wear traditional dress when travelling abroad. His choice to wear *kimono* in the United States was indicative of Okakura's commitment to being a cultural ambassador of Japan. His three books, all written in English—*The Ideals of the East*, *The Awakening of Japan*, and *The Book of Tea*—were designed to present "Eastern" perspectives to Westerners. All three were published around the time of the Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905).³

Okakura's main interest was in the art of Japan, but he found it impossible to discuss Japanese art without recognizing its Chinese and Indian influences. Japanese art history, according to Okakura, began in the 6th century when Indian Buddhism, fused with Chinese sensibility and values, was introduced to Japan via Korea. This transference caused Okakura to perceive a clear connection between the art of India, China, Korea and Japan. He identified China and India as two great centers of Eastern civilization where the three philosophies of Confucianism, Daoism, and Buddhism developed to become the three spiritual elements of Eastern civilization. Upon closer examination of Okakura's numerous writings, it becomes

³ Okakura Kakuzō, *The Awakening of Japan* (New York: Century Co, 1904), and *The Book of Tea* (New York: Duffield, 1906). These books were not translated into Japanese until the 1920s.

evident that his inclusion of India in the "East" was solely because of its connection to Buddhism, and furthermore, what he meant by the "East" really centered on the region commonly referred to as East Asia. More specifically, his discussion centered upon Japan since he considered the Japanese to be the "sole guardians of the art-inheritance of Asia."⁴

Okakura lived during the era when many Japanese became enamored with the West, equating it with the concept of "civilization," and, therefore, passionately and oftentimes even blindly accepting and adopting all things Western. Okakura opposed the excesses of Westernization, since he considered the Eastern artistic heritage at least equal if not superior to that of the West. In the process of discussing the Eastern aesthetic heritage, Okakura became keenly aware of the existence of the antithesis, the West. As an art critic and art historian, Okakura's understanding of East and West was fundamentally shaped by his study of both Eastern and Western arts and their respective histories.

Brief Biography

Okakura Kakuzō, more commonly known among the Japanese as Okakura Tenshin 岡倉天心, was born in Yokohama in 1863, during the transitional period between the arrival of Commodore Perry (1853) and the Meiji Restoration (1868).⁵ His father, Okakura Kan'emon 勘

⁴ Okakura Kakuzō, "Modern Problems in Painting [Okakura's Lecture at the World's Fair in St. Louis, September 1904]," in *Okakura Kakuzō: Collected English Writings*, edited by Okakura Koshirō and Nakamura Sunao, vol. 2 (Tokyo, Japan: Heibonsha, 1984), 81.

⁵ Okakura's pseudonym, Tenshin 天心 means "the heart of heaven." The confusion over Okakura's birth date stems from the conversion of his birthday from the Japanese calendar to the Western one. Okakura was born on the 26th day of the 12th lunar month in the second year of Bunkyū. Since this date is based on the lunar calendar, it translates into February 14, 1863. There are numerous biographies of Okakura available both in English and Japanese, including Horioka Yasuko, *The Life of Okakura Kakuzo: Author of "the Book of Tea"* (Tokyo: Hokuseidō,

右衛門, was a samurai of the Fukui clan, but by order of his lord, was running a silk trading business in Yokohama when Kakuzō was born. Yokohama was one of the ports opened for foreign trade in 1859, and as a result, it had become an enclave where the English language was widely spoken. Consequently, Okakura, who grew up in a shop whose customers were mainly foreigners, was exposed to the English language from the earliest stage of his life. Around 1870, Okakura began attending private school in the Yokohama area where English was used for classroom instruction.⁶ This did not mean that Okakura did not receive any traditional Japanese education. Upon the death of his mother, he was sent to live in a Buddhist temple, from which he commuted to the English school. While at the temple, he received instruction in the Confucian classics and learned to read and write in *Kanbun* [classical Chinese].

With the abolition of feudalism by the new Meiji government, Okakura Kan'emon was released from his obligations. Sometime after 1871, he moved the Okakura family to Tokyo. This allowed his son the opportunity to enter what would later be known as Tokyo Imperial University in 1875, where he majored in political science and economics.⁷ At this time, many of the university professors were *oyatoi gaikokujin* お雇い外国人[hired foreign experts] who delivered the majority of their lectures in English. In 1878, while Okakura was a student, Ernest F. Fenollosa (1853-1908) came to teach at the university. A graduate of Harvard, Fenollosa was

1963); Saitō Ryuzō 齊藤隆三, *Okakura Tenshin* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Hirobumi kan, 1960); and Okakura Kazuo 岡倉一雄, *Chichi Okakura Tenshin* 父岡倉天心[My Father, Okakura Tenshin] (Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha, 1971).

⁶ One of the schools Okakura attended was run by James Hepburn, who devised a system of transliterating Japanese into the Roman alphabet known as the Hepburn System.

⁷ Okakura entered Tokyo Kaisei Gakkō in 1875. When Tokyo Kaisei Gakkō and Tokyo Medical School merged in 1877, they became known as Tokyo Imperial University.

hired to teach Western philosophy, including that of Hegel, Darwin, and Spencer.⁸ While in Japan, Fenollosa discovered Japan's artistic heritage and was so deeply impressed by it that he became a connoisseur and collector of Japanese art. Okakura, his student, who excelled at the English language, served as an interpreter for Fenollosa outside of the college classroom, thereby exposing him to Fenollosa's fondness for Japanese art and culture.

Okakura graduated from Tokyo Imperial University in 1880, and entered the service of the Ministry of Education. After a couple of years working for the Department of Music, he transferred to the Art Department. Close collaboration between Okakura and Fenollosa continued in this early stage of Okakura's professional career. In 1884, Okakura and Fenollosa established *Kangakai* 鑑画会 [Painting Appreciation Society] in an attempt to preserve traditional Japanese art styles, especially of the Kanō and Tosa Schools.⁹ In 1886, Okakura and Fenollosa traveled to the United States and Europe as part of an Imperial Art Commission investigating the state of art education in Europe and America. Two years later (1888), the Tokyo Bijutsu Gakkō 東京美術学校 [Imperial Art School] was established. Okakura was made president of the school in 1890, while Fenollosa served as a highly paid faculty member. Around the same time, in 1889, Okakura and Fenollosa also launched an art magazine, *Kokka* 国華 [National Flower]. Additionally, Okakura served as director of the Imperial Museum between

⁸ Satoko Fujita Tachiki, *Okakura Kakuzo (1862-1913) and Boston Brahmins* (Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1986) discusses Okakura's interaction with Bostonians, including Ernest Fenollosa.

⁹ In 1886, Ernest Fenollosa came to be recognized as a certified art connoisseur by the Kanō 狩野 School and received the Japanese name, Kanō Eitan 狩野永探 [the eternal quest]. See Michael Sullivan, *The Meeting of Eastern and Western Art* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1997), 124- 139.

1889 and 1898.¹⁰ As these activities indicate, Okakura and Fenollosa worked closely together, though not always in agreement, and established themselves as the foremost authorities on Japanese art in Japan, until Fenollosa decided to take a position as the chief curator of Japanese art at the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston in 1890.¹¹

In 1898, Okakura was forced to resign his position as president of the Imperial Art School and director of the Imperial Museum due to hostility from some Western art oriented faculty members, combined with the exposure of an affair he was having with his boss's wife. A number of faculty members resigned along with Okakura, including Yokoyama Taikan 横山 大観 and Hashimoto Gahō 橋本 雅邦. The following year, 1899, Okakura established *Nihon*

¹⁰ For more information on Okakura's impact on Japanese art, see Victoria Weston, *Japanese Painting and National Identity: Okakura Tenshin and His Circle*. vol. 45 of *Michigan Monograph Series in Japanese Studies*. (Ann Arbor: Center for Japanese Studies, University of Michigan, 2004).

¹¹ One major disagreement between Okakura and Fenollosa revolved around the issue of Greek influence on South and East Asia. Fenollosa clearly recognized the Greek influences on Asia, especially on Buddhist art, in his book, *Epochs of Chinese and Japanese Art; An Outline History of East Asiatic Design* (1912). Fenollosa's book contains chapters such as "Greco-Buddhist Art in China: Early Tang," and "Greco-Buddhist Art in Japan: Nara Period."

Before his trip to India in 1902, Okakura seemed to have agreed with Fenollosa, and recognized the Greek influences on Buddhist art. For example, in his lectures on the History of Japanese Art delivered in 1890-1892, he recognized the Greek influence on Buddhist art resulting from Alexander's invasion (See "Nihon Bijutsu shi 日本美術史 [Art History of Japan]," in *Okakura Tenshin zenshū* 岡倉天心全集 [The Complete Works of Okakura Tenshin] (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1979), vol. 4, 44-45. One can also observe the same line of thought around 1897-98, when he wrote "Essays from Japan: A Painting of the Nara Epoch," where he notes, "interesting hints of Greco-Buddhist influence prevalent towards the end of the Six dynasties." See *Okakura Collected English Writings*, vol. 2, 31.

After his visit to India, Okakura came to deny Greek influences on India or Buddhism. For example, in *The Ideals of the East*, Okakura states: "In India the art of this early Buddhism was a natural growth out of that of the Epic age that went before. For it is idle to deny the existence of pre-Buddhistic Indian art, ascribing its sudden birth to the influence of the Greeks, as European archeologists are wont to do (74)." As for Gandharan arts, Okakura comments, ". . . a deeper and better-informed study of the works of Gandhara itself will reveal a greater prominence of Chinese than of the so-called Greek characteristics. . . . The Alexandrian invasion means rather the extension of Persian influence than Hellenic cultures (78)." Similar comments can be found in lectures given on East Asian Art history in 1910 (see "Taitō kōgei shi 泰東巧藝史 [Eastern Art History]," in *Okakura Tenshin zenshū*, vol. 4, 277-278). Indeed, he came to be convinced that the British government promoted the idea of Indo-European connection in order to justify British control over India. (See "Shigakukai sekijō no Indo kenkyū-dan 史学会席上の印度研究談 [India Lecture Delivered to Historical Society]," (1902) in *Okakura Tenshin zenshū*, vol. 3, 269.)

Bijutsu in [Japan Art Institute], a private institution designed to preserve Japan's artistic heritage while encouraging individualistic expression.

Okakura spent most of 1902 in India where he befriended, among others, Swami Vivekananda, Sister Nivedita, Rabindranath Tagore and his nephew, Surendranath Tagore. This trip to India affirmed his conviction that Japan and India shared the same spiritual and artistic heritage. During this time Okakura started a new phase of his career by beginning to write book manuscripts. *The Ideals of the East*, first published in 1903, is believed to have been written either before or during his trip to India. In 1904, Okakura accepted an invitation from the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston, and from this point until his death in 1913, he traveled back and forth between Japan and the United States, occasionally stopping in China, India and Europe. Through his travels, Okakura became convinced that he was an ideal person to introduce Japanese culture and society to a Western audience. Taking advantage of the growing Western interest in Japan in the wake of the Russo-Japanese war, he published *The Awakening of Japan* in 1904 and *The Book of Tea* in 1906. Consequently, Okakura spent much of his adult life as the foremost expert on Japanese art.

Okakura's East and West: The Problem of Inconsistency

Determining a geographical categorization for Okakura's use of the terms "East" and "West" is not easy for at least three primary reasons. First, Okakura was not always consistent in his usages of the terms.¹² Generally, he acknowledged the East to mean Japan, China, and India,

¹² Pekka Korhonen of the University of Jyväskylä explains this inconsistency in his article "The Geography of Okakura Tenshin," in *Japan Review* 13 (2001), 107-128. There he argues that Okakura operated in two different sets of geographical constructs; a European model (implied, but not explicitly defined as the traditional geographic

but occasionally he deviated from this limited definition and included areas ranging westward to the Byzantine Empire.¹³ Okakura's inconsistency can be seen even within the same book, most notably in *The Ideals of the East*. In most of the sections of *The Ideals of the East*, Okakura's discussion of Asia or the East did not extend much beyond India, but there are some comments that seem to extend the definition of Asia beyond the Indus River, such as "Arab chivalry, Persian poetry, Chinese ethics and Indian thought, all speak of a single ancient Asiatic peace," or "Islam itself may be described as Confucianism on horseback."¹⁴ This inconsistency may have derived from his encounters with Indian friends, resulting in the inclusion of these phrases as an afterthought.¹⁵

division of Europe and Asia along the Ural Mountains) and a Japanese model. Korhonen argues that Okakura employed the European model because of his interactions with many Westerners and Indians, evidenced by the fact that the two major works that employ this model, *The Ideals of the East* and *The Awakening of the East*, were both written in India. As demonstrated below, Korhonen is only partially correct in his assessment.

Korhonen's indication of a traditional Japanese model refers to the Buddhist originated maps consisting of India, China and Japan. Historically, Japanese cartographers created upside-down raindrop shaped maps with the triangular south reminiscent of the Indian subcontinent. Japan was placed in the northeastern section of such map, while India (*Tenjiku*), divided into five provinces, of central, eastern, western, southern and northern India, was placed at the center. Korhonen states, "Many of the maps of the Five Indies (*Go tenjiku zu*) were highly artistic, and Okakura certainly must have come across many of them during his studies of Japanese art (120-121)." He argues that this construct was based on the division between the civilized "Buddhaland" and the barbarous nomadic invaders. Therefore, Korhonen asserts, the Mongols were depicted as an invading foreign element and not part of the "Asiatics" in *The Awakening of the East*.

While Okakura may have operated in two different sets of geographical constructs, Korhonen's argument is not entirely convincing. Okakura lived in a time period when knowledge of world geography was greatly expanded. It would be hard to imagine anyone taking the accuracy of the antiquated Buddhist style map seriously. It is also doubtful that Okakura found these maps "artistic." Two maps reprinted in Korhonen's article are *printed maps created for common people* (one was printed in 1698 and the other is undated but most likely printed in the early 18th century) do not seem to meet Okakura's aesthetic standard. Additionally, I have yet to encounter an Okakura reference to the "Five Provinces of India." Overall, Korhonen's explanation appears premature and simplistic.

¹³ Okakura once stated: "This presentation of the line, this expression in two dimensions, is not confined to China and Japan, but distinguishes the whole of Asiatic art. In the Persian art you have an instance of what great beauty line-form can produce, and in Byzantine art we find that in two dimensions art produced wonderful results." Okakura, "Nature in East Asiatic Paintings," in *Okakura Collected English Writings*, vol. 2, 150.

¹⁴ Okakura Kakuzō, *The Ideals of the East*, 4.

¹⁵ Even though Muslims and the Mongols were technically included as part of the "Asiatic" race, Okakura couples them with militant terms, such as "Mohammedan conquest," "Mongol tyranny," "Tartar hordes," and

Second, Okakura's understandings of East and West also shifted depending upon the nature of his work. Most of Okakura's writings dealt with the arts, but he also wrote some works with political overtones, such as *The Awakening of Japan*. In his political writings, Okakura defined the West as Western Europe, Russia and the United States. This is especially evident when he talked of the "White Disaster" or of Western imperialism over Asia.¹⁶ When it comes to art history, however, the line dividing East and West is located along the Indus River --- although his discussion of Western art history centers on Europe, and Eastern art history on East Asia. Okakura generally considered the area west of the Indus River (Persia, Arabia, Mesopotamia, etc) as contributing to the development of Western art, while the area east of the Indus greatly influenced Eastern art. Despite not finding anything or anyone from the United States worthy of inclusion in his art history course, America was recognized as a successor of the Western tradition. Russia, on the other hand, was left out of his conception of art history, completely.

Finally, one work attributed to Okakura, *The Awakening of the East* (to be distinguished from *The Awakening of Japan*), shows such deviation from the rest of his writings that its very authorship is questioned. *The Awakening of the East* is a hand written manuscript found by Okakura's grandson in 1938. Coming to light during the Second Sino-Japanese War (1937-

"Mussulman Imperialism," echoing his thesis of Islamic destruction of Asian unity in *The Awakening of Japan*. See Okakura, *The Ideals of the East*, 1-3, and *The Awakening of Japan*, 12.

¹⁶ Okakura generally depicts the United States in a very favorable light. In *The Awakening of Japan*, when speaking of Commodore Perry, Okakura comments: "Our sincere thanks are also due to the American admiral, who showed infinite patience and fairness in his negotiations. Oriental nations never forget kindness, and international kindness are unfortunately extremely rare. The name of Commodore Perry has become so dear to us that, on the fiftieth anniversary of his arrival, the people erected a monument at the spot where he landed." This complimentary attitude was probably due to his primarily American audience and his lengthy sojourns in the United States. See Okakura Kakuzō, *The Awakening of Japan*, 122.

1945), this politically charged document called for a Pan-Asian military uprising against the West, and was immediately published in 1938 both in its original English and a Japanese translation.¹⁷ In *The Awakening of the East*, the line dividing the East and West roughly corresponds to the traditional geographic boundary of the Ural Mountains. The West includes the European nations, the United States, and Russia, while the East includes the vast expanse of land stretching from Ottoman Egypt to the Kuril Islands and possibly beyond to "the Pacific isles" and "the Carolines."¹⁸ The Turks, Arabs, Persians, Indians, Chinese, Koreans, and Japanese are all identified as peoples of the East. In this work, the division of East and West is based on race (yellow vs. white) and imperialism (colonized vs. colonizer) rather than geography. Therefore, in *The Awakening of the East*, Islam and the Islamic empires are clearly included as part of the East. This is in sharp contrast to Okakura's presentation of Islam as a force that destroyed Asian unity in *The Awakening of Japan*.¹⁹

The Awakening of the East is also characterized by outright hostility to the West and complete condemnation of Western civilization. The West is associated with industrialization, lack of spirituality, and imperialism. The work presents the West as those Imperialist powers that achieved growth at the expense of Eastern subjugation. The people of the West are depicted as inherently aggressive, while the people of the East are characterized as naturally peaceful: "From their very onset, the restless maritime instincts of the Mediterranean and the Baltic, born of chase and war, of piracy and pillage, stood in strong contrast to the continental contentment of

¹⁷ The cover page of the original document is missing, but the original title may have been *We are One*. See explanatory notes provided in *Okakura Tenshin zenshū*, vol. 1, 480-484.

¹⁸ Okakura Kakuzō, *The Awakening of the East*, in *Okakura Collected English Writings*, vol. 1, 138-139.

¹⁹ Okakura Kakuzō, *The Awakening of Japan*, 12.

agricultural Asia."²⁰ The West is also presented as a cunning force that intentionally divides Asia. Fighting amongst Sunnis and Shiites, China and Japan, Shah and Sultan, Hindus and Muslims, are all presented as having been instigated by the West.²¹ Western heritage as a whole is presented as something crude, unsophisticated and even barbarous: "Our perusal of their history has shown us the awful anomalies and terrible bestialities which are the curse of their crude civilization."²² The Western duality of husband and wife is contrasted to the Eastern triad of "paternal care, marital helpfulness and filial obedience" and is described as "reminiscen[t] of the predatory savage."²³ The East, on the other hand, is associated with peace, tolerance, spirituality and individuality, even though the solution suggested to overcome their current condition is a "Pan-Asiatic Alliance" and "Swords."²⁴

These unusually harsh words are uncharacteristic of Okakura. Apparently, the intended audience of *The Awakening of the East* was not Westerners but fellow "Asians." To be sure, *The Awakening of the East* could not have been published when Okakura was alive, since such a document would have been considered subversive by the British government. One explanation contends that this document was written during Okakura's stay in India in 1902, and edited by Sister Nivedita, an Irish devotee of Swami Vivekananda. Some scholars suspect that Sister Nivedita was more than an editor and that she injected her own views into *The Awakening of the*

²⁰ Okakura Kakuzō, *The Awakening of the East*, 136.

²¹ Okakura Kakuzō, *The Awakening of the East*, 158.

²² Okakura Kakuzō, *The Awakening of the East*, 159.

²³ Okakura Kakuzō, *The Awakening of the East*, 149.

²⁴ Okakura Kakuzō, *The Awakening of the East*, 161, 156.

East. Rustom Bharucha even goes so far as to suggest that Sister Nivedita was the "ghost writer" of *The Awakening of the East*.²⁵ Bharucha points out similarities between *The Awakening of the East* and Vivekananda's works, such as the introduction of *The Awakening of the East* and Vivekananda's 1893 speech in Chicago. The opening of *The Awakening of the East* is "Brothers and Sisters of Asia!" while Vivekananda started his speech with "Sisters and Brothers of America." Bharucha argues that, since sister Nivedita was such a dedicated pupil of Vivekananda, she tried to inject Vivekananda's ideas into Okakura's writing.²⁶ Indeed upon comparison between *The Awakening of the East* and Vivekananda's works, one can observe some similarities such as an emphasis on Asian toleration and spirituality.²⁷ Additionally, Sister Nivedita's radical tendencies and her involvement with revolutionary movements have been pointed out.²⁸

There is enough commonality, however, between *The Awakening of the East* and other works by Okakura to make it impractical to attribute its authorship solely to Sister Nivedita. There are several references to the art of India and Japan in the book, including an association of

²⁵ Rustom Bharucha, *Another Asia: Rabindranath Tagore and Okakura Tenshin* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2006), 34-38.

²⁶ Bharucha, *Another Asia*, 34-38.

²⁷ See Swami Vivekananda, "Addresses at World's Parliament of Religions," Chicago; 11 September 1893, in *Complete Works of Swami Vivekananda*, vol. 1. http://www.ramakrishnavivekananda.info/vivekananda/volume_1/vol_1_frame.htm (Accessed in December 2010).

²⁸ She was heavily influenced by Peter Kropotkin, a Russian anarchist. A Bengali revolutionary organization, Anushilan Samiti, was established right around the time Sister Nivedita and Okakura met, and there is sufficient evidence to show these two were involved in this development. See, Peter Heehs, "Foreign Influences on Bengali Revolutionary Terrorism 1902-1908," *Modern Asian Studies* 28, no. 3 (July 1994), 533-556. The author Peter Heehs works for Sri Aurobindo Ashram Archives and Research Library in Pondicherry. Okakura Koshirō. *Sofu Okakura Tenshin* 祖父岡倉天心 [My Grandfather, Okakura Tenshin] (Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 1999), 87-149.

the Indian deity Siva with the Japanese deity Fudō不動 and Sarasvati with Benten弁天 that can also be found in *The Ideals of the East*.²⁹ Likewise, Okakura uses the term ‘White Disaster’ both in *The Awakening of Japan* and *The Awakening of the East*.³⁰ Moreover, attributing *The Awakening of the East* to Sister Nivedita completely does not make much sense considering the overlapping themes found in *The Awakening of the East* and Okakura’s other works. Therefore others, including Okakura’s grandson and the political scientist, Okakura Koshirō, suggest that *The Awakening of the East* was a collaborative work between Okakura, Nivedita and other Bengali intellectuals.³¹

While in India, Okakura mingled with the elite of the Bengali Renaissance. As the heartland of Indian nationalism, Bengal produced a number of influential figures, such as Ram Mohan Roy (1772-1833), Sri Ramakrishna (1836-1886), Swami Vivekananda (1863-1902), Rabindranath Tagore (1861-1941), and Aurobindo Ghose (1872-1950). Sympathetic to the desire for *swaraj* (self-rule), Okakura became increasingly involved with the Bengali revolutionaries, especially Surendranath Tagore, the nephew of Nobel Prize winner Rabindranath. Surendranath was a member of the Anushilan Samiti revolutionary organization.³² Surendranath recalled his time with Okakura in his memoir:

[Okakura] is busy writing his next book on the Awakening of Asia, at which he works all day, sprawling over a bolster on his bedstead; while we spend wildly exhilarating

²⁹ Okakura Kakuzō, *The Awakening of the East*, 144; *The Ideals of the East*, 134.

³⁰ Okakura Kakuzō, *The Awakening of the East*, 136; *The Awakening of Japan*, 95-112.

³¹ Okakura Koshirō, *Sofu Okakura Tenshin*, 87-149.

³² Okakura Koshirō, *Sofu Okakura Tenshin*, 110-111. For discussion of the Bengali Renaissance, see Stephen N. Hay, *Asian Ideas of East and West; Tagore and His Critics in Japan, China, and India*, vol. 40 of *Harvard East Asian Series* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970), 12-26.

evenings, sitting round his table, listening to his glowing passages deploring the White Disaster spreading over the East, in its intellectual and spiritual surrender to the western cult of Mammon. Okakura would invite, nay, insist on our criticism, and appear gratefully to incorporate such harsher words or blatant epigram as any of us thought fit to suggest.³³

This testimony by Surendranath explains why *The Awakening of the East* contains much harsher words than other of Okakura's writings and helps to explain why its geographic delineation of the East was much greater than Okakura's normal conceptualization. The evidence also indicates that Okakura was willing to incorporate the ideas of his Indian friends into his work. Prevalent Indian ideas, such as the contrast between a spiritual East and a materialistic West, and the belief in the origin of science in the Vedas expounded in the works of Vivekananda and Tagore are present in Okakura's text.³⁴ Additionally, according to the description of the original manuscript provided in the collected works of Okakura, *The Awakening of the East* contains three different sets of handwriting. The handwriting used for the main body of the text is identified as that of Okakura, while that of the editor is identified as Sister Nivedita. A third set of handwriting belonging to neither Okakura nor Nivedita appears in the latter half of chapter III. This section is also edited by both Okakura and Nivedita.³⁵ If indeed Okakura and Nivedita were involved in a secret society, *The Awakening of the East* may have been the draft of a speech or a political tract that was not meant for wide public circulation.

³³ Surendranath Tagore, "Kakuzo Okakura: Some Reminiscences by Surendranath Tagore," in *Okakura Collected English Writings*, vol. 3, 237. Surendranath was the son of Satyendranath Tagore, the first Indian to enter Indian Civil Service.

³⁴ Michael Adas, "Contested Hegemony: The Great War and the Afro-Asian Assault on the Civilizing Mission Ideology." *Journal of World History* 15, no. 1 (2004): 49-50; Hay, *Asian Ideas of East and West*, 35-44.

³⁵ See explanatory notes provided in *Okakura Tenshin zenshū*, vol. 1, 480-484.

In any case, the seditious language of *The Awakening of the East* would have precluded its publication in Britain or America.

How committed Okakura was to the Pan-Asian political cause is questionable. As far as I can ascertain, there is no written evidence indicating his involvement in the Bengali revolutionary movement after Okakura left India in 1902. He had nothing to say about the partition of Bengal in 1905 which resulted in an uproar and protests from the Bengalis, the most notable voice of dissent being his friend, Rabindranath Tagore. Instead, Okakura seems to have dedicated himself purely to art criticism both in Japan and the United States after 1902. In 1912, he did stop by Calcutta on his way to Boston and again met Rabindranath Tagore. While there he also met a widowed poetess, Priyambada Devi Banerjee (1871-1935) with whom he exchanged letters until his death the following year. The contents of Okakura's letters to Priyambada Devi are highly personal, showing his tender and vulnerable side.³⁶ It appears Okakura's involvement in a Pan-Asian revolutionary movement was rather brief and limited only to his stay in India during 1902. The present study, therefore, focuses on the conceptualization of East and West from a perspective of Okakura Kakuzō purely as an art critic and art historian.

Okakura's East

If one sets aside *The Awakening of the East* as an anomaly, a much clearer picture of Okakura's thinking on the East-West dichotomy can be obtained. When Okakura declared "Asia is One," he was mainly referring to Asia east of the Indus River, with India and China serving as

³⁶ Their correspondence is found in *Okakura Collected English Writings*, vol. 3.

"the two great poles of Asiatic Civilisation."³⁷ The phrase "Asia is One" is followed immediately by: "The Himalayas divide, only to accentuate, two mighty civilizations, the Chinese with its communism of Confucius and the Indian with its individualism of the Vedas."³⁸

In fact, Okakura's understandings of East and West tended to cluster around the two ends of Eurasia. One indication of this view can be seen in his usage of terms when he is writing or speaking in Japanese. In referring to East and West, Okakura appears to have used the terms Taisei [Extreme West] and Taitō [Extreme East] more frequently than the generic Seiyō, the Japanese equivalent of the Occident, and Tōyō or the Orient. This intentional distinction can be seen in Okakura's own translation of the title *The Ideals of the East* as *Taitō risō ron* 泰東理想論 instead of *Tōyō no risō* 東洋の理想, which became the standard translation of this title.³⁹ Okakura's word choice of Taitō implies that his book was only concerned with the Far East.⁴⁰ Therefore, even though he talked about the unity of Asia and saw a connection between Japan, China, and India, Okakura's discussion was essentially East Asia centered, while India was included to recognize the great influence of "Indian" Buddhism on the art and culture of East Asia. Okakura perceived the close connection between the arts of China and Japan, but he felt that Japan was the only place where both Chinese and Indian elements truly melded together. His view was that the influence of the two great civilizations moved from west to east, ultimately

³⁷ Okakura Kakuzō, *The Ideals of the East*, 19.

³⁸ Okakura Kakuzō, *The Ideals of the East*, 1.

³⁹ Okakura's letter to Koike Motoyasu, 17 May 1913, in *Okakura Tenshin zenshū*, vol. 7, 250-251. Another translation given to this title is *Tōhō no risō* 東邦の理想. The term Tōhō denotes "Eastern region." *The Ideals of the East* was never translated into Japanese during Okakura's lifetime.

⁴⁰ For example, he identifies Taitō as specifically China, Japan, and Korea in "Taitō kōgei shi," in *Okakura Tenshin zenshū*, vol. 4, 259.

causing Japan to become "a museum of Asiatic civilization" where "the historic wealth of Asiatic culture can be consecutively studied."⁴¹

For Okakura, Japanese art history was inconceivable without the contributions of China and India. He did not consider the possibility that there could exist "pure" Japanese arts; instead, he perceived all Japanese artistic heritage as an amalgamation and synthesis of indigenous and foreign elements. He commented in a speech to the *Kangakai* (Painting Appreciation Society): "Is there such a thing as uniquely Japanese art? Art was unknown in the earliest stage of Japanese history. It is impossible to determine what is truly Japanese, since Japanese art has changed so many times over the course of history. The art of the *Tenpyō* era was based upon the art of three Korean Kingdoms, and those of *Enki* era were influenced by the art of the Tang dynasty in China. . ."⁴² Okakura considered the sixth century to be the true start of Japanese art history since that was the beginning of Japan's contact with foreign cultures. Okakura recognized these "foreign contacts" to be the chief catalyst for change when he stated: "Indeed it is not impossible to say that our country's arts are almost entirely derived from foreign lands. . . although there is no need [for the Japanese] to feel ashamed since the Japanese were able to take something foreign and make it their own."⁴³

⁴¹ Okakura Kakuzō, *The Ideals of the East*, 6-7.

⁴² Okakura Kakuzō, "Kanga kai ni oite 鑑画会に於て [Speech given to Kanga kai] (1887), in *Okakura Tenshin zenshū*, vol. 3, 177. Translated from . . . 日本固有なる者は果して何処に在る乎。日本美術上古はいざ知らず、美術が始めてその形をなしたる時より今日までの沿革を考ふるに、変化万端にして孰れを日本固有と定むる能はず。天平の美術は其の淵源を三韓に取り、延喜の美術之を唐朝の文化に受く。

⁴³ Okakura Kakuzō, "Nihon bijutsu shi," in *Okakura Tenshin zenshū*, vol. 4, 15. Translated from . . . 実に我邦美術の原因は、其の大部殆ど外国より来れるを云ふも恐らくは不可なからん。斯く云えば、我邦の美術は甚だ価値なきが如し。然れども外国より伝来せるものにして、之れを受くる能く渾化せば、蓋し其の国のものにして亦辱づべきにあらず。

Among the most important elements introduced to Japan in the sixth century was that of Buddhism which came through the Korean Kingdom of Paekche. In fact, Okakura recognized Buddhism to be the most important force behind the beginning of Japanese art when he wrote: "Our national art was in its infancy until the sixth century, when the rise of the newly introduced Buddhism suddenly called it into flower and created what is known as the art of Nara."⁴⁴ Okakura understood that the Buddhism introduced into Japan was not a pure form, but a version that had been morphed and altered as it filtered through Chinese and Korean lenses. He considered the period of instability following the fall of the Han Dynasty (known as the Six Dynasties) as the critical point, since this was when "the three basic elements of East Asian art" (*Tō-A bunka san dai genso* 東亜文化三大原素), Confucianism, Daoism (more accurately what Okakura called "Laoism"), and Buddhism came together.⁴⁵ Here, one should note that Okakura used the rather specific geographical designation of *Tō-A* or "East Asia" in his discussion rather than the broader and less specific Asia or the East. Buddhism was surely an important element as it brought inspiration for sculpture and new architectural styles. These new styles were by no means purely "Indian," but instead, an amalgamation of the three teachings into one package.

It should be pointed out that these three philosophical systems are what Chinese refer to as the "three teachings" (*san jiao* 三教, Jp. *san kyō*), and not "Japanese," which would have

⁴⁴ Okakura Kakuzō, "Essay from Japan: A Painting of the Nara Epoch: Eight Century (1897-1898)," in *Okakura Collected English Writings*, vol. 2, 30.

⁴⁵ The term, *Tō-A bunka san dai genso* appears in Okakura's "Nihon Bijutsu shiron 日本美術史論 [Japan Art History Theory]," in *Okakura Tenshin zenshū*, vol. 4, 141. Okakura usually differentiated between Daoism (Taoism) and Laoism. He defined "Taoism" as religious Daoism that sought to attain the secret of immortality or elixir of life. He used the term Laoism for the philosophical Daoism derived from Laozi and Zhuangzi. The only book in which he did not differentiate between the two was *The Book of Tea*. It may be hypothesized that Okakura's American editor suggested he use the standard "Taoism" rather than his neologism, "Laoism."

included Shinto instead of Daoism. Shinto, the indigenous religion of Japan, was not considered a significant enough artistic element in Okakura's mind for specific mention. According to Okakura, "Shintoism is the national religion of Japan, but it has done very little for art. It has aimed at simplicity. Except for the images of ancestors and gods, it has done almost nothing."⁴⁶ The only element of Shinto that Okakura considered as contributing to the development of Japanese arts was its tendency "to inculcate purity in everything—especially in architecture. The Shinto architecture, with its undecorated, plain wooden construction, every thing being concentrated in beauty of proportion,—is an entirely distinct thing from any other products of Asiatic art."⁴⁷ This general de-emphasis on "indigenous" Shinto seems to be in accord with Okakura's view that no Japanese art existed apart from foreign influences.

Since Okakura's understanding of Japanese art history was so closely connected to the three teachings of Buddhism, Confucianism, and Daoism, there is no wonder why he saw China and India as the two great centers of civilization and why he saw the unity of Eastern civilization through Buddhism. The concept of unity within "Buddhahland" is most clearly expressed in *The Awakening of Japan* when he stated: "Buddhism, introduced into China and the farther East during the early centuries of the Christian era, bound together the Vedic and Confucian Ideals in a single web, and brought about the unification of Asia."⁴⁸ Interestingly, Okakura identified Buddhism as "Vedic," thereby presenting Buddhism as a version of the Hindu tradition. Hinduism, therefore, in an indirect way, was considered a part of the element that constituted the

⁴⁶ Okakura Kakuzō, "Religions in East Asiatic Art," in *Okakura Collected English Writings*, vol. 2, 142.

⁴⁷ Okakura Kakuzō, "Religions in East Asiatic Art," in *Okakura Collected English Writings*, vol. 2, 142.

⁴⁸ Okakura Kakuzō, *The Awakening of Japan*, 8.

Asian unity of which Okakura spoke.⁴⁹ This unity of Asia, according to Okakura, was destroyed by the Mongols: "By the Mongol conquest of Asia, Buddhaland was rent asunder, never again to be reunited."⁵⁰ More importantly, Okakura blamed the Turkish-Mongolian conquerors of India who adopted Islam as the true cause of the division of "Buddhaland" since "Islam interposed a barrier between China and India greater than the Himalayas themselves."⁵¹

As for the other two elements that constituted "the three basic elements of East Asian arts," Okakura considered Daoism or "Laoism" to be more important than Confucianism. Okakura perceived China as being divided into two regions, the northern region along the Yellow river and the southern region along the Yangtze River. He felt that Confucianism was a product of the northern section while recognizing the southern section as the home of the free and independent spirit of Daoism. While he did not feel that Confucianism had made the same level of contribution as Daoism, he did acknowledge the emphasis it placed on interpersonal matters and cosmic harmony through rituals, etiquette, and music. He recognized the bronze vessels used for ancestor worship and mirrors used "to correct" disagreeable facial expressions as examples of artifacts inspired by Confucianism.⁵² He repeatedly described Confucianism as

⁴⁹ Sister Nivedita, who wrote the introduction to *The Ideal of the East* interpreted this as "Indianising of the Mongolian mind" but this appears to be her India-centric interpretation and does not seem to correspond to Okakura's East-Asia centered vision. See Sister Nivedita's "Introduction," in Okakura, *The Ideals of the East*, xviii.

⁵⁰ Okakura Kakuzō, *The Awakening of Japan*, 13.

⁵¹ Okakura Kakuzō, *The Awakening of Japan*, 12.

⁵² Okakura Kakuzō, "Religions in East Asiatic Art," in *Okakura Collected English Writings*, vol. 2, 134-137.

being "communistic," while describing Buddhism and Daoism/Laoism to be "individualistic."⁵³

It seems like this was Okakura's way of explaining the Eastern collective mentality, but he still felt that the individualistic tendency of the East far outweighed any tendency toward collectivism.

Okakura generally considered Eastern art and its civilization to be characterized by a spirit of individualism, freedom, independence, and peace. As if to refute the conventional understanding of Eastern civilization, Okakura made constant references to these concepts in his writings. Philosophical Daoism, which he refers to as "Laoism," was referenced as a major factor contributing to Eastern individualism and the spirit of freedom. In a lecture Okakura stated:

Laoism aimed at independence and individuality, wishing to play with the universe, not to bow down to it. Thence arose a great conception. Nature was more than man; man was only a small part of nature. Just see how poor, how trammelled [sic], how ridiculous we are! Look at nature, with its freedom, its vast intent! The Laoist wished to live in nature, and so in fine arts gave up e.g. figure painting, and devoted themselves to landscape and birds and flowers.⁵⁴

"Laoism" which arose in the Yangtze River Valley, was also associated with poetry, something Okakura dearly loved. Acquaintances of Okakura included many famous poets, including Rabindranath Tagore and Priyamvada Devi Bannerjee. Okakura was a poet himself and composed poems in classical Chinese, Japanese, and English. He particularly loved to compose Chinese style poetry (known as *Kanshi* 漢詩) and left approximately 130 poems written in classical Chinese. He felt that the poetic spirit of Laoism was an essential part of Eastern

⁵³ In "Religions in East Asiatic Art," Okakura commented that Confucianism's source was "the communistic ideal of ancient China." See Okakura Kakuzō, "Religions in East Asiatic Art," in *Okakura Collected English Writings*, vol. 2, 134.

⁵⁴ Okakura Kakuzō, "Religions in East Asiatic Art," in *Okakura Collected English Writings*, vol. 2, 142.

aesthetics and that it emphasized freedom and individualism. Speaking of the Chinese poet Qu Yuan屈原(Jp. Kutsu Gen, 340-278BCE) Okakura comments: "This poetry, as exemplified in Kutsu Gen, of tragic memory, abounds in the intense adoration of nature, the worship of great rivers, the delight in clouds and lake-mists, the love of freedom and assertion of self."⁵⁵

"Laoism" was also a vital element in the Japanese tea ceremony, which, to Okakura, was the ultimate expression and example of the Eastern aesthetic ideal. Okakura considered Zen Buddhism, from which the tea ceremony arose, to be the "legitimate successor"⁵⁶ of Laoism as it emphasized "individualism." As he states: "Zennism, like Taoism, is a strong advocate of individualism. Nothing is real except that which concerns the working of our own mind."⁵⁷ Okakura saw both Zen Buddhism and "Laoism" to be philosophies that recognized the beauty found within ordinary things or customs, with the tea ceremony, or "Teaism," constituting the embodiment of such an ideal put into practice:

A special contribution of Zen to Eastern thought was its recognition of the mundane as of equal importance with the spiritual. It held that in the great relation of things there was no distinction of small and great, an atom possessing equal possibilities with the universe. . . . The whole idea of Teaism is a result of this Zen conception of greatness in the smallest incidents of life. Taoism furnished the basis for aesthetic ideals, Zennism made them practical.⁵⁸

⁵⁵ Okakura Kakuzō, *The Ideals of the East*, 44.

⁵⁶ Okakura Kakuzō, *The Book of Tea*, 50-51.

⁵⁷ Okakura Kakuzō, *The Book of Tea*, 65. In *The Book of the Tea*, Okakura does not differentiate between Taoism and Laoism. Considering his other writings, it may be assumed he is referring to the philosophical tradition expounded by Laozi ("Laoism") and Zhuangzi.

⁵⁸ Okakura Kakuzō, *The Book of Tea*, 68-69.

The tea room and its décor, such as arranged flowers and simple works of art, create a sense of harmony that expresses the ideal of beauty in small and insignificant things. For example, the tea room is typically a small rustic cottage characterized for its simplicity and certainly lacks apparent extravagance, but "a good tea-room is more costly than an ordinary mansion, for the selection of its materials, as well as its workmanship requires immense care and precision."⁵⁹

The extreme simplicity of the tea room often makes it appear barren, but Okakura explained that this level of simplicity was intentional since "it is left for each guest in imagination to complete the total effect in relation to himself."⁶⁰

It was in these qualities that Okakura found Eastern art expressing the concepts of individualism, freedom, and independence. Viewing and appreciating art, as Okakura understood it, was "a game to be played by two persons."⁶¹ The empty space in a tea room or the lack of background in many East Asian paintings allows individuals the freedom to impose their own images and conceptions upon the framework provided, creating an opportunity for each viewer to add a little of themselves into what they are viewing, thus increasing their appreciation of the item or room at hand:

The artist only gives the suggestion for the spectator's imagination to indulge and revel in. In leaving things unsaid art invites the beholder to come in and fill the gap, that he may feel the joy of joining in this artistic banquet[sic]. Nothing is more condemned among us as a painting which leaves no play for the beholder's imagination⁶²

⁵⁹ Okakura Kakuzō, *The Book of Tea*, 77.

⁶⁰ Okakura Kakuzō, *The Book of Tea*, 95.

⁶¹ Okakura Kakuzō, "Nature in East Asian Painting," in *Okakura Collected English Writings*, vol. 2, 148.

⁶² Okakura Kakuzō, "Nature in East Asian Painting," in *Okakura Collected English Writings*, vol. 2, 148.

Okakura continued:

Another point of distinction about Eastern art, is that it is not interested in beauty as such. The quest of art is not the beautiful but the interesting. In the world range of eastern criticism you will rarely find a painting praised because it is beautiful, but always because it is aesthetically interesting. The Japanese term for artistic, "Omoshiroi" is not an equivalent of the word "interesting," but is derived from a word which means "white-faced."⁶³

Leaving it up to the viewer to complete the image was a major departure from most Western art where no part of the canvas was left unpainted. Conventional Western art tries to create a complete picture in such a manner as to convey the artist's complete image to the viewer and completely controls the viewers' impression. The opposite is true of Eastern art, according to Okakura, since it seeks to form only a partial image and invites the viewer to interpret freely the image or object as he/she sees it, allowing for a sense of openness and freedom not found in Western art. Okakura also presented the idea that while Western art tended to be enjoyed by the social elite, the simple but elegant pleasures of Eastern art, as represented by the tea ceremony, were enjoyed by rich and poor alike, representing the "true spirit of Eastern democracy."⁶⁴

Okakura associated the East with peace, while associating the West with war and aggression. Okakura's viewpoint on Western aggression must be viewed through the filter of the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-1905 when Japan first started to emerge as a major power in East Asia. Despite the fact that Japan had a long history of the martial tradition and had been recently involved in foreign wars, Okakura still tried to present an image of Japan, and the East in general, as being characterized by peace. Perhaps as a reaction to the popularity of Nitobe Inazo's book,

⁶³ Okakura Kakuzō, "Nature in East Asian Painting," in *Okakura Collected English Writings*, vol. 2, 148.

⁶⁴ Okakura Kakuzō, *The Book of Tea*, 4.

Bushido: The Soul of Japan published in 1900, and a lack of true appreciation of Japanese culture among most Westerners, Okakura commented:

He [an average Westerner] was wont to regard Japan as barbarous while she indulged in the gentle arts of peace: he calls her civilized since she began to commit wholesale slaughter on Manchurian battlefield. Much comment has been given lately to the Code of the Samurai,—the Art of Death which makes our soldiers exult in self-sacrifice; but scarcely any attention has been drawn to Teism, which represents so much of our Art of Life. Fain we remain barbarians, if our claim to civilization were to be based on the gruesome glory of war. Fain would we await the time when due respect shall be paid to our art and ideals.⁶⁵

This contrast of Teism as an "Art of Life" and Bushido as an "Art of Death" is interesting considering Okakura's somewhat militant tendencies. Indeed, *The Awakening of Japan*, published in 1904, was Okakura's attempt to explain recent Japanese history and to justify Japan's actions during the Sino-Japanese and Russo-Japanese Wars. In his mind, war was something that the West had taught Japan, and Japan was resorting to war only to preserve its own independence and peace. Okakura justified the invasion of Korea because he considered Korea to be "originally a Japanese province, and in the Tokugawa days paid tribute to the Shogunate."⁶⁶ Furthermore, Okakura and many Japanese of his time considered the control of the Korean peninsula essential for Japan's continued survival:

Any hostile power in occupation of the peninsula might easily throw an army into Japan, for Korea lies like a dagger ever pointed toward the very heart of Japan. Moreover, the independence of Korea and Manchuria is economically necessary to the preservation of our race, for starvation awaits our ever-increasing population if it be deprived of its legitimate outlet in the sparsely cultivated areas of these countries.⁶⁷

⁶⁵ Okakura Kakuzō, *The Book of Tea*, 7-8.

⁶⁶ Okakura Kakuzō, *The Awakening of Japan*, 209.

⁶⁷ Okakura Kakuzō, *The Awakening of Japan*, 208.

As far as Okakura was concerned, even in the midst of a war, he still considered Japan and the rest of the East as representing peace and harmony and concluded his book by asking, "Europe has taught us war; when shall she learn the blessings of peace?"⁶⁸

Okakura's West

Upon examination of Okakura's activities both in Japan and the United States, it is clear that Okakura's main concern was the East and its artistic heritage. The *Kangakai* [Painting Appreciation Society] and the *Nihon bijutsu in* [Japan Art Institute] both encouraged Japanese artists to preserve an Eastern essence in their work, while his three books written for a Western audience sought to educate and inform the reader about the East from an Eastern perspective. As a result, Okakura spent a relatively small amount of time discussing the West and its art, but it is important to look at a few examples of his views on Western art to gain insight into his thoughts. A series of lectures that Okakura gave on Western art history delivered at the Imperial Art School between 1890 and 1892 serves as a major source of information.⁶⁹ Other references to the West and Western arts appear sporadically in his writings as he compared and contrasted East and West.

For Okakura, the West was the "antithesis" of the East with a distinctively different history and evolution. According to Okakura, both Eastern and Western art histories developed

⁶⁸ Okakura Kakuzō, *The Awakening of Japan*, 223.

⁶⁹ See Okakura Kakuzō, "Taisei bijutsu shi 泰西美術史[Western Art History]," in *Okakura Tenshin zenshū*, vol. 4, 171-255. Okakura's lectures were the first lectures on Western art history in Japan. His source materials are unknown, but the Imperial Art School possessed numerous foreign publications, including 18 books donated by William Bigelow, a wealthy Bostonian physician, who supported Okakura's work. See explanatory notes on "Taisei bijutsu shi" in *Okakura Tenshin zenshū*, vol. 4, 527-529.

in parallel and have roots that can be traced back to ancient times, but the two forms developed contrasting artistic traditions and ideals. Comparing the Chinese bronze vessels of the Zhou era to Greek art, Okakura commented: "Indeed, these together constitute, like the calm and delicate jade, compared with the flashing individualistic diamond, the antithesis of ideals, the two poles, of the decorative impulse in East and West."⁷⁰

In his lectures on Western art history, Okakura equated the West (Seiyō or Taisei) with Europe (Ōshū 欧洲), but in tracing the Western art heritage, he found it impossible to stick strictly to Europe.⁷¹ He believed that the origin of Western art was to be found in ancient Egypt, and furthermore, that Western artistic traditions have a close connection to Asia. This "Asia" was not synonymous to "East"; instead he simply used the term to refer to the areas that were conventionally considered to be part of Asia such as Anatolia, Persia, and Mesopotamia. He divided Western art history into three periods, Ancient (before c.395), Medieval (c. 395-1500) and Modern (after c.1500), and he saw this connection between European art and Asia to be especially strong in the ancient period. He classified Egypt as "the oldest country in the West," although he did not consider the Egyptians to be Europeans, Asians or Africans.⁷² Mesopotamia (Assyria, Babylonia and Chaldea), Persia, and the Eastern Mediterranean (Phoenicia and Judea), were also included in Okakura's list of cultures that contributed to development of the Western

⁷⁰ Okakura Kakuzō, *The Ideals of the East*, 31.

⁷¹ Okakura Kakuzō, "Taisei bijutsu shi," in *Okakura Tenshin zenshū*, vol. 4, 171-172.

⁷² Okakura Kakuzō, "Taisei bijutsu shi," in *Okakura Tenshin zenshū*, vol. 4, 178, reads "Egypt is the oldest state in Seiyō (translated from 埃及は西洋にては最旧の国なり)." He also stated "Egyptians are a unique race. . . They are different from the Aryans of Europe or the Mongoloids of Asia. They are also not dark like Ethiopians or Africans (Translated from 埃及は一種特有の人種なり. . . 欧州のアリアン人種、亜細亜の蒙古人種とは一種異なれり。亦エチオピア、亜非利加土人の如く黒からず)

art in the ancient world. Indeed, it can be said that the line dividing East from West in Okakura's art histories was the Indus River. Okakura argued that when the Greeks under Alexander conquered Persia, they returned home with new ideas and concepts that they had been exposed to in Egypt, Mesopotamia, and Persia, and incorporated many elements into Greek heritage. Okakura argued that it was the Greeks that truly started "European art,"⁷³ but he still saw a clear connection between Greek art and Asian art. For example, Okakura commented that the lion gate of Mycenae was based upon an "Assyrian style," and that there is no doubt that Greek sculpture derived from "Asia."⁷⁴

The second stage Okakura identified in Western art history was the Middle Ages which he defined as starting with the division of the Roman Empire and ending around 1500. He identified Early Christian (including that of the Byzantine Empire), Arab-Islamic, Romanesque, and Gothic to be the main artistic styles of the medieval period. He recognized the importance of the interaction between Europeans and Arabs in the development of Western art and technology, as well as acknowledging Arab contributions to European music, astronomy, math, and fountain making technology.⁷⁵ Okakura believed that Gothic architecture was derived from a European imitation of Islamic architecture, as he explained:

. . . These crusades continued for a long time and [their participants included] Louis, the King of France, and Richard, the King of England. Upon their return, they praised the

⁷³ The word used here is Ōshū bijutsu 欧洲美術 [European Art] Okakura Kakuzō, "Taisei bijutsu shi," in *Okakura Tenshin zenshū*, vol. 4, 92.

⁷⁴ Okakura Kakuzō, "Taisei bijutsu shi," in *Okakura Tenshin zenshū*, vol. 4, 203.

⁷⁵ Okakura Kakuzō, "Taisei bijutsu shi," in *Okakura Tenshin zenshū*, vol. 4, 222-223.

Arabian style [architecture] and tried to replicate it. This was the beginning of the Gothic style which combined the Romanesque and Arabian styles.⁷⁶

The fact that one of the most impressive examples of Islamic architecture, the Alhambra, is found in Spain may also have helped shape his view that an Arab-Islamic element had become part of the European heritage. Indeed, Okakura may have even considered the Arabs to be “Europeans.” In his *Book of Tea*, he states, “The earliest record of tea in European writing is said to be found in the statement of an Arab traveler, that after the year 879 the main sources of revenue in Canton were the duties on salt and tea.”⁷⁷ Unfortunately, there are no footnotes in his *Book of Tea* to indicate the source of this rather ambiguous statement. Overall, Okakura appears uncertain of how to fit the Arab-Islamic traditions into his East and West worldview, so he mentions it without ever fixing it into either category.

The third stage that Okakura identifies in Western art history is the Modern era which started around 1500. Here, Okakura’s discussion comes to focus almost exclusively on Western Europe, but even then he attributes the beginning of the Renaissance to the Turkish conquest of the Byzantine Empire and subsequent migration of “Eastern Romans” to Italian cities.⁷⁸ It is also this time period when he comes to include “Northern Europe” (i.e. Germany and France) and the Low countries in his discussion.

⁷⁶ Okakura Kakuzō, “Taisei bijutsu shi,” in *Okakura Tenshin zenshū*, vol. 4, 223-224. Translated from 此等の十字軍は漸次相継続し、仏王ルイ、英王リチャードも亦其の中にありたりしが、帰国後大いに亜拉比亜風を称美せされ、遂に之れを行はるるに至る。之れ即ちゴシック美術の起る基にして、全くローマネスクと亜拉比亜風の相混じたるものなり。As for Romanesque style, the outline of his lecture seemed to suggest Okakura may have thought of it as a combination of Early Christian and Arab-Islamic elements. But he does not go into detailed discussion of influence of the Arabic elements in the main body. See Okakura Kakuzō, “Taisei bijutsu shi,” in *Okakura Tenshin zenshū*, vol. 4, 177.

⁷⁷ Okakura Kakuzō, *The Book of Tea*, 13-14.

⁷⁸ Okakura Kakuzō, “Taisei bijutsu shi,” in *Okakura Tenshin zenshū*, vol. 4, 226.

Okakura describes many Western art styles to be realistic (*shasei teki* 写生的), but he felt they lacked spirit (*seishin* 精神).⁷⁹ This Western emphasis on realism was one of the areas that Okakura found to be fundamentally different between Eastern and Western art. He explained that Eastern painters did "not draw from models, but from memory,"⁸⁰ while Western artists did just the opposite. Okakura reasoned that truly good art directly appealed to the heart of the viewer. He did not believe that working from models and producing realistic images was the true goal of art. Hence, of all the Western painters, Leonardo da Vinci seemed to be held in the highest regard by Okakura. The "Last Supper" was especially praised by Okakura for its depth of human emotions:

The subject matter [of the "Last Supper"] is Jesus, knowing there is a betrayer amongst them, is asking questions of his disciples. [The painter masterfully] depicted a wide range of emotions such as sorrow, anger and doubt [in Jesus' disciples]. Among the disciples was Judas, resting on his elbow in front of Jesus as he incessantly denied he was the betrayer. Yet, Judas's mind was in agony, and [Leonardo da Vinci] was able to convey Judas' distress. [He] was able to capture the subtle nuance of [this complex] feeling masterfully.⁸¹

⁷⁹ One example of such comment is "realistic but lacking in spirit (translated from 写生的のみにして、精神的ならざるや). See Okakura Kakuzō, "Taisei bijutsu shi," in *Okakura Tenshin zenshū*, vol. 4, 211.

⁸⁰ Okakura Kakuzō, "Nature in East Asiatic Painting," in *Okakura Collected English Writings*, vol. 2, 150.

⁸¹ Okakura Kakuzō, "Taisei bijutsu shi," in *Okakura Tenshin zenshū*, vol. 4, 236-238. Translated from 其の図題は耶穌が其衆徒弟に向て己を密告せし人あるを知て、反問者を誰何するの状なり。其の中には或は之れを憂ふう状、怒る相、疑ふる状等千様万状を画き尽せり。然るに其等の中独りジューダーなるもの耶穌の前に肘付きて此の衆徒中誰か反するものあらんやと、頻りに其の否を語る所の形状あれども、其の心中煩悶を保ちしを以て自然其の顔容に憂苦の状を表はしたるは、其の妙を写し得たりと云うべし。

Okakura also rated favorably other Western painters such as Rembrandt (1606 – 1669), Jean-Baptiste-Camille Corot (1796-1875), and Jean Francois Millet (1814-1875), since they emphasized "spirit" over purely realistic representations of objects.⁸²

Okakura also thought that the representation of human beings and the human body was a distinctive feature of Western art. He traced the origin of this "humanism" to the Greeks and expressed that such a concept was contrary to Eastern (especially to Daoist) traditions, as he explained to a Western audience:

Portraiture has never obtained such a prominent place in our art. Why should we perpetuate this evanescent thing, this cradle and nest of lust and mean desires. We have no desire to glorify the human body as the Greeks did, or give special reverence to man as the image of God. The nude does not appeal to us at all. We have not, therefore, conceived an ideal type of human body. . . . The outward man is not more important than other manifestations of outward nature,—trees, rocks, waters.⁸³

While Okakura considered Michelangelo to be one of the Western world's greatest artists, he felt that Michelangelo was excessively faithful to human anatomy (*kaibō teki*解剖的) and that this led him to create figures Okakura felt were unnatural.⁸⁴ Raphael's "Madonna," on the other hand, was praised for its elegance, although Okakura considered Michelangelo to be a superior artist to Raphael.⁸⁵ Okakura considered Peter Paul Rubens' works to lack *hin* 品, which can be variously translated as grace, dignity, or refinement.⁸⁶

⁸² Okakura Kakuzō, "Taisei bijutsu shi," in *Okakura Tenshin zenshū*, vol. 4, 252, 255.

⁸³ Okakura Kakuzō, "Nature in East Asiatic Painting," in *Okakura Collected English Writings*, vol. 2, 147.

⁸⁴ Okakura Kakuzō, "Taisei bijutsu shi," in *Okakura Tenshin zenshū*, vol. 4, 238-240.

⁸⁵ Okakura Kakuzō, "Taisei bijutsu shi," in *Okakura Tenshin zenshū*, vol. 4, 240-251. Raphael is oftentimes thought to be the favorite of Okakura, as his friend, William Bigelow and J. E. Lodge stated in their reminiscence "He liked Raphael and disliked Rubens." (*Okakura Collected English Writings*, vol. 3, 227-232) But upon closer examination of Okakura's works, he rated da Vinci the highest among the giants of the High

Okakura considered the High Renaissance, the world of Leonardo da Vinci, Michelangelo, and Raphael to be the highest point of Western art history. From the seventeenth century forward, Okakura saw a decline in Western art. The seventeenth century saw a change in popular painting styles and subjects (*fuzokuga* 風俗画 or *ukiyo-e* 浮世絵) to include a great number of decorative paintings, such as landscapes, flowers, animals and still-life, which Okakura felt was a step backwards from earlier Western art. By the nineteenth century, the elements of Greek revivalism were gone, replaced by an artistic style almost exclusively concerned with realistic representation of objects.⁸⁷

Worse yet, with industrialization and the development of a middle class society, Okakura perceived Western art's further decline. For him, industrialism and subsequent commercialism meant a complete lack of individuality and creativity. He felt that this period degraded Western art to nothing more than mere decoration or display of wealth:

We of the East often wonder whether your society cares for art. You seem not to want art, but decoration,—decoration in the sense of subjugating beauty for the sake of display. In the rush for wealth there is no time for lingering before a picture. In the competition of luxury, the criterion is not that the thing should be more interesting, but it should be more expensive. The paintings that cover the walls are not of *your* choice, but those dictated by fashion.⁸⁸

Renaissance. In his travel diary in Europe (1887), one can also observe some negative comments on Raphael, such as "Perugino ceiling in Sistine chapel fine. Raphael mediocre," and "Vatican gallery and paintings, Carlo Crivelli superb, Raphaels Ascension awful." See Okakura's Europe Travel Diary (1887), "Ōshū shisatsu nisshi 欧州視察日誌" (1887), in *Okakura Tenshin zenshū*, vol. 5, 310-311. His travel diary is written in a combination of English and Japanese.

⁸⁶ Okakura Kakuzō, "Taisei bijutsu shi," in *Okakura Tenshin zenshū*, vol. 4, 252.

⁸⁷ Okakura Kakuzō, "Taisei bijutsu shi," in *Okakura Tenshin zenshū*, vol. 4, 250-255.

⁸⁸ Okakura Kakuzō, "Modern Problems in Painting," in *Okakura Collected English Writings*, vol. 2, 74.

Okakura was repulsed by Western society's obsession with the "vulgar display of riches."⁸⁹ He criticized Western architecture, interior decorations and even the use of flowers "to be a part of the pageantry of wealth."⁹⁰

The development of a mass consumer driven society resulting from industrialization meant artists lost their freedom to express their own ideas and emotions. What was considered desirable art became dictated by the market, generating an environment detrimental to artistic creativity:

Competition imposes the monotony of fashion instead of the variety of life. Cheapness is the goal, not beauty. The democratic indifferences of the market stamps everything with the mark of vulgar equality. In place of the hand made works, where we feel the warmth of the human touch of even the humblest worker, we are confronted with cold blooded touch of the machine. The mechanical habit of the age seizes the artist and makes him forget that his only reason for existence is to be the one, not many. He is impelled not to create but multiply. Painting is becoming more and more an affair of the hand rather than of the mind.⁹¹

Bearing in mind Okakura's feelings about the steep decline in Western art, it is understandable when he criticized those Japanese who simply accepted everything Western as superior to anything Japanese. He argued that the Western art introduced to Japan during the 19th century was "at its lowest ebb" and was not worthy of imitation.⁹² Okakura feared that cultural imperialism would cause Eastern art to be abandoned in favor of anything and everything Western. Worse yet, this form of cultural imperialism was not being imposed by

⁸⁹ Okakura Kakuzō, *The Book of Tea*, 98.

⁹⁰ Okakura Kakuzō, *The Book of Tea*, 129.

⁹¹ Okakura Kakuzō, "Modern Problems in Painting," in *Okakura Collected English Writings*, vol. 2, 80.

⁹² Okakura Kakuzō, *The Ideals of the East*, 226.

Westerners, but propagated by the Japanese themselves. He harshly criticized those Japanese who blindly adopted everything Western: "That eagerness and profound admiration for Western knowledge which confounded beauty with science, and culture with industry, did not hesitate to welcome the meanest chromos as specimens of great art ideals."⁹³

For Okakura, the history of Eastern and Western art had taken two completely different courses and he felt that they should remain as two separate and distinct artistic heritages. He feared the complete destruction of the Eastern artistic heritage since he saw it as possessing higher artistic ideals than that of the West. He translated "modernization" to mean "the occidentalization of the world,"⁹⁴ and in such a world, he feared the great Eastern artistic tradition would be overcome by the inferior Western version, and Eastern sensibilities would completely lose their place: ". . . it would appear that in fundamental nature the two arts are so widely different that, except in a few important points they can never grow into one. And it would be a calamity should the great art of the Asiatic past be lost."⁹⁵

A Meeting of East and West: Thesis-Antithesis-Synthesis

Even though Okakura saw a clear division between Eastern and Western artistic traditions and tried to preserve Eastern ideals, he did not reject Western concepts completely. Indeed, he was very much influenced by Western philosophy, especially that of Hegel.⁹⁶ For

⁹³ Okakura Kakuzō, *The Ideals of the East*. 226.

⁹⁴ Okakura Kakuzō, "Modern Problems in Painting," in *Okakura Collected English Writings*, vol. 2, 77.

⁹⁵ Okakura Kakuzō, "Nature in East Asiatic Painting," in *Okakura Collected English Writings*, vol. 2, 153-154.

⁹⁶ Okakura Koshirō, *Sofu Okakura Tenshin*, 153-156.

example, when Okakura spoke of "the three terms by which European scholars love to distinguish the past development of art" in *The Ideals of the East*, he was referring to Hegel's theory on aesthetics. He identified these three stages to be 1) Symbolic or Formalistic, 2) Classic and 3) Romantic eras which he applied to historical Japanese art context.⁹⁷ Okakura thus explained many of the similarities between East and Western art as due to this parallel development of the two societies: "the kinship between Japanese work of this period [the Nara period] and that of the Greco-Roman is due to the fundamental resemblance of its mental environment to that of the classic nation of the West."⁹⁸

Okakura's emphasis on the spirit of art over realism may have also been influenced by the writings of Hegel. According to Hegel:

What distinguishes art from other things made by man is, first of all, that it is made for man's *sensuous* appreciation in such a way as to address itself ultimately to his *mind*, which is to find a spiritual satisfaction in it. The sensuous shapes and sounds of arts present themselves to us not to arouse or satisfy desire but to excite a response and echo in all the depths of consciousness of the mind. The sensuous can be thus *spiritualized* in us because in art, it is *spiritual* that appears in sensuous shape. A man-made sensuous thing is a true work of art, in other words, only in the measure that it has been brought into being through mind, by genuinely spiritual productive activity.⁹⁹

This theory of art developed by Hegel resonates in Okakura's emphasis on the spirit of art that speaks directly to the viewer. Compare the above statement by Hegel to Okakura's following statement:

⁹⁷ Okakura Kakuzō, *The Ideals of the East*, 163-166. Henry Paulucci, *Hegel: On the Arts: Selections from G.W. F. Hegel's Aesthetics or the Philosophy of Fine Art*, 2nd ed. (Smyrna, DE: Bagehot Council, 2001).

⁹⁸ Okakura Kakuzō, *The Ideals of the East*, 65.

⁹⁹ Henry Paulucci, *Hegel: On the Arts*, 4.

Who of the recognized great painters either in the West or the East has not directly appealed to us despite the distance of time and race? Their language is necessarily different. Some may be in the Confucian sequence of the white, some in the Italian sequence of the brown; others again in the French sequence of the blue, but behind the veil is the mind, always eager to tell its own story.¹⁰⁰

Thus, Hegel's influence on Okakura's view of the East and West is apparent. Okakura saw the West to be the "antithesis" of the East, although such a binary view of the world was not uncommon in the late 19th to early 20th century among both Westerners and Easterners.¹⁰¹ Okakura's teacher, Ernest Fenollosa's collection of poems published in 1893 was entitled, *East and West*.¹⁰² Likewise, Okakura saw the world to be divided into two halves that developed in parallel and his study of the art histories of the East and West seems to confirm this view.

Nevertheless, his vision for the future of Japanese art was not purely the preservation of the ancient heritage, but instead he sought the *evolution* of Japanese art to a higher level. Okakura identified himself as a "conservative" who found it "deplorable that traditions of Chinese and Japanese painting should be entirely lost,"¹⁰³ but he also identified himself as a *shizen hattatsu ron sha*, 自然発達論者, or "natural development theorist." He explained this concept to Japanese artists in 1887:

Natural development does not distinguish between the East and West, but bases itself on the basic principal of art, it would take in what is rational and master what is beautiful. Art should be based on the arts of the past, but it needs to evolve to accommodate the modern experience. If it is appropriate, study the works of Italian masters, or use oil

¹⁰⁰ Okakura Kakuzō, "Modern Problems in Painting," in *Okakura Collected English Writings*, vol. 2, 62.

¹⁰¹ Okakura Kakuzō, *The Ideals of the East*, 31.

¹⁰² Ernest Francisco Fenollosa, *East and West* (Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Literature House, 1970).

¹⁰³ Okakura Kakuzō, "Modern Problems in Painting," in *Collected English Writings*, vol. 2, 79.

paintings techniques. Furthermore, one should spend time on research and testing and seek the best way for future generations. . . . Artists of Japan, art is in co-possession of heaven and earth. Let us not have a distinction between East and West.”¹⁰⁴

For a Western audience, he stated in 1904:

I do not mean to say that we should not study the Western methods, for thereby we may add to our own method of expression. Nor do I desire that we should not assimilate the wealth of ideas which your civilization has amassed. On the contrary, the mental equipment of Japanese painting needs strengthening though the accretion of the world's ideals. We can only become more human by becoming more universal.¹⁰⁵

One can ascertain from these two statements that Okakura emphasized the selective adoption of art practices from the West. The trace of evolutionary theory in Okakura's argument is apparent as he studied both Eastern and Western art histories, he saw the arts to be constantly evolving, and never static. He also found the cross-cultural interactions between different groups of people to be one of the greatest catalysts of change, whether it was the Japanese encounter with China or the European encounter with the Arabs. For Okakura, the era in which he lived represented an era of cross-cultural interaction and he found it completely natural for the arts to change and evolve within this new context. What he found unnatural was the abandonment of Eastern heritage in favor of its Western counterpart. Surrounded by Americans who appreciated Eastern art, Okakura was also well aware that some Western artists gained inspiration from Eastern art and began to incorporate these new Asian ideas and techniques into their art. As a student of

¹⁰⁴ Okakura Kakuzō, "Kanga kai ni oite 鑑画会に於て[Speech given to Kangakai (1887)]," in *Okakura Tenshin zenshū*, vol. 3, 173-178. Translated from 自然発達とは東西の区別を論ぜず美術の大道に基き、理のある所は之を取り美のある所は之を究め、過去の沿革に拠り現在の情勢に伴ふて開達するものなり。伊太利の大家中に在て参考すべきものは之を参考し、画油の手法も之を利用すべき場合に於ては之を利用し、猶更に試験發明して将来の人生に的切なる方法を探らんとす. . . . 日本の美術家諸君よ、美術は天地の共有なり、豈東西洋の区別あるべけんや。

¹⁰⁵ Okakura Kakuzō, "Modern Problems in Painting," in *Okakura Collected English Writings*, vol. 2, 79.

Hegelian philosophy, Okakura may have seen the meeting of the East and West to be the meeting of thesis and antithesis, which led to the synthesis of the two, but not necessarily creating one new culture; instead, both artistic traditions are evolving into something new, based on their own respective traditions.

Conclusion

Okakura Kakuzō, remembered chiefly as a leading Pan-Asianist, was an art critic and art historian who fought to preserve the artistic heritage of the East in the face of rampant Westernization. His most famous quote, "Asia is One," was derived from his study of Japanese art history in which he saw a strong connection between India, China, and Japan through the thread of Buddhism. This meant that Okakura's conceptualization of "Asia" or "the East" was limited to the area east of the Indus River, with India and China serving as the two great centers of Eastern Civilization. Okakura's concept of the East, however, was ultimately East-Asia centered, with India included only because of its influence upon the arts of China and Japan through Buddhism.

Conceptually, he associated Eastern civilization and its art with individualism, freedom, and peace. As if to challenge the stereotypical view of Asia shared by many in the West, he repeatedly pointed out examples of individualism and freedom in the Eastern artistic traditions, including those grounded in both Buddhism and Daoism. He valued art based on spirit to be of a higher caliber than that which simply sought to depict realism. Artwork that drew in the viewers and allowed them to become a participant in the art was considered by Okakura to be the goal of a true artist. He believed that Eastern art tried to emphasize a concept of spirit, by having artists

produce works from memory and imagination rather than from using models or copying landscapes. He also saw strong elements of individualism and freedom in the way that most Eastern art styles emphasized simplicity and restraint, often leaving much of the image blank to allow the viewer to complete the picture in their own mind rather than have the artist dictate exactly what the viewer should see and feel from the art. Ultimately, he saw the gentle art of the tea ceremony as the highest expression of the Eastern aestheticism and Eastern peace because of its simple elegance that could transcend social, economic, and spiritual boundaries.

On the other hand, Okakura saw much of Western art as nothing more than an attempt to copy and represent nature exactly as the artist saw it. The overemphasis on realism, whether the subject matter was the human body, a landscape, animals or a still life, left the work devoid of the spirit and character which defined Eastern art. Okakura especially disdained much of the art produced during the industrial age since he felt the artistic community had become slaves of consumerism, creating mere decoration that served as a vulgar display of wealth, rather than real art. He identified the modern West with industrialization and the mass production of goods. Instead of creating hand crafted goods that carried the spirit and personality of the artisan who made them, the West had given itself over to a world where goods were created by the cold and unfeeling claws of machines, and therefore, lacked the originality, creativity, and individuality found in handmade items. For Okakura, Western art and society had become a poor substitute for the spirit and individualism found in the East, having traded creativity and freedom for realism and sameness.

Okakura Kakuzō lived through a period when many Japanese were rejecting or abandoning their cultural traditions in favor of Western civilization. In such an environment, not

only were many valuable cultural artifacts destroyed but the core spirit of the people and their culture appeared to be in danger of extinction. Okakura was one of the cultural conservatives who mourned the loss of Eastern heritage, but he was not an ultraconservative who sought to preserve traditions in their purest form. Indeed, he perceived the art histories of the East and West to be a history of evolution, where encounters between societies with different traditions were one of the most powerful agents of cultural change. For Okakura, the two halves of civilization developed separately in parallel and he believed that these two civilizations could each be elevated to an even higher level by incorporating good elements from each other while still maintaining their distinct identities. For him, Eastern and Western civilizations were thesis and antithesis, being equal in their stature and magnificence. In the area of aesthetics, Okakura perceived the East to possess higher quality than the West. What Okakura Kakuzō tried to accomplish was the elevation of Eastern civilization to the same level, if not higher than, Western civilization in the eyes of his fellow countrymen, his Asian friends, and Westerners.

CHAPTER 6
KŌTOKU SHŪSUI (1871-1911)
A SOCIALIST CRITIQUE

In November of 1910, the trial of a group of Japanese anarchists accused of plotting the assassination of Emperor Mutsuhito elicited protests from socialists and anarchists around the world. Despite evidence to the contrary, a thirty-nine-year-old leader of the Japanese anarchist movement, Kōtoku Shūsui 幸徳秋水 (1871-1911), was accused by the Japanese government of being the ring leader of the conspiracy. Deaf to the international outcry coming from famous figures such as the American anarchist, Emma Goldman, Irish playwright, Bernard Shaw, and Karl Marx's French socialist grandson, Jean Longuet, the government executed Kōtoku and 11 other anarchists on January 24 and 25, 1911.¹

Born in 1871, a few years after the Meiji Restoration, Kōtoku Shūsui lived during a period when many Japanese intellectuals eagerly pursued Western ideas and concepts. As an avid reader of English language materials, Kōtoku was among the first Japanese to be exposed to socialist and anarchist theories. Excited by these new theories, he sought to introduce them to more Japanese by translating such works as Marx's *Communist Manifesto* and Peter Kropotkin's *The Conquest of Bread* into Japanese. As a journalist, Kōtoku did not hesitate to interject his own ideas and views on politics, social issues, and international affairs into his writings. When many Japanese started to show their support for militarism and expansionism, Kōtoku warned that imperialism would lead to the destruction of civilization in his book, *Nijyū seiki no kaibutsu*:

¹ Itoya Toshio 糸屋寿雄, *Kōtoku Shūsui kenkyū* 幸徳秋水研究 (Tokyo: Aoki Shoten, 1967), 323-325.

Teikoku shugi 廿世紀之怪物帝國主義 [*Imperialism: The Monster of the Twentieth Century*] (1901).

For Kōtoku Shūsui, "civilization" was not a geo-cultural entity, but an historical stage in which people strove to make progress toward "freedom, equality, and universal love." Kōtoku believed that these ideals should be realized by the all humans, not just a select few. He perceived socialism to be the vehicle by which to bring these ideals into realization, while he viewed imperialism and militarism as concepts that would move humanity backwards from the goals of a civilized society. Since he approached civilization from a universalistic perspective, the East-West binary was not as important a part of Kōtoku's discourse as it was for other Meiji thinkers. Instead, he saw the world divided between the strong and the weak, the exploiter and the exploited, and the colonizer and the colonized. Kōtoku empathized with the weak, oppressed, and exploited regardless of nationality or race. Only after the Russian Revolution of 1905, did the East-West binary become somewhat relevant to Kōtoku since he envisioned revolutions taking place in both the East and West. He predicted that China would undergo the next revolution and saw Russia and China serving as the two centers of revolution from which the revolution would spread to the Western and Eastern worlds, respectively. Yet, in this vision, Eastern and Western worlds existed only as loose geo-cultural entities; they were not antagonistic or antithetical entities, but rather complimentary ones where socialists worked together toward the common goal of world revolution.

Brief Biography

Kōtoku Shūsui may have been executed as an anarcho-syndicalist; yet, he had embraced anarchism only after a journey of intellectual discovery led him to alternately embrace *jiyū minken undō* 自由民権運動 (Liberty and Popular Rights Movement), parliamentary socialism, Marxist communism, and anarcho-communism, before finally becoming an anarcho-syndicalist. A brief biography of Kōtoku's life will help explain this mental progression through the many stages of his life.²

Kōtoku Shūsui was born as Kōtoku Denjirō 幸徳傳次郎 in 1871 (4th year of Meiji) in Nakamura, part of today's Kōchi prefecture (then known as Tosa) on Shikoku Island. His family was not of samurai background, but they were prominent local merchants that served as headsmen of the town. However, Kōtoku's family's fortune fell into steady decline, especially after the Meiji Restoration, and he did not enjoy the lifestyle one might expect from someone of his background. Although the Meiji government officially abolished the feudal class system in

² A good biography available in English is F. G. Notehelfer, *Kōtoku Shūsui, Portrait of a Japanese Radical* (Cambridge, England, University Press, 1971). The present biographical sketch is based on Notehelfer's biography as well as Nishio Yōtarō 西尾陽太郎, *Kōtoku Shūsui*. vol. 20 of *Jinbutsu sōsho* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1959); Hayashi Shigeru 林茂, *Kindai Nihon no shisōkatachi: Nakae Chōmin, Kōtoku Shūsui, Yoshino Sakuzō*. 近代日本の思想家たち: 中江兆民・幸徳秋水・吉野作造 [Thinkers of Modern Japan: Nakae Chōmin, Kōtoku Shūsui, Yoshino Sakuzō] (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1958); Hayashi Hisao 林尚男, *Heiminsha no hitobito: Shūsui, Kosen, Naoe, Sakae* 平民社の人びと: 秋水・枯川・尚江・栄 [People of the Heiminsha: Shūsui, Kosen, Naoe, Sakae] (Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha, 1990); Ikeda Satoshi 池田諭, *Moeru Ajia to Nihon no genten: hadō ka ōdō ka: yomigaeru Tenshin to Shūsui no risō*. 燃えるアジアと日本の原点: 覇道か王道か: よみがえる天心と秋水の理想 [The Origin of Pan Asia and Japan: Hegemonic Way or Kingly Way: Revival of the Ideals of Tenshin and Shūsui]. (Tokyo: Sanpō, 1974); Ōkōchi Kazuo 大河内一男, *Kōtoku Shūsui to Katayama Sen; Meiji no shakai shugi*. 幸徳秋水と片山潜: 明治の社会主義 [Kōtoku Shūsui and Katayama Sen: Socialism of the Meiji Era] (Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1972).

1869, class consciousness was still strongly felt during the period when Kōtoku was growing up, and he found himself teased for being a townsman's son by the ex-samurai sons who surrounded him. Considered a *shindō* 神童 or a "godly child" (a term reserved for exceptionally bright children), Kōtoku received instruction in the Chinese classics in addition to the regular elementary and middle school curriculum. Despite his intellectual capacity, Kōtoku did not have a chance to finish middle school because a typhoon destroyed his school building in 1885, and his family could not afford to send him to another school. His disappointment and his strong desire to learn led Kōtoku to run away from home four times in pursuit of an education. These childhood experiences of discrimination and limited educational opportunity encouraged Kōtoku to become a supporter of the Liberty and Popular Rights Movement.

In 1888, Kōtoku met and became a student of one of the Liberty and Popular Rights Movement's greatest leaders, Nakae Chōmin 中江兆民 (1847-1901). Famous for his translation of Jean-Jacques Rousseau's *Social Contract*, Nakae was a journalist and political activist, who campaigned for the establishment of a parliamentary system. Nakae's enthusiasm for the writings of Rousseau and the French revolutionary ideals of "liberty, equality, and fraternity" even earned him the moniker of "Rousseau of the East." Although Nakae owned a school that taught French language and philosophy classes, he advised Kōtoku to study English since that would allow him access to a greater range of available books and magazines. It was also Nakae who persuaded Kōtoku to become a journalist and gave him his pen name, Shūsui, meaning

"autumn water."³ As his greatest mentor, Nakae held a lifelong influence over Kōtoku that lasted even after he turned to socialism.

In 1893, Kōtoku Shūsui was hired by the *Jiyū Shinbun* (Liberty Newspaper, publication of *Jiyūtō*, the Liberal Party. *Shinbun* means newspaper), and started his career as a journalist. Due to financial difficulties, the *Jiyū Shinbun* ceased publication in 1894. After briefly working for the *Hiroshima Shinbun*, Kōtoku took a position with the *Chūō Shinbun* in 1895. During his early days as a journalist, Kōtoku's job was to translate articles from English language newspapers. Starting in 1897, however, he was given the opportunity to start expressing his own opinions as an editorial writer.⁴ Kōtoku's career at the *Chūō Shinbun* did not last long; he resigned from the newspaper when its ownership shifted to Itō Hirobumi伊藤 博文 (1841-1909) in 1898.⁵ Itō Hirobumi was one of the most influential politicians of the Meiji period, and represented governmental policies Kōtoku adamantly opposed, making it impossible for Kōtoku to continue working at the paper.

³ Shūsui—meaning "autumn water" or "autumn flood"—is said to be taken from the *Book of Zhuangzi*, a Daoist classic, and implies purity and straightforwardness. Notehelfer, *Kōtoku Shūsui*, 33.

⁴ He also became a contributor in *Marumaru Chinbun* 團團珍聞, an illustrated satirical magazine, published between 1877 and 1907. The term "*Chinbun* 珍聞" means "peculiar hearings" and rhymes with Japanese word for newspaper, "*shinbun* 新聞," or "new hearings." Kōtoku wrote editorials between 1897 and 1901, mostly using a penname, *Iroha Iori* いろは庵. See Kōtoku Shūsui, *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū* 幸徳秋水全集 [The Complete Works of Kōtoku Shūsui] (Tokyo: Meiji Bunken, 1968), vol.1.

⁵ Itō Hirobumi was the first Prime Minister of Japan, who played the crucial role in drafting the Meiji Constitution, modeled after the German Second Reich Constitution. Itō served as the Prime Minister four times as well as serving as the Resident General of Korea between 1905 and 1909. Itō was assassinated by the Korean nationalist, An Jung-geun 安重根 in 1909.

Around the same time, Kōtoku started down the path toward socialism by way of Albert Schäffle's *Quintessence of Socialism*.⁶ During 1897-1898, Kōtoku became involved in the cause of socialism by joining the Society for the Study of Social Problems (*Shakai mondai kenkyūkai* 社会問題研究会) and the Society for the Study of Socialism (*Shakai shugi kenkyūkai* 社会主義研究会). After leaving *Chūō Shinbun*, Kōtoku was able to find a position at a left-leaning newspaper, the *Yorozu Chōhō* 萬朝報, in 1898, quickly becoming one of its most influential writers.⁷ Indeed, it was during his time at the *Yorozu Chōhō* that Kōtoku began to clearly express his socialist views, best defined by his April 1901 article entitled "I am a Socialist." Also in April of 1901, Kōtoku published his first book, *Imperialism: The Monster of the Twentieth Century*, mentioned above.

On May 19, 1901, Kōtoku, along with Katayama Sen 片山潜, Kinoshita Naoe 木下尚江, Abe Iso'o 安部磯雄, Nishikawa Kōjirō 西川光二郎, and Kawakami Kiyoshi 河上清 formed the Social Democratic Party (*Shakai minshutō* 社会民主党), Japan's first socialist party. The new party was short lived since the Japanese government banned it the very next day. Despite the failure of the Social Democratic Party, Kōtoku continued to express socialist views in the *Yorozu Chōhō* as well as in his second book, the *Principles of Socialism* (*Shakai shugi shinzui* 社会主義

⁶ Kōtoku identified Schäffle's *Quintessence of Socialism* as one of the most critical works that led him to socialism in "Yo wa ikani shite shakai shugisha ni narishika 余は如何にして社会主義者になりし乎[How I Became a Socialist]," *Heimin Shinbun*, 17 January 1904, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 5, 68.

⁷ *Yorozu Chōhō* 萬朝報 also hired other prominent writers such as Sakai Toshihiko 堺利彦(1871-1933), Uchimura Kanzō 内村鑑三(1861-1930) and Naitō Konan 内藤湖南(1866-1934). Sakai Toshihiko also became a prominent socialist. Uchimura Kanzō was the best known leader of Japanese Christianity (Chapter 4 of this dissertation). Naitō Konan was one of Japan's leading "East-Asia" specialists. For more information on Naitō, see Stefan Tanaka, *Japan's Orient: Rendering Pasts into History*.

神髓, 1903). At this point in his intellectual journey, Kōtoku was not yet a revolutionary socialist, but rather a committed parliamentarian seeking to create a socialist party in Japan through which he wanted to bring change using "peaceful means."⁸

As the prospect of war between Japan and Russia became more imminent, however, Kōtoku took a strong anti-war stance based upon his socialist perspective that a war would only benefit the rich and powerful at the expense of the common people. When the owner of the *Yorozu Chōhō* decided to start supporting the war in 1903, Kōtoku and some of his colleagues, including Sakai Toshihiko, decided to resign and launched their own weekly newspaper, the "Common People's Newspaper" (*Heimin Shinbun* 平民新聞).⁹ The *Heimin Shinbun* was not well received by the Japanese government, especially after Kōtoku used it to express his discontent with the government for raising taxes in March, 1904.¹⁰ In November of 1904, upon the one year anniversary of the newspaper's launch, Kōtoku and Sakai translated and published the first Japanese translation of the *Communist Manifesto*. This choice to publish the *Manifesto* showed Kōtoku's commitment to Marxist revolutionary communism. The *Manifesto* was immediately banned from circulation and Kōtoku and his colleagues were fined for violating the Press Law. In the subsequent trial, Kōtoku was found guilty of disturbing the "peace and order;" the *Heimin Shinbun* was ordered to close, and Kōtoku was sentenced to five months in prison. While serving his prison sentence between February 28 and July 28, 1905, Kōtoku experienced an important transformation of his worldview; the time in prison offered him a chance to read and embrace

⁸ Notehelper, *Kōtoku Shūsui*, 99.

⁹ Uchimura Kanzō also resigned from *Yorozu Chōhō* at this time.

¹⁰ Sakai, the main editor of the newspaper was imprisoned for two month after this incident.

Peter Kropotkin's works, resulting in a shift of his views from Marxism to anarchist communism.¹¹

After his release from prison, Kōtoku decided to leave Japan for a while. He traveled to the United States to learn conversational English, develop "instruments for the International Movement of Communists or Anarchists," and "to visit the leaders of many foreign revolutionary groups."¹² Kōtoku spent roughly six months, from December 1905 to June 1906, in the San Francisco-Oakland area where he met with members of the Japanese socialists¹³ and other socialist/anarchists of various nationalities.¹⁴ Kōtoku joined the Socialist Party of San Francisco and met members of the Industrial Workers of the World (I.W.W.), from whom he learned about the concept of "syndicalism" by which workers were encouraged to form trade unions and to take direct action in seizing a nation's means of production. The level to which Kōtoku embraced these new, more radical ideologies may be seen in his participation in the establishment of a *Shakai Kakumei tō* or Socialist Revolutionary Party in Oakland. This latest step in Kōtoku's intellectual journey would lead him back to Japan.

While Kōtoku had been in the United States, a change in Japan's political atmosphere, allowed the reestablishment of Japan's Socialist Party (Nihon shakai tō 日本社会党) and the *Heimin Shinbun* under the new, more liberal administration of Saionji Kinmochi 西園寺 公望

¹¹ A letter from Kōtoku Shūsui to Albert Johnson, 10 August 1905, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū* vol. 9, 254. Kōtoku also exchanged letters with Peter Kropotkin.

¹² A letter from Kōtoku Shūsui to Albert Johnson, 10 August 1905, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū* vol. 9, 254.

¹³ A former writer of *Yorozu Chōhō*, Oka Shigeki, established the *Heiminsha* (Commoner's Party) of San Francisco.

¹⁴ Included among these were Albert Johnson, an American anarchist; Mrs. Fritz, a Russian émigré anarchist; and Mr. Widen, a Swedish revolutionary.

(1849-1940).¹⁵ Soon after returning to Japan at the request of fellow Japanese socialists on June 23, 1906, Kōtoku delivered a speech entitled "The Tide of the World Revolutionary Movement" at a meeting of the Socialist Party. In this speech, he introduced the ideology of syndicalism and urged the Japanese socialists to abandon the parliamentary approach. Japan's liberal political atmosphere did not last long, however, and the Socialist Party was again outlawed in February 1907, and the *Heimin Shinbun* forced to cease publication in April 1907.

In May 1910, the Japanese police arrested a group of anarchists for possession of explosives and conspiring to assassinate Emperor Mutsuhito. There were only four individuals directly involved in the plot, Miyashita Takichi 宮下 太吉 (1875-1911), Niimura Tadao 新村忠雄 (1887-1911), Furukawa Rikisaku 古河力作 (1884-1911), and Kanno Suga 菅野スガ (1881-1911), but this incident led the police to conduct a sweep of known socialists and anarchists for arrest and interrogation. Those arrested during the police operation included Kōtoku. Although Kōtoku argued that he was in no way part of the plot, a fact confirmed by the main conspirators, he was still found guilty and sentenced to death. On January 24, Kōtoku Shūsui's journey came to an end as he was among the eleven anarchists executed for conspiracy, with a twelfth woman, executed the following day.¹⁶

¹⁵ This time, *Heimin Shinbun* was published as daily newspaper.

¹⁶ Kanno Suga was a female revolutionary who was also an ex-lover of Kōtoku. Kanno was executed on 25 January 1911, one day after the execution of the male conspirators.

Kōtoku and East-West Binary

Before the Russian Revolution of 1905, the East-West binary did not play an important part in Kōtoku's framework of thinking about the world. He did use words such as Tōyō (the East) or Seiyō (the West) occasionally, but rarely were they used in pairs or in the same work to compare and contrast the two entities.¹⁷ As an adept reader of English language materials, including those translated from French, German, and Russian, etc., Kōtoku Shūsui was heavily influenced by what other Japanese would have considered "Western" thinkers. At the same time, his trainings in the Chinese classics provided a distinctive Confucian undertone to his discussions.¹⁸ Kōtoku took in whatever appealed to him, whether the ideas came from the East or the West, and freely combined them. He probably found socialists' emphasis on the welfare of the people to be compatible with Mencius's teachings,¹⁹ and saw similarities between anarchism and the teachings of philosophical Daoism in the *Laozi* and *Zhuangzi*.²⁰ Kōtoku did

¹⁷ In a few of his earlier writings, some trace of Asia-Europe, and Yellow-White binaries may be observed, but as Kōtoku embraced socialism more fully, such concepts faded. For example, in 1897 Kōtoku presented the war between Greece and Turkey as a struggle between Europe and Asia. See Kōtoku Shūsui, "Toruko o kanashimu 土耳古を哀む [Grieving for Turkey]," *Chuō Shinbun*, 28-29 April 1897, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 1, 225-230.

¹⁸ Kinji Ken Yada, *Confucian Path to Meiji Socialism: Kōtoku Shūsui's Radical Reaction to Modernization* (Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Southern California, 1972).

¹⁹ Of all Confucianists, Kōtoku seems to have been particularly influenced by Mencius (also known as Mengzi 孟子, c.372-289 BCE). Famous for his argument of human nature as good, Mencius is usually considered the second greatest Confucian sage after Confucius. Mencius emphasized the people's welfare and rights, and essentially justified the people's right to rebel against a bad ruler. Kōtoku specifically mentions *The Book of Mencius* as one of the books that led him to Democracy (*Minshu shugi* 民主主義), which created a foundation for his eventual embracing of socialism. Kōtoku Shūsui, "Yo wa ikani shite shakai shugisha to narishika," *Heimin Shinbun Weekly*, 17 January 1904, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 5, 68.

²⁰ Kōtoku Shūsui, "Gokuchū kara san bengenin ate no chinbensho 獄中から三辯護人あての陳辯書 [Prison Letter to Three Defense Lawyers]," 18 December 1910, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 6, 522. Laozi 老子 (c. 6th century BC) and Zhuangzi 莊子 (4th century BCE) were the two greatest figures of philosophical Daoism.

not admire or advocate the East over the West or vice versa. The East and West were neither friend nor foe, neither a model to aspire to nor a model to avoid.

For Kōtoku, Tōyō (the East) was a geographical entity (discussed more fully below) while Seiyō (the West) was a loose cultural entity. He uses the word, Tōyō fairly frequently, but rarely employs the term Seiyō, preferring to mention specific countries or use other terminology, such as the "European continent (Ōshū欧州)," or Europe and America (Ō-Bei欧米). This is understandable since Kōtoku's interest was not in world cultures but rather in politics and foreign relations. In the age of imperialism, Kōtoku saw the world to be divided between a handful of Great Powers (*rekkoku*列國) and the rest.²¹ Moreover, the lack of an East-West binary in Kōtoku's thinking can be attributed also to his understanding of "civilization." Neither Tōyō nor Seiyō constituted distinct civilizations (*bunmei* 文明) for Kōtoku since his understanding of civilization was closely tied to his view of human history rather than specific societies or countries.

Civilization and Barbarism

For Kōtoku, "civilization" was not a cultural entity as defined by region or people, but rather a stage in human history and development. He disdained those who had accepted "civilization" to mean the adoption of Western attire, culture, and institutions, saying that he

²¹ The term, *rekkoku* 列國 literally means "series or group of states," but this term when used in the context of modern imperialism, implies strong states or the "Great Powers." Today, the term "*rekkyō*" 列強 (the series or group of the strong) basically refers to "the Great Powers."

considered such people as among those who "contaminate and disgrace civilization."²²

Influenced by both Darwinian evolutionary theory and Marxist historical materialism, Kōtoku viewed history as a story of progress (*shinpo* 進歩) from barbarism to civilization. Kōtoku accepted Darwinian theory and believed that human beings had evolved from animals. He considered humans to be productive animals (*seisan teki dōbutsu* 生産的動物) since their abilities to manipulate nature and produce goods differentiated them from all other creatures.²³ For Kōtoku, human progress consisted of overcoming both nature and human animalistic instincts:

Humans make progress because of their own willingness to correct things undesirable in nature. Those who most successfully suppress their natural instincts become the most morally progressive people. Those who meddle most extensively with what nature provides become the most materially developed people. It is necessary for those who wish to receive the full benefits of civilization to subjugate nature totally.²⁴

Kōtoku considered the people of the primordial past (*taisho* 太初, or *kodai* 古代) to be barbarians because they were not able to overcome their natural instincts. This state of barbarism (*banya* 蠻野) meant that human behavior was not much removed from that of wild beasts (*yajū* 野獸). Dictated by animalistic impulses, primeval people were thought to be warlike, protective of each other and hostile to outsiders. These barbaric practices were slowly

²² Kōtoku Shūsui (unsigned), "Bunmei o ojoku suru mono 文明を汚辱する者 [Those who Disgrace Civilization]," *Chōkōzetsu* 長廣舌, 10 October 1900, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 2, 450.

²³ Kōtoku Shūsui, *Nijyū seiki no kaibutsu: Teikoku shugi* 廿世紀之怪物帝國主義 [Imperialism: The Monster of the Twentieth Century] (1901), in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 3, 180.

²⁴ Kōtoku Shūsui, *Nijyū seiki no kaibutsu: Teikoku shugi*, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 3, 141. Translated from 人は自ら奮て自然の弊害を矯正するが故に進歩ある也。尤も多く自然の慾情を制壓するの人民は、是れ尤も多く道德の進歩せる人民也、天然物に向つて尤も多くの人口を加へたるの人民は、是物質的に尤も多く進歩せるの人民也。文明の福利を享けんする者は、実の自然に盲従せざるを要す。

overcome as society progressed and humans gained more control over themselves and their environment. Interestingly, though Kōtoku was non-religious and a self-proclaimed atheist, he gave credit to religious figures such as Buddha and Jesus for leading people away from the state of their bestial past.²⁵

Like most Japanese of the Meiji era, Kōtoku saw himself living in the period of "modern civilization (*kindai bunmei*近代文明)." ²⁶ Though not explicitly stated, Kōtoku most likely understood the beginning of modern civilization to be around the eighteenth century, during the age of Enlightenment. He was certainly influenced by his beloved teacher, Nakae Chōmin, an admirer of *Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, and of French revolutionary ideals. Nakae translated "*Liberté, égalité, fraternité*" into *jiyū* 自由, *byōdō* 平等, and *hakuai* 博愛. It should be noted that the Japanese translation of *fraternité* does not contain a masculine connotation, but translates to mean "universal love" since *haku* 博 means "wide" or "universal" and *ai* 愛 means "love." For Kōtoku, these three words served as the highest ideals of human social development. He associated these concepts with "civilization," "progress," and modernity. On January 1, 1901 Kōtoku wrote:

Ah, the twentieth century! How I wished you to arrive quickly so that the ideals and goals of civilization and progress could be realized, and the benefits of complete liberty,

²⁵ Kōtoku Shūsui, *Nijyū seiki no kaibutsu: Teikoku shugi*, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 3, 122-123; Kōtoku, "Daigyaku Mudōroku 大逆無道録 [The Rambling of a Rebel]," *Chiyoda Maiyū* 千代田毎夕 (24 Nov. -15 Dec.1900), *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 3, 19

²⁶ Kōtoku Shūsui, *Nijyū seiki no kaibutsu: Teikoku shugi* in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 3, 134. He also used states "the late nineteenth century, the era of civilization (*jyūkyū seiki matsuyō no bunmei jidai* 十九世紀末葉の文明時代 (the era of civilization) on *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 3, 161.

equality and universal love be enjoyed by all. Now that you are here, I wonder if you can live up to my expectations.²⁷

After the Age of Enlightenment and the launching of its ideals of "liberty, equality and universal love," human society took tremendous strides in science, technology, philosophy, etc., because "freedom" unleashed creative energies. Yet, Kōtoku felt that the time in which he lived was still far from his vision of civilization. Instead, the beginning of the twentieth century was characterized by the rise of imperialism (*teikoku shugi* 帝國主義) where "the weak were eaten by the strong (*jaku niku kyō shoku* 弱肉強食)."²⁸ The equality of humankind was missing, with increasing discrepancies between the rich and the poor, the powerful and the weak. Kōtoku believed that proper progress of civilization required social (*shakai* 社會) improvements where all humanity (*jinrui zentai* 人類全般) would become the beneficiaries of civilization.²⁹

Therefore, Kōtoku saw that Japan and the rest of the world were headed in the wrong direction. In his book, *Imperialism: The Monster of the Twentieth Century*, Kōtoku warned that civilization itself was in danger of destruction. He was deeply disturbed by the popularity of "imperialism" in Japan which used "patriotism (*aikoku shin* 愛國心)" to arouse people's support

²⁷ Translated from 嗚呼二十世紀、吾人は世界人類をして、速かに文明進歩の理想目的を達するを得て、完全なる自由、平等、博愛の福利を享けせしめんが爲めに、早く汝二十世紀の来らんことを希へきり、而して今や汝の来るに遭う、汝果して能く吾人の希望に副ふべき采。Kōtoku Shūsui (unsigned), "Nijyū seiki o mukau 二十世紀を迎ふ [Welcoming the Twentieth Century]," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 1 January 1901, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 3, 199.

²⁸ The term *jaku niku kyō shoku* 弱肉強食 is a Japanese expression that derives from the Chinese poet Han Yu 韓愈 (768-824CE). *Jaku* 弱 means weak, *niku* 肉 means meat, *kyō* 強 means strong, and *shoku* 食 means to eat. Kōtoku seems to have used this phrase as a variation for "survival of the fittest (*tekisha seizon* 適者生存)." See *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 3, 81, 169.

²⁹ Kōtoku Shūsui, *Nijyū seiki no kaibutsu: Teikoku shugi*, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 3, 115.

for "militarism (*gunkoku shugi* 軍國主義)." He argued that patriotism was nothing more than the simple manipulation of basic animalistic instincts to protect one's own people from outsiders. He also argued that war only benefits the rich and powerful, while the vast majority of people would suffer, creating greater discrepancies between the powerful and the rest, instead of promoting progress toward the equality of all peoples. For Kōtoku, imperialism was a "monster" that would lead human society backwards into barbarism, rather than helping it to charge forward towards the proper goals of "liberty, equality, and universal love." Thus, Kōtoku stated:

Imperialism is a system that will take away the well-being of the majority for the sake of the desires of a small minority; something that will prevent scientific progress for the sake of bestial emotions. It is also a system that will destroy freedom and equality of people, and slay the justice and morality of society. It is a bandit that will destroy world civilization.³⁰

Kōtoku saw socialism and its ideals of liberty, equality, and universal love, as the perfect antidote to imperialism. He urged the Japanese people to start a movement for a "great world revolution (*sekai teki dai kakumei* 世界的大革命)" to establish a society for the workers and common people.³¹

With growing persecution of socialists around the world, Kōtoku construed the decline of freedom and equality as a further slide of civilization into a state of barbarism. After the Japanese government began suppressing socialist activities and closed his newspaper in 1904, Kōtoku began labeling Japan as "barbaric" and complained that Japan was only projecting

³⁰ Kōtoku Shūsui, *Nijyū seiki no kaibutsu: Teikoku shugi*, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 3. 194. Translated from 帝國主義なる政策は、少數の慾望の爲めに多數の福利を奪ふ者也、野獸的感情の爲めに科學的進歩を阻礙する者也、人類の自由平等を殲滅し社會の正義道德を戕賊し、世界の文明を破壊する蠹賊也と。

³¹ Kōtoku Shūsui, *Nijyū seiki no kaibutsu: Teikoku shugi*, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 3, 196.

images of "civilization" without its substances, like "wrapping dung in brocade; its beauty might deceive the eyes but people cannot stand its bad odor."³² Russia and Germany were also presented as countries with "oppressive (*assei* 壓制)" regimes which did not meet the standard of civilization. While living in the United States, Kōtoku also expressed his discontent in the limitations of freedom of speech, expression, meetings etc. imposed upon socialists: "There is no other country that seems so free and yet is so unfree as the United State of America."³³ Kōtoku saw the growing lack of freedom as a sign of backwardness rather than progress for humanity.

Kōtoku and the World

The East-West binary did not dictate Kōtoku Shūsui's understanding of the world. Instead, he thought of the world as divided into the strong and the weak, the exploiters and the exploited, the colonizer and the colonized. Kōtoku tended to refer to specific areas, such as Turkey, the Transvaal, and Qing rather than using the label of "weak state (*jaku koku* 弱國)." But those weak areas shared a common experience of being penetrated by strong states (*kyō koku*

³² Kōtoku Shūsui (unsigned), "Kokujoku no bakuhaku 國辱の暴白 [Nation's Shame Exposed]," *Heimin Shugi*, 12 June 1904, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 5, 150. Translated from 是れ唯だ錦繡を以て糞土を包むと同じきのみ、其美は縦令目を眩せしむに足ると雖も、詩かも而も人は其の悪臭に堪えざらんとする也。See also, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 5, 268.

³³ Kōtoku Shūsui, "Gorukī to Beijin no gizen ゴルキーと米人の偽善 [Gorky and Hypocrisy of the Americans]," *Hikari*, 20 May 1906, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 6, 85. Translated from 米國位い自由なようで不自由な國はない。See also *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 6, 42.

強國) or the Great Powers (*rekoku* 列國).³⁴ Kōtoku realized that the Great Powers (*rekoku*) did not form a single monolithic entity; instead, he saw them as political, economic and diplomatic rivals who were constantly competing with each other. Alliances between these Great Powers were simply out of convenience and were often short lived. The Great Powers tried to keep the conflicts away from their home countries or regions, preferring to wage their conflicts in areas where the turmoil and devastation would have little impact on their own people and stability. Relatively weak regions of the world, such as Africa and Asia, found themselves being used as the battlefields for both the military and economic conflicts taking place between the major powers.

Africa

For Japanese intellectuals who understood the world primarily in terms of an East-West binary to understand the world, such as Fukuzawa Yukichi, Shimoda Utako, and Okakura Kakuzō, the southern portion of the globe, including Africa, Central and South America, and Oceania were completely ignored or dismissed as unimportant regions. This was not exactly the case for Kōtoku; while he did not say a great deal about Central or South America (with the exception of brief mentions of Cuba and Panama), he did mention Africa regularly in his works. Oftentimes Kōtoku combined Africa (*Afurica* 阿布利加) and Asia (*Ajia* 亞細亞), by mentioning one after another, usually in his discussion of imperialism.³⁵ He was aware of the events taking

³⁴ The terms *jaku koku* 弱國 and *kyō koku* 強國 can be found in Kōtoku Shūsui, "*Heiwa kaigi no sandō* 平和會議の賛同 [Agreements of the Peace Conference]," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 24-25, 27-29 September and 1 October 1898, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 2, 132.

³⁵ Kōtoku Shūsui, *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 3, 58, 80, 149.

place on the African continent, such as the Italian invasion of Abyssinia (Ethiopia), the British penetration of Egypt, Sudan, and South Africa, the French expansion into West Africa, and the Fashoda Incident between Britain and France.³⁶ Writing during the era that saw the partitioning of Africa, the contest over Central Asia, and the near partition of China, Kōtoku clearly viewed Africa and Asia as weak regions being preyed upon and exploited by the strong states.³⁷

Kōtoku was particularly interested in the Boer War (1899-1902) and viewed the conflict as the Boer's rightful struggle to maintain their independence in the face of encroaching British imperialists. He set aside both his normal commitment to pacifism and his disdain for patriotism, viewing Boer's tenacity positively:

They [the Boers] are truly the manifestation of justice, freedom, independence, and patriotism What a great people! What a noble people! Even though Britain, Russia, Germany, and the United States may have large territories and materialistic wealth, there is no comparison to [the Boers in their greatness].³⁸

Understandably, Kōtoku was disappointed and upset when the Boers eventually lost the conflict and the Transvaal became a British colony.³⁹

³⁶ Kōtoku Shūsui, *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 1, 252; vol. 2, 50, 130, 140, 185, 205, 272. French in Madagascar is mentioned in vol. 1, 321; German invasion of Africa is noted in vol. 2, 174.

³⁷ Examples of pairing "Asia and Africa" can be found in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 1, 201, 213, 323; and vol. 3, 58, 80, 169, 171, 174, 199, etc.

³⁸ Kōtoku Shūsui (unsigned), "Ikeru kyōkun 活ける教訓 [A Living Lesson]," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 31 August 1901, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 3, 304-305. Translated from . . . 彼等は直ちに正義、自由、獨立、愛國の権化なれば也。 . . 如何に偉大なる國民ぞや、如何に高尚なる國民ぞや、英露獨米諸國の強大、物質的の強大、豈に比するに足らんや。 Other entries of the Boer War can be found in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 2, 205-207, 270; vol. 3, 201, and vol. 4, 83-86.

³⁹ Kōtoku Shūsui, "Nan'A no kōwa 南阿の媾和 [Armistice in South Africa]," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 4 June 1902, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 4, 83-86.

Turkey

The Ottoman Empire was one of the troubled areas to which Kōtoku Shūsui paid close attention. Simply known as *Toruko* 土耳古 / 土耳其, Turkey posed an interesting challenge to geographical categorization for Kōtoku because the Ottoman Empire at the turn of the twentieth century consisted of territory considered both part of Europe and Asia. In his early writing, before Kōtoku firmly embraced socialism and its universalistic approach, he identified Turkey as part of Asia, with his attitude toward Turkey and the Turks being rather ambiguous. While observing the conflict between the Greeks and the Turks over Crete in 1897, Kōtoku initially presented a pro-Greek perspective whereby the "chivalrous and freedom loving Greeks" on Crete were trying to break free of the "shackles of the Turks."⁴⁰ However, within a few months, Kōtoku also expressed a sympathetic view toward Turkey as a fellow Asian country that had lost its former glory and had been preyed upon by the European powers.⁴¹ Later, Kōtoku's view shifted again and he began to identify Turkey as a European country albeit "the lowest (*saika'i* 最下位)" one, probably because of the expression "the sick man of Europe."⁴² Whether or not Turkey is considered part of Europe or Asia, it represented a formerly glorious country greatly

⁴⁰ Kōtoku Shūsui, "Girishia no shuppei 希臘の出兵 [Greece Sends Troops]," *Chuō Shinbun*, 26 February 1897, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 1, 212-217. "Chivalrous and freedom loving Greeks" is translated from 義侠にして自由を愛する希臘人. "The shackles of the Turks (Turkey)" is translated from 土耳古の桎梏.

⁴¹ Kōtoku Shūsui, "Toruko o kanashimu," *Chuō Shinbun*, 28-29 April 1897, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 1, 225-230.

⁴² Kōtoku Shūsui, *Nijyū seiki no kaibutsu: Teikoku shugi*, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 3, 162.

weakened and in danger of losing its sovereignty, having become a diplomatic playground for the Great Powers, comparable to China in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.⁴³

Tōyō (the East) and Japan (1897-1902)

When Kōtoku Shūsui started to express his views through newspaper articles in 1897, Qing dynasty China was going through a period of crisis in the wake of the Sino-Japanese War (1894-1895). Japan's victory over China exposed China's many weaknesses to the international community and provided an opportunity for foreign powers to begin exerting influence over China. Not only was China forced to cede Taiwan to Japan in 1895, but from 1897, it was pressured by Western powers to "lease" lands or grant rights to foreign powers to build railways. In short, the Sino-Japanese War threatened to partition much of China into foreign spheres of influence. As the foreign presence increased, so did the Chinese people's resentment toward outsiders, resulting in the Boxer Rebellion (1899-1900).

As a journalist, Kōtoku observed the events and crisis in China (*Shin koku* 清國) with great interest since he felt it would affect the entire region or Tōyō (the East). During this early stage preceding the Russo-Japanese War, Kōtoku used the term Tōyō to refer to East Asia (Tō-A 東亞) or occasionally calling the region the "Far East (Kyokutō 極東 or Zettō 絶東)."⁴⁴ In the midst of "cutting of the Chinese melon" and the Boxer Rebellion, Kōtoku repeatedly argued that

⁴³ Kōtoku Shūsui, "Shinkoku mondai to Toruko mondai 清國問題と土耳其問題 [Problems in China and Turkey]," *Nihonjin*, 5 July 1900, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 1, 318-329.

⁴⁴ Once Kōtoku even wrote "the Tōyō, meaning China, Japan and Korea, etc. 東洋即ち支那、日本、朝鮮等" in "Heiwa kaigi no sandō," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 24-25, 27-29 September and 1 October 1898, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 2, 132. The term Kyokutō 極東 can be found in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū* vol. 2, 68, 81-82, 86 etc. Zettō 絶東 can be found in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 1, 246.

it was Japan's "heavenly mission (*tenshoku* 天職)" to be a peacekeeper in the East. In 1900, during the Boxer Rebellion, Kōtoku wrote:

. . . First, Japan must take a lead in protecting China's interest, since China's interest are the East's (Tōyō) interest, and China's peace is the East's peace. If we value Eastern peace and interest, there is no other way than to protect and preserve China. If any Great Power makes an unreasonable demand or takes a violent action that threatens China's integrity, Japan must oppose it resolutely. . . . Second, preserving the balance of powers among the Great Powers is essential for peace of the East. If, as a result of this incident, one or several countries occupy [China's] territories, or demand some kind of concessions, resulting in disruption in the balance of power, Japan must oppose it resolutely. Third, in order to accomplish the above goals, [Japan] must, on the one hand, guide the Chinese government as a teacher, a father, and an adviser, and on the other, act as an arbitrator between China and the Great Powers and do its best to bring a peaceful resolution. Moreover, for the benefit of all powers, [Japan] must take the responsibility to stand up for the principle of peaceful resolution. . . .⁴⁵

Note the tone of paternalism in Kōtoku's argument; it is very clear that he did not see China as equal in status to Japan. China was a weak state that needed guidance from Japan "the rising power of the Far East (*Zettō no shinkōkoku* 絶東の新興國)," "the nation of the sages (*kunshi* 君子 Ch. *junzi*), with a sense of "justice and morality (*seigi jindō* 正義人道)."⁴⁶ This line of

⁴⁵ Kōtoku Shūsui (unsigned), "Nihon no taido hōshin 日本の態度方針[Japan's Attitude and Policies]," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 29 July 1900, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū* 376-379. Translated from . . . 第一に我日本は率先して清國の利益を擁護せざる可らず、夫れ清國の利益は東洋の利益也、清國の平和は東洋の平和也、東洋の平和と利益を尊重せんと欲せば、清國を擁護し保全するより急なるなし、故に萬一、列國中に不法の要求を提出し若くは清國のインタグリチーを危うくするの暴動に出づる者あらんか、我が日本は斷々として之れに抗争せざる可らず. . . . 第二には、列國... 權力平衡の維持は東洋の平和の爲めに缺く可らざる條件也、若し今回の處分に於て、或一國若くは數國が、土地占領若くは或種の特權の要求に依て、列國均勢を破壊せんとする者ある乎、我日本は斷々として之れに抗争せざる可らず、第三には、以上の目的を達せんが爲めに、一面清國政府に向つては師父として顧問として之を扶導し、教誨し、一面彼れと列國との間に於ける調停者として圓滿の結局に盡力し而して更に列國共同の福利の爲めに、和局條件指定者たり主義者たるの地位責任を有するの覺悟なかる可らず. . .

⁴⁶ The expressions "the rising power of the Far East" and "justice and morality" can be found in Kōtoku Shūsui, "Shinkoku mondai to Toruko mondai," *Nihonjin*, 5 July 1900, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 1, 318-329.

thought was perhaps only wishful thinking since Kōtoku often complained that Japan's diplomacy did not reflect the Japanese people's opinions.⁴⁷ Kōtoku was at least hopeful that Japan, in the future, might live up to the lofty ideals he envisioned for it. At this point before the Russo-Japanese War, Kōtoku saw Japan as "the most advanced nation in the East, and comparable to the world's first-rate nations,"⁴⁸ but he had not yet begun to see Japan as a full-fledged imperialist. Even when Kōtoku wrote *Imperialism: The Monster of the Twentieth Century* in 1901, he presented Japan as more of an imperialist-wannabe with few territorial possessions (Taiwan) and a weak economy that did not place it into the same position of needing additional territories like the Great Powers. At this point, Kōtoku was not even opposed to Japan protecting or advancing its own national economic interests overseas.

Kōtoku and The Russo-Japanese War

With the possibility of war with Russia looming on the horizon in 1903, Kōtoku spent his energy opposing the war from a socialist standpoint. Drawing from the experiences of the Sino-Japanese War (1894-1895), Kōtoku pointed out that it was the "workers (*rōdōsha* 労働者)" and

The phrase, "The nation of the sages" is found in Kōtoku Shūsui, "Danjite meiyō ni arazu 断じて名誉に非ず [It is not Honorable]," *Chōkōzetsu*, 27 September 1900, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 2, 443. *Kunshi/junzi* is a "gentleman" or "sage" in Confucian tradition.

⁴⁷ Examples of his complaining about Japanese diplomacy can be found in Kōtoku Shūsui, "Gaikō ni okeru hi rikken koku 外交に於ける非立憲國 [Non Constitutional State in Diplomacy]," *Nihonjin*, 5 October 1900, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 1, 333-339; "Nihon gaikō no himitsu 日本外交の秘密 [Secrecy of Japanese Diplomacy]," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 14 July 1900, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 2, 367-369.

⁴⁸ Kōtoku Shūsui, "Kensō chiroku 剣相知録," *Kansai Seinen*, 31 January 1898, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 1, 282. Translated from 東洋第一の先進國にして世界一等國に伍する

"peasants (*hyakushō* 百姓)" who paid the price of war, while military officers (*gunjin* 軍人) and government suppliers (*gōyo shōnin* 御用商人) benefited from it. Not only did many young sons of workers and peasants sacrifice their lives dying in the war, their families suffered from the loss of loved ones, loss of laborers, neglected fields, increased taxation, price inflation, etc. He pointed out that common soldiers were usually from humble families (*senka* 賤家) rather than from the wealthy families (*kanemochi* 金持ち). While some argued that Japan benefited from the war through the indemnity extracted from China after the war, Kōtoku presented a counterargument of no benefit for the common people since the money was spent on military expenses, or in his words "the instruments of murder (*hitogoroshi no kikai* 人殺しの器械)."⁴⁹

A much better way to handle this issue, according to Kōtoku, was immigration and economic expansion into Manchuria:

Today, what Japan needs is not a war with Russia but an economic expansion into Manchuria. In other words, have many people immigrate, invest capital, let them settle, and absorb its wealth. Then Japan will be safe and secure. . . . We cannot even begin a discussion until Japan establishes itself as an economic power [in Manchuria].

. . . [Japan's] plan for the next hundred years should be economic expansion, including enriching the people (*kokumin* 國民, nation's people). [We] need to focus on enriching the majority of the people, including the children of peasants and workers, rather than government suppliers, stockbrokers, nobles, or military officers.⁵⁰

⁴⁹ Kōtoku Shūsui, "Hikaisenron 非開戦論 [Anti-War Theory]." *Shakai shugi kyōkai enzetsukai 社會主義協會演說會* [A speech given to the meeting of association of socialists], 18 June 1903, published in *Shakai shugi*, 3 July 1903, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 4, 414-423.

⁵⁰ Kōtoku Shūsui, "Hi kaisen ron," *Shakai shugi*, 3 July 1903, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 4, 419-420. Translated from 今日、日本の急は魯西亜と戦うことではない。實際的に經濟的に滿州へ出て行くより外ない。即ち澤山の人を移住させ、資本を投じて、固着せる土地に密着して、富を吸収するに如くはない。之でこそ、日本は安泰である。 . . . 日本が經濟上に勢力を占めぬ中は到底駄目な話である。 . . . それで國家百年の計は經濟上の膨張を期し、國民を富ますことを計らねばならぬ。御用商人や株屋や貴族や及至は軍人を富まさずに、百姓の子も労働者の子も、多數の人民を富ますことを考へねばならぬ。

Obviously, Kōtoku did not consider the immigration of Japanese people and economic expansion into Manchuria to be a form of imperialism. If economic or territorial expansion meant that the common people would benefit, he was for it, but he was certainly against the common people being exploited by capitalists. Indeed, Kōtoku saw many of the wars of the late nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries as wars between and for capitalists who manipulated the masses into fighting for their own profit:

Today, governments around the world are all controlled by capitalists. The wars of the United States in Cuba and the Philippines were fought to open new markets for the capitalists. Great Britain's expedition in South Africa was also instigated by the capitalists for their profit. . . . These economic markets are not for the interest of the majority or the common people, but only for very wealthy small minorities. Even the brilliant Emperor Wilhelm or shrewd President Roosevelt cannot control them[these capitalists]. . . they are the puppets of the capitalists. And what about the results? . . . Great Britain has 500,000 people unemployed, the United States is facing large and small scale strikes, Germany is experiencing increased treason, and Russia is crumbling because of common people's revolutionary movements. . . .⁵¹

So Kōtoku drew his line not across East and West or Russia and Japan, but between capitalists on one hand and common people on the other, regardless of their countries of origin. Reflecting these sentiments, soon after the outbreak of the war Kōtoku expressed sympathy for the common Japanese soldier but asked them to be respectful of Russian soldiers who were also

⁵¹ Kōtoku Shūsui (unsigned), "Wasen o kessuru mono 和 戦を決する者 [Those who Make Decision to Go to War]," in *Shūkan* [Weekly] *Heimin Shinbun*, 7 February 1904, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 5, 79-82. Translated from . . . 今や世界の政治は、盡く資本家の爲に支配せられざるなし、米國のキューバ、比律賓の戦争も亦資本家の爲めに市場を拓くに在りき、英國の南阿功伐も亦た資本家の利益の爲めに煽起せられたりき. . . . 此等經濟市場の利害や決して多數平民の利害に非づして、少數富豪の利害ならざる可らず. . . 彼の英氣のウイヘルム皇帝、辣腕ルーズベルト大統領と雖も能く之を制するなし. . . 遂に資本家の爲めに傀儡たるに過ぎざりしに非ずや、而して其結果は如何. . . 英國は實に五十萬の失業者を出せる也、米國は日々大小の同盟罷工に悩みつゝあるなり、獨逸は年々不敬罪の犯人を得つゝある也、露國は平民的革命運動の爲めに、土崩瓦解しつゝある也. . .

someone's son, husband, and/or father and "fellow human beings (*dōhō naru jinrui* 同胞なる人類)." ⁵² Kōtoku wrote an open letter to his Russian comrades, stating:

Dear Comrades! Your government and our government have plunged into fighting at last in order to satisfy their imperialistic desires, but to socialists there is no barrier of race, territory, or nationality. We are comrades, brothers and sisters and have no reason to fight each other. Your enemy is not the Japanese people but our militarism and so-called patriotism. Yes, patriotism and militarism are our common enemies; nay all socialists in the world also look upon them as [sic.] common enemies. . . . ⁵³

This letter, originally published in Japanese by the *Heimin Shinbun* (Common People's Newspaper) was translated into English and published in the same newspaper a week later. The English version allowed the message to be circulated among socialists around the world, as it was reprinted or translated into other languages, reaching even more obscure papers such as the *Volks Zeitung*, a German language newspaper in New York. Russian socialists also issued a statement in response to Kōtoku's letter in their newspaper, *Iskra*. ⁵⁴

In these years around the Russo-Japanese War, Kōtoku became increasingly critical of the Japanese government's policies and came to view Japan as a full-blown imperialist. Kōtoku started to question Japan's occupation of Taiwan following the Sino-Japanese War (1894-1895):

Manchuria where Russia has invaded is indeed somebody else's territory. Wasn't Taiwan that Japan has taken also somebody else's territory? The Russians commit plunder and slaughter. How [do you know that] the Japanese will not do the same? Is

⁵² Kōtoku Shūsui, "Heishi o okuru 兵士を送る," *Shūkan Heimin Shinbun*, 14 February 1904, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 5, 83-84.

⁵³ Kōtoku Shūsui, "A Letter to Russian Socialist," *Shūkan Heimin Shinbun* (English sect.), 20 March 1904, quoted in Notehelfer, *Kōtoku Shūsui*, 98.

⁵⁴ Notehelfer, *Kōtoku Shūsui*, 98; Itoya, *Kōtoku Shūsui kenkyū*, 180-182; *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 5, 130.

Russia the only one that is violent and rowdy? Is Japan the only one that is virtuous and gentlemanly?⁵⁵

What Kōtoku emphasized was not the differences between Russia and Japan, but rather the similarities of the two imperialistic powers and the commonalities of human behavior. Kōtoku also came to see Japanese intentions toward Korea as less than benevolent and criticized Japan's intentions since, whether the policy was expressed as "helping to plant independence (*dokuritsu fushoku* 独立扶植), "securing territorial integrity (*ryōdo hozen* 領土保全)," or "unification (*gōdō* 合同)," they all meant the same thing to Korea: Japanese domination and the creation of a greater "Japanese Empire." Having rejected the hope that Japan would become the "peacekeeper of the East" and separate itself from the destructive and barbaric practices of the other Great Powers, Kōtoku certainly no longer took Japan's claim to "fight for civilization and guide the Tōyō" at face value.⁵⁶

East and West after the Russian Revolution of 1905

The Russian Revolution of 1905 took place at roughly the same time as Kōtoku's ideology became radicalized in prison (28 Feb.-28 Jul. 1905) through the works of Peter Kropotkin. Later in that same year, Kōtoku decided to leave for the United States and spent about 6 months in the San-Francisco-Oakland area, meeting socialists and anarchists from all over

⁵⁵ Kōtoku Shūsui, "Rokoku to Nihon 露國と日本 [Russia and Japan]," *Shūkan Heimin Shinbun*, 17 January 1904, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 5, 528. Translated from 露國の侵せる満州は、實に他人の領土なり、日本の取れる臺灣は果たして他人の領土ならざりし乎、掠奪、虐殺、露人之を爲せり、日人は果して之を爲さざりし乎、獨り露國のみ暴横なる乎、獨り日本のみ仁義なる乎、君子なる乎。

⁵⁶ Kōtoku Shūsui (unsigned), "Chōsen heidon ron o shōsu 朝鮮併呑論を評す [Commenting on Possible Annexation of Korea]," *Shūkan Heimin Shinbun*, 12 June 1904, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 5, 169-174.

the world. The Russian Revolution installed within Kōtoku a great sense of hope in which he commented on how he was "envious of Russia" and hoped to see the revolution spread from Russia to other parts of Europe, such as Britain, Germany and Austria-Hungary.⁵⁷

Kōtoku predicted China to be the "Russia of the East (Tōyō no Rokoku 東洋の露國)," since he saw the same characteristics in China that led Russia to revolution and felt it would be the first Asian country to go through a revolution from which the waves of revolution would spread throughout the region. Chinese students in Japan were also starting to show interest in socialism. In 1907, Kōtoku was invited to give a speech to the newly formed Chinese student Socialism Study Group (*Shakai shugi kōshū kai* 社會主義講習會), which was attended by about 90 students. After delivering this speech, Kōtoku was very hopeful that the Chinese students in Tokyo would take a lead in a socialist revolution in China. He envisioned Japanese socialists collaborating with their Chinese counterparts and using Japan as the "training ground" for young Chinese revolutionaries, just as Switzerland had served as the training ground for Russian revolutionaries.⁵⁸

In 1907, Kōtoku also became involved with the East Asia Friendship Group (*Tō-A washin kai* 東亞和親會), established by some participants of the Socialism Study Group. This pan-Asian, anti-colonial revolutionary organization was attended by Chinese, Japanese, Indian, Vietnamese, and Filipino revolutionaries.⁵⁹ With these developments and the influx of more

⁵⁷ Kōtoku Shūsui, "Ichi nami yorozu nami 一波萬波 [One Wave, Many waves]," *Hikari*, 20 March 1906, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 6, 72-77.

⁵⁸ Kōtoku Shūsui, "Tōkyō no shakai undō 2 東京の社会運動 [Social activities in Tokyo, part 2]," *Osaka Heimin Shinbun*, 20 September 1907, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 6, 334-337.

⁵⁹ Itoya, *Kōtoku Shūsui kenkyū*, 234-235.

diverse viewpoints from foreign revolutionaries, Kōtoku came to understand that the coming revolution would be much larger than just what he had previously perceived as Tōyō (the East) since it would include not only East Asia, but also Southeast and South Asia. In 1907, Kōtoku clearly identifies India, the Philippines, Korea, and Vietnam (Annam) as part of his revised vision of Tōyō.⁶⁰ After the Russian Revolution of 1905, Kōtoku Shūsui saw the twentieth century with much more hopeful eyes, seeing that the revolutions would spread both in the Western and Eastern world.

The Disunity of Seiyō

As discussed above, for Kōtoku Shūsui, an East-West binary was irrelevant for the most part, until after the Russian Revolution of 1905 when he embarked on promoting a Pan-Asian revolutionary movement. Even then, East and West were not in binary opposition, but in a complimentary relationship. For him, a binary between strong and weak states and colonizer and colonized were far more important than an East-West binary. However, because strong states (*kyōkoku*) and Great Powers (*Rekkoku*) were normally countries of Western Europe along with the United States, Kōtoku used the term Ō-Bei (Europe and America) in place of "Great Powers."

⁶⁰ Kōtoku Shūsui, "Byōkan hōgo 病間放語 [Sick Man's Ramblings]," *Kōchi Shinbun*, 1 January 1908, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 6, 380-390. Inclusion of the Philippines as part of Tōyō is significant since Kōtoku seemed to have identified the Philippines as part of the South Seas (Nan'yō 南洋) in his earlier writings. For example, in 1898, at the end of the Spanish-American War, Kōtoku expressed his concern that if the Philippines were to be annexed by the United States, then Japan would lose commercial opportunities in the South Seas. See Kōtoku Shūsui, "Kanjōteki gaikō ron 感情の外交論 [Emotional Diplomacy]," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 16 August 1898, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 2, 114-116. Kōtoku also mentioned the "Asians, Africans or Filipinos (Ajaiajin, Afurikajin oyobi Hiripinjin 亜細亜人、阿弗利加人及び比律賓人)" in his book, *Nijyū seiki no kaibutsu: Teikoku shugi*, indicating that the Philippines were not considered "Asians." See Kōtoku Shūsui, *Nijyū seiki no kaibutsu: Teikoku shugi*, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 3, 174.

Yet, Kōtoku did not see the Seiyō, Ō-Bei, or Rekkoku as singular or monolithic because he recognized great disunity within Europe and America.

Not all countries of Europe and America were included as Great Powers (Rekkoku), since only Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Russia, Austria-Hungary, and the United States were so identified. Other nations, even those with colonial possessions, such as the Netherlands, Belgium, Portugal and Spain were not counted among the Rekkoku. It is conceivable that their omission resulted from the fact that these countries were not active in the contested areas to which Kōtoku paid closest attention. Interestingly, Switzerland and Belgium were idealized as freedom-loving, non-imperialistic countries by Kōtoku.⁶¹ His favorable view of Belgium as a non-imperialistic country is notable, considering that it was King Leopold II's acquisition of territories in the Congo basin which prompted Otto von Bismarck to convene the Berlin Conference of 1884-1885 which drew ground rules for the Great Power's acquisitions of African territories and established the Congo basin as the Congo Free State. Considering Kōtoku's sympathy for colonized people, his lack of condemnation of Belgium could be attributed to an ignorance of events in the Congo Free State, as his primary focus was on Asia.

Among the Rekkoku, Kōtoku observed fierce competition. For example, Kōtoku clearly saw the rivalries growing between Germany and Great Britain, as well as between Russia and Great Britain. When most Japanese people were simply celebrating the signing of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance in 1902 as formal recognition of Japan status as a "first rate state," Kōtoku offered a much more cynical but sophisticated view that Great Britain needed Japan as an ally to

⁶¹ Kōtoku Shūsui, "Nisha icho o tore 二者一を取れ [Pick one of the two]," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 23 August 1903, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 4. 323.

counter Russia-German rapprochement.⁶² With a Russo-Japanese War clearly imminent, Kōtoku argued that Japan would end up fighting the war *for* Britain and the United States, since they were the only ones with surplus capital capable of investing in Manchuria.⁶³

Nor did the Ō-Bei countries share any unifying political system or ideology. Kōtoku regarded Russia and Germany to be authoritarian monarchies, while Britain and the United States were countries that, at least theoretically, valued liberty and justice. Within each country, there were many different lines of thought, as represented by various political parties and religious and social groups that created a state of disunity. Since Kōtoku did not perceive a unified Western cultural identity, he rarely used the word the West. The few times he did, it often was attached to a person, as in *Seijin* 西人, meaning a Western person, and was meant to denote someone of a different racial and cultural background. Unlike many other intellectuals of his time, Kōtoku saw the concept of the West (Seiyō) as of limited use in his socialist perspective of the world.

Like other Japanese intellectuals, Kōtoku was against blind worship of everything Western or the irrational adoption of Western customs and institutions. As Christianity began to gain influence after the Russo-Japanese War, Kōtoku was determined to write a book, *Kirisuto massatsu ron* 基督抹殺論 [Christ is Dead], in which he would demonstrate that "Christ never

⁶² Kōtoku Shūsui, "Nichi-Ei dōmei jōyaku 日英同盟條約 [Signing of Anglo-Japanese Alliance]," *Yorozu Chōhō*, 14-15 February 1902, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 4, 35-39.

⁶³ Kōtoku Shūsui, "Hikaisenron 非開戰論 [Anti-War Theory]," *Shakai shugi kyōkai enzetsukai* 社會主義協會演說會 [A speech given to the meeting of association of socialists], 18 June 1903, published in *Shakai shugi*, 3 July 1903, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 4, 414-423.

existed," the Bible was a "forgery," and that Christianity had pagan origins.⁶⁴ He also found it alarming that Christianity was often used to preach the "Gospel of Patriotism." In a letter to Albert Johnson in 1906, Kōtoku wrote:

The most comical fact of the result of the late war is conciliation (or rather embrace) of Christianity with Buddhism and Shintoism. The history of Christianity in Japan was until now a history of horrible persecutions. The Japanese diplomatists, however, earnestly desiring to silence the rumors caused and spread in Europe during the war that "Japan is a yellow peril" or "Japan is a pagan country," suddenly began to put on the mask of western civilization, and eagerly welcome and protect, and use it as a means of introducing Japan to European and American powers as a civilized Christendom. On the other hand, Christian priests, taking advantage of the weakness of the government, got a great monetary aid from the State, and under its protection they are propagating in full vigor the Gospel of Patriotism. Thus Japanese Christianity, which was before the war the religion of poor, literally now changed within only two years to a great bourgeois religion and a machine of the State and militarism!⁶⁵

Unlike some Japanese who associated Christianity with "civilization," Kōtoku saw Christianity as counterproductive to human progress due to its promotion of irrational and unscientific blind faith.⁶⁶ The fact that he intended to produce a book on the matter, rather than his normal short newspaper articles, shows his strong commitment to this issue. An admittedly "unoriginal work," Kōtoku presented the views of "Western" scholars to illustrate how many "Westerners" did not equate Christianity with "civilization." In short, to Kōtoku Shūsui's mind, Seiyō or Ō-Bei was diverse and divided both politically and culturally in a manner that made a

⁶⁴ Kōtoku Shūsui, A letter to Albert Johnson [Original in English], 11 April 1910, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 9, 487.

⁶⁵ Kōtoku Shūsui, A letter to Albert Johnson [Original in English], 18 December 1906, in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 9, 304-305.

⁶⁶ Kōtoku Shūsui, *Kirisuto massatsu ron* 基督抹殺論 [Christ is Dead], in *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū*, vol. 8, 349-485.

conceptualization of the world divided into East or West or Eastern and Western civilizations meaningless.

Conclusion

The approach of the twentieth century marked a possible turning point in world history, with prospects and tidings of both promise and peril leaving the future uncertain. Kōtoku Shūsui looked at the world around him and saw the potential that could be achieved if people worked together in a concerted effort to realize the dream of "liberty, equality, and universal love" for all. While he longed for this perfect outcome, he was well aware of the realities that surround him and saw the dangers that lurked in the growing strength of imperialistic powers, where a minority of strong state was extending its awesome power to subjugate the weaker nations of the world. Many Japanese of the period advocated the adoption of "imperialism" as their foreign policy of choice, but Kōtoku warned that imperialism was a "monster of the twentieth century" that would bring down "civilization" rather than elevating humanity to a higher level. Kōtoku urged his contemporaries to abandon the dangerous hopes they placed on imperialism and asked them instead to adopt the message of socialism in seeking to achieve a world based on the three ideals of liberty, equality, and universal love, in opposition to subjugation and domination of the weak by the strong.

Instead of viewing the world from the limited vantage point of an East-West binary, Kōtoku Shūsui conceptualized the world in an alternative binary that separated the world between greater and lesser states where "the weak were eaten by the strong." Powerful Imperialist countries such as Great Britain, France, Russia, Germany, Italy, Austria-Hungary, the

United States and even Japan after 1900, worked to spread their dominion over the much weaker areas of China, the Transvaal, the Ottoman Empire and other parts of Asia and Africa. Even as Kōtoku saw these powerful nations as a threat to lesser countries, he also realized that the various political, social, religious and economic systems of the Great Powers prevented them from forming into a unified entity. Rivalries and competition between the powerful nations due to their imperialistic tendencies also limited the amount of cooperation that could be achieved leaving them in a situation where they were unable to effectively work together. Kōtoku felt this lack of unity provided an opportunity for socialism to gain a foothold against the spreading encroachment of imperialism, since socialism's foundation is rooted in universal acceptance and equality that aims to bring diverse groups of people together under a single cause in order to raise them from being the weak to becoming the strong.

It was only after the Russian Revolution of 1905, that Kōtoku foresaw a future of revolutions taking place in both the Eastern and Western halves of the world. While he did not expect Japan immediately to take up the call to revolution, he did see that it could serve as a training ground for revolutionaries throughout Asia, much like Russian revolutionaries were trained in Switzerland. Kōtoku and his socialist comrades worked together toward their goal of bringing revolution to all humanity. Working with revolutionaries of diverse backgrounds and nationalities, Kōtoku Shūsui firmly believed it was possible to reach the next pinnacle of human advancement by bringing the world together around "liberty, equality and universal love." Powerful states and interests were hostile to Kōtoku's utopian world vision, and on January 24, 1911, on false charges, a less tolerant, more oppressive, and imperialistic Meiji state solved its Kōtoku Shūsui "problem" forever.

CHAPTER 7

COMPARISONS, REFLECTIONS, AND LEGACIES

In 1942, the Society for Commemorating the Great Accomplishments of Okakura Tenshin (*Okakura Tenshin Iseki Kenshō kai* 岡倉天心偉績顕彰会) was established, almost 30 years after his death. Okakura's residence at Izura was donated to the Society and a stone pillar engraved with Okakura's profile and a phrase "*Ajia wa ichinari* 亜細亜ハ一な里," the Japanese translation of "Asia is One" was erected on the premise. In the midst of World War II, which justified the Japan's action in the name of creating a Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere, Okakura's famous words were resurrected from the past and given a new context and meaning.

During World War II, the East-West binary was very much a part of Japanese discourse, though they were careful to distinguish between friend (Germany) and foe (the United States and Great Britain). The Joint Declaration of the Greater East Asia Conference issued on November 6, 1943 accused the United States and Great Britain of oppressing people around the world, and that "(e)specially in East Asia, they indulged in insatiable aggression and exploitation, and [have] sought to satisfy their inordinate ambition of enslaving the entire region." The stated purpose of "the Greater East Asia War" was "liberating their region from the yoke of British-American domination, and ensuring their self-existence and self-defense, and in constructing a Greater East Asia."¹ Though only the U.S and Great Britain were specifically named in the document, the implication was of a conflict between Asia and Europe, that is, East versus West.

¹ The Joint Declaration of the Greater East Asia Conference, Tokyo, 6 November 1943. The Conference was held attended by Tōjō Hideki 東条 英機, Prime Minister of Japan, Zhang Jinghui 張景惠, Prime Minister of

By then, Japanese used a derogatory term to refer to Americans and British: *kichiku Bei-Ei* 鬼畜米英 or "American and British devils and beasts." Once considered the agents of civilization, they were now relegated to less than barbarian status. A magazine entry in October 1944 stated:

Our ancestors called them Ebisu or savages long ago, and labeled the very first Westerners who came to our country the Southern Barbarians. To the hostile eyes of the Japanese of former times they were "red hairs" and "hairy foreigners," and perceived as being of about as much worth as a foreign ear of corn. We in our times should manifest a comparable spirit. Since the barbaric tribe of Americans are devils in human skin who come from the West, we should call them *Saibanki* or Western Barbarian Demons.²

Not only was the pre-Meiji image of Westerner as barbarians resurrected but "devils" and "demons" were added to the description to dehumanize the enemy. In this particular document, the Americans were identified as "Western Barbarian Demons," and grouped together with other Westerners such as the Portuguese and Spaniards (Southern Barbarians) as well as the Dutch and English (the Red Hairs). From this, it is clear that an East-West dualism, albeit in a different form, constituted an important part of wartime rhetoric.

Bunmei

For intellectuals of the Meiji era, an East-West binary was an integral part of their discourse of *bunmei*. Fukuzawa Yukichi first translated the English word "civilization" as "bunmei," followed by others who offered their own interpretations of the word in an effort to

Manchukuo, Wang Jingwei 汪精衛, President of the Reformed Government of the Republic of China, Ba Maw, Head of State of Burma, José Laurel, President of the Second Philippine Republic, Prince Wan Waithayakon, envoy from the Kingdom of Thailand, and Subhas Chandra Bose, Head of State of the Provisional Government of Free India, as an observer.

² *Manga Nippon*, October 1944, quoted in Dower, *War Without Mercy*, 247.

present their own vision of the direction that Japan should take. As the Japanese adopted many customs and institutions from Western countries, situating Japan's own identity within the context of the Eastern and Western world became an important part of the discussion. The five case studies presented here are only a small example of such efforts, but they demonstrate a wide range of interpretations of "bunmei" and the East-West binary. For Fukuzawa, Shimoda, and Kōtoku, "bunmei" was the highest stage in human society, though its content and meaning differed for each individual. Fukuzawa established the highest stage of development to be relative to the time period, rather than a permanently fixed ideal stage. He talked of "Japanese Civilization" in historical times, but he argued that Japan in his time was at a stage of "semi-civilization" compared to the higher stage of development achieved by many Western societies. For Fukuzawa, the West represented the stage that Japan should aspire to, and he never doubted Japan's ability to achieve the status of "civilization." Other intellectuals shared Fukuzawa's optimism that civilization was something that Japan could experience if it were willing to work toward it, and they rejected the idea that civilization was something unique to the West and Westerners.

For Fukuzawa, modern civilization meant an unleashing of creative energy which allowed the continuous progress of society as a whole. He identified the essential element of modern civilization to be the spirit of freedom and independence which liberated people from superstitions and old customs. For him, the concept of civilization was closely tied to scientific achievements. It is important to note that Fukuzawa excluded manners and decorum, something Confucianists would have emphasized, from his discussion of civilization. Fukuzawa's lack of interest in proper etiquette and behavior is significant because these very concepts were traits

that Westerners considered essential for someone to be considered "civilized," as argued in Norbert Elias' seminal work, *The Civilizing Process*.³ When Fukuzawa was still a translator of the Western publications, he translated "moral" as *reigi* (ritual prosperity), a classic Confucian term, but when he developed his own definition of civilization, he dropped the notion of proper conduct completely. It should be noted that none of the five figures examined here defined civilization in terms of the acquisition of proper manners and etiquette. Perhaps this was due to the fact that emphasis on decorum would have been considered an archaic standard of civilization for Japanese.

Fukuzawa contemplated many social issues, including Japanese society's treatment of women, while developing his definition of *bunmei*, but gender issues were never a major part of his concept.⁴ Shimoda Utako, the only female writer examined here, brought the women's issue forefront in her discussion of civilization. It is not certain whether or not she came across a definition of civilization that emphasized the proper treatment of women as a criterion for civilization from Western publications or if this was a concept she herself developed. For her, civilization meant a stage where the weaker members of the society would be protected by law enabling them to live their lives to their fullest potential and therefore be able to contribute to society. A firm believer of separate spheres of responsibility for men and women, Shimoda never advocated or supported the women's suffrage movement. Like Fukuzawa, she saw Meiji

³ Norbert Elias, *The Civilizing Process: Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations*. Translated from German by Edmund Jephcott (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1994).

⁴ Fukuzawa left several essays on women, such as *Nihon fujinron* 日本婦人論 (1885), *Hinkōron* 品行論 (1885), *Danjo Kosairon* 男女交際論 (1886), *Onna Daigaku Hyōron* 女大学評論 (1889), and *Shin Onna Daigaku* 新女大学 (1889), but while he was interested in women's issues, the concept of gender was not part of his definition of *bunmei* as presented in *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization*. See, Carmen Blacker, "Fukuzawa Yukichi on Family Relationships," *Monumenta Nipponica* 14 (April-June 1958): 40-60.

Japan as going through a transitional stage from semi-civilization to civilization, while accepting the West as the current civilized part of the world. For Shimoda, the West represented the strong and rich state that Japan was striving to become. Shimoda viewed Western women as strong contributors that added to the prosperity and wealth of Western societies, and she urged Japanese women to become valuable members of their own society.

For socialist Kōtoku Shūsui, civilization was also a stage in human societies' development. Being heavily influenced by his teacher, Nakae Chōmin, the "Rousseau of the East," he viewed civilization to be a state of development where all humanity would enjoy liberty, equality, and universal love. He held a universalistic perspectives calling all humanity *dōhō* (of the same womb). Out of the five figures treated in this study, Kōtoku was the least concerned about the East-West binary, since rather than focusing on the differences between Eastern and Western cultures, he tended to view the world as being divided into strong and weak, exploiter and exploited, and colonizer and colonized. When he saw the Japanese turning toward imperialism, he argued that imperialism was a "monster," something that would devolve humanity back into a state of barbarism, or the stage of bestial aggression. Kōtoku's universalistic perspective was in sharp contrast to Shimoda Utako's view of the world through the lens of multiple overlapping binaries such as East-West, male-female, inside-outside, and old-new. Her identification of East and West was closely tied to the physical differences between Caucasian and Mongoloid women and she considered her fellow East-Asian women to be her *dōhō* while excluding Western women from such a category. Still, she found much that the Eastern women could learn from Westerners of the "same gender" especially where women contributed to enriching and strengthening their country. For her, imperialism was an essential

part of creating a strong state. She wanted Japanese women to be physically strong, like Western women, so that women could participate in colonial ventures where they would have to survive in climates different from their homeland.

The Christian leader Uchimura Kanzō and the art critic Okakura Kakuzō did not directly provide their own definition of *bunmei*, but their understanding of the term can be deduced from their discussions surrounding civilization. For Uchimura *bunmei* was something that marched across the globe according to God's Providence. Rather than a stage of development, he used it to mean politically the most highly developed society relative to its own time, with the world leader changing over the course of human history. Highly influenced by the Providential historians of the Western world, he accepted the theory of a westward march of civilization. For him, "historical people" meant people who contributed to the progress of civilization. As the center of civilization moved from one place to another, each society contributed something unique before passing civilization onto the next leading society. Like Fukuzawa, Uchimura considered civilization to be relative to its time, but unlike Fukuzawa, Uchimura did not concern himself with the idea of societies going through different stages of development. He was disinterested in areas where civilization had not swept through and he did not spend any time discussing "barbarism" or "semi-civilization." Uchimura was only interested in civilization as it was going through its height of power, and his discussion moved to each different geographical location as civilization marched across the globe. Unlike Kōtoku, Uchimura did not associate aggressiveness with "barbarism" or a "bestial" stage. For him, it was possible to talk about "Bestial Civilization (the term he used to refer to Babylonian civilization)," while Kōtoku would have found "bestial" and "civilization" completely contradictory.

Okakura Kakuzō was the only figure of the five to demonstrate an understanding of civilization as a geo-cultural entity. Through his study of art history, he observed two very distinct artistic traditions in the East and West, with the dividing point found around the Indus Valley. This is similar to the way Uchimura Kanzō divided the East and West at the Pamirs, except that for Uchimura there was not much "civilization" to speak of in the East. Being influenced by Hegel, Okakura viewed the East and West as binary opposites: thesis and antithesis. While Fukuzawa and Shimoda identified the West with civilization and the East with semi-civilization, Okakura recognized both East and West as civilizations. In his examination of both Eastern and Western art, Okakura associated the East with freedom and individuality, while he considered Western art, with its emphasis on realism, to be characterized by a lack of freedom and individuality as it restricted the viewer's realm of interpretation. As far as contemporary Western art was concerned, he saw it as corrupted by industrialization and lacking in originality, creativity, and individuality. For Okakura, there was no reason for Japanese to abandon the beautiful artistic heritage of the East in favor of less than perfect Western counterpart.

All five figures exhibited to some degree the influence of evolutionary theory. They all shared the general notion that human society as well as Japanese society was supposed to evolve for the better. Whether or not they studied the works of Charles Darwin or Herbert Spencer, the notion of "the survival of the fittest" or as the Japanese put it, "*jaku niku kyō shoku*" ("the strong consumes the weak") provided some sense of urgency among the Japanese intellectuals. This urgency led them to formulate their own interpretations of *bunmei*, which was a conveniently vogue term expressing ideals for the future. The discussion of *bunmei* as well as the East-West

binary played an important part in critiquing the present state of the nation and creating visions for Japan's future.

East and West

For all five figures, East tended to cluster around East Asia, especially China and Japan. For Fukuzawa, the antithesis of the West was China and Confucianism. With the exception of a cursory treatment in his world geography books, Fukuzawa did not have much to say about Asian countries besides China and Japan. When Shimoda Utako talked of Eastern women, she usually meant Chinese, Korean, and Japanese women, referring to Chinese and Korean women as part of her *dōhō*. Uchimura and Okakura drew a line dividing the East and West at the Indus and the Pamirs; both of them recognized China and India to be two centers of civilization, but their discussion tended to emphasize China over India, and more importantly Japan over China. Kōtoku's conceptualization of the East changed over time; before 1905, it was limited to China, Korea, and Japan, after 1905, as he envisioned a worldwide revolution taking place, his definition expanded to include a larger vision of the East that included India. Thus, generally speaking, the "East" for these Meiji intellectuals tended to cluster around East Asia, with India being the farthest limit to what they considered part of the "East."

The West also tended to cluster around Europe (mostly Great Britain, France, and Germany, and to a lesser extent, Russia, Italy, the Netherlands, and Austria-Hungary) and North America (especially the United States) for Japanese intellectuals. This is probably due to that fact that Japanese had developed the concept of the West prior to the Meiji era, associating that term with Europe and the Europeans. Even though Okakura and Uchimura included the areas

west of the Indus and the Pamirs to be part of the West, any discussion of areas not part of Europe, such as Mesopotamia, Anatolia, Persia, and Arabia were normally limited to ancient history and were almost never included in contemporary discussions. Thus, Japanese understandings of the East and West appear to focus on the two extremities while ignoring or deemphasizing the middle part of the world: the areas today referred as Middle East, South Asia, and even Southeast Asia.

In addition to the middle part of Eurasia, these Japanese largely ignored the "South," meaning Africa, South and Central America, and Oceania. Fukuzawa dismissed Africa and Oceania since he considered them to be still going through a stage of "barbarism," thus unworthy of his time and attention. Shimoda and Okakura had very little to say, if anything, about the "South." Uchimura and Kōtoku made more reference to Africa, Central and South America than others, but their comments were still quite limited. In his geography book, *Chirigakukō*, Uchimura briefly discussed how God designed civilization to spread from north to south; from Europe to Africa, from North America to South America, and from Asia to Australia.⁵ This was not, however, the central part of Uchimura's discussion since he believed southward advance would take place only after civilization completed its westward march in the northern hemisphere. Uchimura's discussion of David Livingstone confirmed view that Africa was an area that needed guidance by the Europeans, and not worthy of note for its own sake. Kōtoku frequently mentioned Asia and Africa together as areas that were affected by imperialists. He did pay attention to news coming from Africa such as the Boer War and the Fashoda Incident,

⁵ Uchimura, *Chirigakukō*, in *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū*, vol. 2, 386-388, 478-479.

but he still did not have much to say about the people of Africa. He also missed the fact that Belgians controlled the Congo Basin, projecting Belgium as a small and peaceful European state.

Thus, East Asia (China, Japan and Korea), Europe (Great Britain, France, Germany) and the United States constituted the main parts of the East and West, and those were the areas that mattered to these Japanese intellectuals. For Fukuzawa, Shimoda, and Uchimura, the East may have appeared lower in stature and accomplishments than the West, but in a sense, they still elevated the East over other areas and more importantly elevated Japan within the East. Being acutely aware of the differences between their own generation and that of their parents and grandparents, the East was associated with old traditions from which Japan was just beginning to make a departure. Japan's neighbors, China and Korea, were perceived by the Japanese as holding onto the past and therefore they lost most of the respect that they had been granted previously. The Japanese called the Meiji era the time of *ishin* 維新, or "complete renewal," and recognized Japan as the leader of such a process within the Eastern world. For Fukuzawa writing in the 1870s, China and Japan both still represented the East and a state of semi-civilization, but he argued that Japan could advance to a civilized state by discarding the outdated Confucian paradigm. He also believed that Japan would have a better chance of advancing ahead of China because of historical differences between the two countries. Others, writing mostly in the last decade of the nineteenth century and the first decade of the twentieth century, recognized Japan's leadership in East Asia. Shimoda recognized the need of Japanese women to improve their position in society but she never doubted Japan's role as the leader of the Eastern world. Uchimura believed that Japan would be the first destination of civilization in East Asia because of its location and geographical features that God himself had designed. Okakura

Kakuzō believed that Japan was the only true repository of Eastern artistic heritage. Even Kōtoku Shūsui recognized Japan's leadership in East Asia; before 1905, Kōtoku urged Japan to serve as the leader and protector of the East, and after 1905, he envisioned Japan as the training ground for the revolutionaries of the East.

The centrality of Japan here is attributable to number of factors, such as Japan's victory over China in the Sino-Japanese War in 1894-1895, participation in the suppression of the Boxer Rebellion in 1900, the signing of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance in 1902, Japan's victory over Russia in the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-1905, and the successful removal of the unequal treaties by 1911. The fact that many Chinese, Korean, and Vietnamese students came to Japan to attend school rather than go to Europe or America also seemed to have added to the sense of Japan as the leader of the East.⁶ The tendency of Western publications to project Japan as a progressive pupil of their civilization, and attributing to the Japanese the nickname "the British of the East," probably did not hurt this concept.⁷ Despite differences in their vision of Japan's future, all five intellectuals anticipated that Japan would assume the leadership position in the East.

All five intellectuals exhibited some level of ambivalence toward the West. For Fukuzawa, the West was a model to emulate but it was also the main threat to Japan's sovereignty. The senior figure in this study, and writing mostly before the Sino-Japanese War, Fukuzawa had as his main concern the preservation of Japan's independence in the face of

⁶ Hirakawa Sukehiro, *Japan's Love-Hate Relationship with the West*, 35-36.

⁷ The expression "the British of the East" can be found in *The British Printer*, vol. 8 (London: Raithby, Lawrence & Co., 1895), 371. See also Henry Dyer, *Dai Nippon: The Britain of the East* (London: Blackie & Son, Limited, 1904). "Europeans of the East" also appears in Friedrich Wenckstern, *A Bibliography of the Japanese Empire; Being a Classified List of All Books, Essays and Maps in European Languages Relating to Dai Nihon Published in Europe, America and in the East from 1859-93 A.D.* (Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1895), v.

Western imperialism. Shimoda, while greatly admiring the riches and power of the West, also expressed her suspicion about Western territorial ambitions. Uchimura, who idealized the United State as Christendom, was disappointed by the many examples of unchristian behavior he encountered while visiting the United States. He was also very critical of American Christianity which he felt was hopelessly corrupted by mammonism and denominationalism. Okakura was critical of modern Western art and Western imperialism, but he admired some Western artists, such as Leonardo da Vinci and Rembrandt, appreciated Beethoven's music, and loved to read Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's detective novels. Kōtoku, while critical of Western imperialism, did not express likes or dislikes of Western societies per se, but his ideal vision of civilization was strongly influenced by Western thinkers such as Rousseau, Darwin and Marx.

While none of these intellectuals promoted the total adoption or denial of Western civilization, all were somewhat selective of what they choose to emphasize or ignore. A rather common example of omission can be seen with Christianity. Fukuzawa repeatedly argued that Japan must adopt the spirit of the Western civilization by which he meant the spirit of freedom and independence. He did not regard Christianity as an essential part of the Western spirit and accused Western Christians of not living up to their ideals. Fukuzawa was not totally opposed to religions per se, and even encouraged Buddhism or Christianity since he believed they could "give peaceful influence on a large number of our people."⁸ Shimoda likewise acknowledged the benign influence of Christianity upon Westerners whom she thought would be aggressive and cruel without it. Like Fukuzawa, Shimoda encouraged people to adopt a religion, caring not which religion as long as it had a positive influence upon the believers. Fukuzawa and

⁸ Fukuzawa, *Autobiography*, 336.

Shimoda's utilitarian attitude toward religion sharply contrasted to that of Kōtoku who viewed religion as a tool of the elite to control the weak. Uchimura, on the other hand, believed that Christianity was the soul of civilization and actively advocated its spread. However, even Uchimura, in a sense, separated Christianity from Western civilization in that he did not advocate the same Christianity that was commonly practiced in Western societies. Uchimura viewed Christianity to be the essence of civilization itself, but *not of Western civilization*. What he advocated was a Non-Church Christianity that removed much of the corruption he saw within the religion of modern Western societies.

Thus, rather than the adoption of Western customs and institutions in their entirety, Japanese intellectuals tended to advocate a combination of Western and Japanese elements to form a new synthesis that included the best parts of both societies. Coming from the long tradition of *Wakon Kansai* 和魂漢才 (Japanese spirit and Chinese leaning), the general tendency was for the retention of a distinct Japanese essence while selectively adopting some aspects of Western civilization. In a sense, *Wakon Kansai* was replaced by *Wakon Yōsai* 和魂洋才 (Japanese spirit and Western learning), or *Wa Yō secchū* 和洋折衷 (the blending of Japanese and Western). Shimoda clearly identified herself as a *secchū ha* or one who advocated combining the best of Eastern and Western cultures, and she had no intention of turning Japanese women into replicas of Western women. She did not want Japanese women to be the "flowers" of the ballroom, but Shimoda urged Japanese women to be the "fruits," which were not as flashy as flowers, but still solid products of education and useful to society. Okakura Kakuzō, while maintaining a position that Japanese art heritage should be preserved and protected, also expressed an opinion that Japan's arts could be improved by selectively adopting some Western

art techniques. Uchimura argued that Westerners did not make good missionaries in Japan because they dismissed the Japanese as "heathens" and failed to see good and fertile soil onto which Christianity could be planted. In order for Christianity to spread and grow in Japan, Uchimura believed that Christianity must be Japanized. Even Fukuzawa did not go so far as to suggest abolishing the Japanese language or everything Japanese as some of his contemporaries had done.⁹ He criticized those that only adopted "the outward appearance of civilization" and sometime in his later life Fukuzawa "gave up foreign clothes except for horseback riding."¹⁰ For him, the outward appearance of clothes and language was rather an unimportant part of modern life and did little to promote civilization. To reflect this feeling, Fukuzawa normally wore only Japanese traditional clothes and wrote and spoke in Japanese to spread his message about how Japan should proceed into the future and the course it should take.

With the exception of Kōtoku, who did not pay much attention to cultural differences between East and West, the Japanese of this study presented the West as more or less a reverse image of how they viewed the current state of their own nation. For Fukuzawa, Shimoda, and Uchimura, the image of "the other" was somewhat sanitized and idealized. Fukuzawa identified the West with civilization and progress, while he associated the East with semi-civilization and stagnation. Fukuzawa considered the spirit of freedom and independence to be the essence of Western civilization that sparked progress, while he viewed the lack of independent thinking and the servile mentality he felt came from Confucian traditions as thwarting the progress of his own country. Shimoda viewed Western women as physically strong, valued in society, and treated

⁹ Marius B. Jansen, *The Making of Modern Japan* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000), 462. Mori Arinori, the founder of Meirokusha (the Meiji Six Society) and Minister of Education, advocated the use English.

¹⁰ Fukuzawa, *Autobiography*, 331.

with respect, while she considered Eastern women as physically weak, undervalued in society, and slavishly servile. Shimoda considered Western countries to be wealthy, strong, and civilized, while she viewed Meiji Japan as being in the process of working toward the goals of "enriching the state and strengthen the military (*fukoku kyōhei*)" and "civilization and enlightenment (*bunmei kaika*)."¹ Uchimura viewed the West to be the area civilization touched by God's plan and therefore an area of spirituality, while he regarded the East as an area characterized by materialism and utilitarianism, with little spirituality.

The reverse projection was done, for the most part, to self-criticize and make the Japanese people realize the weakness of their own nation in relation to the West, rather than to glorify and aggrandize the West. The East-West binary provided a choice between continuing of the present state or progressing to a higher level. It also implied a choice between following China's example of clinging to old traditions by refusing to learn from the "barbarians" thereby resulting in its current deplorable condition, that once great nation found itself facing, or to follow Western societal patterns to survive and hopefully thrive in the turbulent environment of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This "Occidentalism" of Meiji Japan was not so much about hostility toward the West (as Ian Buruma and Avishai Margalit's *Occidentalism* depicts) or the glorification of self (as Edward Said's *Orientalism* seems to imply) but is aimed at inspiring fellow Japanese to work collectively toward the common goal of bettering Japan. Even Okakura Kakuzō's understanding of Eastern and Western art, which may seem to have a strong self-celebratory tone, contained a sense of self-criticism. Okakura's audience was made up of both Westerners and Japanese. While he taught Westerners about Eastern artistic traditions, he

also criticized Japanese who did not appreciate their own artistic traditions and who accepted everything Western as superior.

At the same time, the use of the East-West binary helped to define Japan's new role as leader of the Eastern world. The self-criticism was used, in part, to encourage the Japanese people to strive to get ahead of their neighboring countries. The implication was that Japan was moving ahead toward civilization while its neighbors lagged behind. All five intellectuals, despite differences in their goals, recognized Japan's leadership in the Eastern world. In the confines of the East-West discourse, China and to a lesser extent Korea, along with the West constituted the "other" from whom Japan distinguished itself. The leadership role such intellectuals assigned to Japan manifested itself very clearly during World War II in the rhetoric of the Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere. The division of the world into East and West morphed into one of hostility. And Okakura Kakuzō's "Asia is One" was revived to promote Pan-Asian unity against the West. The basic metageographical structure of East and West and Japan's role as leader of the East promoted and developed by these thinkers during the Meiji era found new life and meaning with the outbreak of World War II, when the long feared conflict between East and West finally reached a point of open hostility.

Legacy

The discussion in Japan of an East-West binary has faded in recent years, but its legacy can still be seen in modern Japanese society. One of the most notable examples may be found in the way Japanese universities divide their history departments or programs into *Nihon shi* 日本史 (Japanese History), *Tōyō shi* 東洋史 (Eastern History), and *Seiyō shi* 西洋史 (Western

History). Many Japanese universities employ this three-way division or a close variation that may include archeology, art history, geography, historical geography etc. In February 2011, this author randomly selected twenty Japanese universities for an survey of their program structure. Of the twenty, eighteen universities used some variation of this three-way division.¹¹ For example, Sophia (also known as Jōchi), Nihon, and Gakushūin Universities use the classic three-way division, while Keiō (founded by Fukuzawa) adds a fourth division, archeology (kōko gaku 考古学); Tokyo University and Aoyama Gakuin University divide the History Department into five divisions, adding archeology and art history as the fourth and fifth categories. Some schools, such as Chūō, Osaka, and Waseda list these three subfields as separate majors within the larger college, typically the College of Humanities.

Rikkyō and Kansai Universities are the only two universities examined that do not use a three-way division. Rikkyō University's undergraduate program is divided into Japanese History, World History and Interdisciplinary Cultural Studies (formerly Geography), but their graduate level concentrations consist of the typical three-way division. Kansai University offers Japanese History and World History concentrations, but Kansai University's World History program appears to be relatively new and the school's website states that it combines Eastern and Western history divisions in order to offer a more global perspective. The university's faculty members

¹¹ The author examined eight National Universities (Tokyo, Kyoto, Osaka, Kyushu, Nagoya, Hokkaido, Hiroshima, Tsukuba), and twelve private universities (Nihon, Waseda, Sophia, Gakushūin, Kokugakuin, Aoyama Gakuin, Chuo, Keio, Rikkyō, Kansai, Meiji, Toyo) for this project in February 2011. Japanese universities typically accept students into programs through competitive entrance examinations where a student is tested for each field of study they may want to pursue. Based on their test score the student will be told what field the university will accept them into, if they do not want to accept this field, they will not be allowed into the university. Unlike American universities where students are able to change their majors as their interest changes, it is very difficult for students to change their major, concentration, or program in a Japanese university. Transferring to a different university or readmission after many years of absence are virtually unheard of, and non-traditional students are extremely rare in Japanese universities.

are still classified as professors of "*Tōyō shi*" or "*Seiyō shi*." Thus, even among the universities that do not technically use the three-way division, the shadow of the three-way division is present and the influence of a worldview that distinguishes "self" (Japan) from the "other" (both *Tōyō* and *Seiyō*) appears to be quite prevalent.

There are usually about two to seven full-time faculty members in each division of a Japanese university. In term of specialization, the *Seiyō shi* division tends to focus on European history, such as English, French, and German history. Only five out of twenty schools have U.S. history specialists. Interest in ancient Greek or Roman history appears to be quite high, with fifteen out of twenty schools having either a Greek or Roman specialist. Some even have multiple ancient history specialists in relatively small departments; Aoyama Gakuin and Hiroshima Universities have both Greek and Roman specialists; Tokyo University has two Ancient Greek history specialists.

In the *Tōyō shi* division, Chinese history specialists typically constitute the largest group. All schools examined have at least one Chinese history specialist, with fifteen out of twenty having more than one specialist (four specialists in three schools, three in six schools, and two in five schools). Central or Southeast Asia specialists are also listed under *Tōyō shi* scholars with eight schools having a Central Asia specialist and six schools having Southeast Asia specialists. South Asia or India history specialists appear to be surprisingly rare, with only two schools having specialists in that field. On the other hand, Middle East history specialists (including Turkish, Persian, and Arabic) can be found in eleven universities.¹² Most universities list these

¹² Prevalence of Middle Eastern Historians in Japanese universities could possibly be recent phenomena. The author was not able to collect enough data.

under their *Tōyō shi* division, although Ancient Mesopotamia (Waseda and Tsukuba) and Ancient Egypt (Kansai) specialists are considered *Seiyō shi* scholars. Kyūshū and Kyōto universities have separate Islamic World History (Kyūshū) and Southwest Asian History (Kyoto University) divisions. This seems to reflect an uneasiness of classifying Southwest Asia as "Tōyō." Others schools seem to have opted for classifying the Islamic world as Tōyō for lack of other options. Where history departments recognize only three regions and the Islamic world must be placed somewhere within three regions, the term Tōyō may be expanded to mean "Asia," but China historians still dominate the *Tōyō shi* divisions. In Gakushūin University, all three *Tōyō shi* scholars are China specialists. Meiji University has four China specialists (one of whom also covers Korea) and one Ottoman Empire specialist, while Nagoya University has three China and one Southeast Asia specialist. Despite the inclusion of Middle East history in *Tōyō shi* divisions, the common understanding of the labels Tōyō and Seiyō is centered on the two extremities of Eurasia. The problems with this concept inspired the influential anthropologist Umesao Tadao 梅棹 忠夫 (1920-2010) to coin the term, Chūyō 中洋 or "Middle Ocean" to describe the area between Tōyō and Seiyō or from Bangladesh to the Mediterranean. Though never widely used, Umesao's concept of Chūyō is quite telling of the Japanese fixation on East and West, since he argues that India and the Middle East are neither Tōyō nor Seiyō.¹³

The three-way division of Japanese university history departments also reflects a lack of emphasis on the "South" in Japanese academia. The "South," including such areas as Africa and Latin America, is essentially considered an area without history which is normally only covered

¹³ Umesao Tadao 梅棹 忠夫, *Bunmei no seitai shikan* 文明の生態史観 [Civilization from the Perspective of Ecological History] (Tokyo::Chūkō Bunko, 1974) 5-66, 211-232.

in relation to Seiyō. They may possibly be covered in geography and anthropology classes, but there is virtually no place for the history of the "southern regions" in the three-division scheme of most Japanese universities. This type of exclusion becomes a major obstacle for the development of world history as a serious academic field in Japan. Similar trends may be found in literature, philosophy, and other humanities or social science disciplines.¹⁴ Meiji intellectuals provided no single authoritative view of "East and West" or "civilization and barbarism," but collectively, their general emphasis on the two extremities of the Eurasian landmass, and their neglect of the South plagues Japanese academia to this day.

Future Research

The Western notion of the "other" is explored in several major works such as Edward Said's *Orientalism*, Michael Adas' *Machines as the Measure of Men*, and Martin Lewis and Karen Wigen's *The Myth of Continents*. An analysis from a non-Western perspective is less common, however, I have examined Japanese uses of the terms Tōyō and Seiyō, or East and West mostly focusing on the Meiji era, when use of the binary played such an important role in intellectual discourse. I have also briefly examined pre-Meiji Japanese conceptualizations of the world, as well as earlier usages of Tōyō and Seiyō and related terms and concepts. My source materials indicate that Japanese may have developed the concept of "West" independently of a Western influence, simply as a result of their geographical location. One thing that needs further research is examination of the terms East and West within the larger East Asian context.

¹⁴ The author did not closely examine literature course offerings in Japanese universities, but it appears that many universities offer Japanese, Chinese and various European language literatures, such as English, French, German and Russian literature majors.

Other countries of East Asia like China may have developed the concept of "East" and "West" separately from Japan, using the written Chinese language as a lingua franca. Hopefully, this study will inspire other scholars to examine similar geo-cultural concepts from other regions of the world such as South Asia and the Middle East, and from various time periods, in order to provide a more nuanced understanding of "East and West" as not just a Western invention, but something that developed locally in other parts of the world.

The notion of civilization and barbarism from both a Western and non-Western perspective needs to be further explored. My study of "*bunmei*" in the Meiji period reveals that there was no consensus in definition of the term. More study is needed to gain a greater appreciation of this complex concept. While the Meiji intellectuals of this study pondered the deeper meanings of this term, the general population may have had significantly different understandings. A closer comparison of Japanese writers and various Western sources may also provide insight into the notion that *bunmei* was not a purely foreign import but developed out of older East Asian notions of "civilization." One thing is for certain; the issue is definitely not as clear as "East is East, and West is West" as Rudyard Kipling's famous line suggests.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources in Japanese

Books

Arai Hakuseki. *Arai Hakuseki zenshū* 新井白石全集 [The Complete Works of Arai Hakuseki]. 6 vols. Edited by Imaizumi Teisuke and Ichishima Kenkichi. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Hanshichi, 1905.

Fukuzawa Yukichi 福沢諭吉. *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū* 福沢諭吉全集 [The Complete Works of Fukuzawa Yukichi]. 21 vols. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1958.

Hayashi Shihei 林子平. *Shinpen Hayashi Shihei zenshū* 新編・林子平全集 [New Complete Works of Hayashi Shihei]. Tokyo: Daiichi Shobō, 1978.

Ikegami Junchi 池上 洵一, ed. *Konjaku monogatari shū* 今昔物語集 [Anthology of Tales from the Past]. 4 vols. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2001.

Itagaki Hiroko 板垣弘子, ed. *Shimoda Utako chosakushū: shiryōhen* 下田歌子著作集. 資料編 [The Collected Works of Shimoda Utako]. 9 vols. Tokyo: Jissen Joshi Gakuen, 1998.

Izui Hisanosuke 泉井 久之助, etc. trans. *De Sande Tenshō ken'ō shisetsu ki* デ・サンデ天正遣欧使節記 [Reports of Tenshō era Embassy to Europe compiled by De Sande]. Tokyo: Yūshōdō Shoten, 1969. [Translation of Duarte de Sande, *De missione legatorum Iaponensium ad Romanam curiam, rebusq; in Europa, ac toto itinere animaduversis dialogus ex ephemeride ipsorum legatorum collectus, & in sermonem latinum versus ab Eduardo de Sande Sacerdote societatis Iesv.* Tokyo: Toyo Bunko, 1935.]

Kōtoku Shūsui 幸徳秋水. *Kōtoku Shūsui zenshū* 幸徳秋水全集 [The Complete Works of Kōtoku Shūsui]. 12 vols. Tokyo: Nihon Tosho Sentā, 1968.

Miura Baien 三浦梅園. *Baien zenshū* 梅園全集 [The Complete Works of Baien]. 2 vols. Tokyo: Kōdōkan, 1912.

Miyoshi Etsunan 三好銭南. *Chōya no jinbutsu* 朝野の人物 [Distinguished Individuals]. Tokyo: Shōbundō, 1911.

Oda Takeo 織田武雄, Muroga Nobuo 室賀信夫, and Unno Kazutaka 海野一隆. *Nihon kochizu taisei sekaizu hen* 日本古地図大成. 世界図編 [The World in Japanese Maps until the mid-19th Century]. Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1975.

Okakura Kakuzō 岡倉覺三. *Okakura Tenshin zenshū* 岡倉天心全集 [The Complete Works of Okakura Tenshin]. 8 vols. Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1979.

Ōsaka Asahi Shinbunsha 大阪朝日新聞社, comp. *Jinbutsu gaden* 人物画伝 [Biographies]. Tokyo: Yūrakusha, 1907.

Rekishigaku Kenkyūkai, 歴史学研究会 ed. *Nihonshi shiryō* 日本史史料 [Historical Documents of Japanese History]. Vol. 3. *Kinsei* [Early Modern]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2006.

Sase Suibai 佐瀬酔梅. *Tōsei katsujin ga* 当世活人画 [Portraits of Distinguished Individuals of the Day]. Tokyo: Shunyōdō, 1900.

Satō Nobuhiro 佐藤信淵. *Satō Nobuhiro kagaku zenshū* 佐藤信淵家學全集 [The Complete Works of Satō Nobuhiro]. Edited by Takimoto Seiichi. 2 vols. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1925.

Shimoda Utako. *Fujin jōshiki no yōsei* 婦人常識の養成 [Cultivations of Women's Common Sense]. Tokyo: Jitsugyō no Nihonsha, 1910.

_____. *Gaikoku shōjo kagami* 外國少女鑑 [Stories of Exemplary Girls of Foreign Lands]. Tokyo: Hakubunkan, 1902.

_____. *Joshi Nihon shō rekishi* 女子日本小歴史 [Short History of Japan for Girls]. Tokyo: Banshō sha, 1902.

_____. *Joshi Nihon rekishi kyōkasho* 女子日本歴史教科書 [Japanese History Textbook for Girls]. 2 vols. Tokyo: Bungakusha, 1903.

_____. *Joshi no tsutome* 女子のつとめ [Duties of Women]. Tokyo: Narumidō, 1902.

_____. *Kōsetsu sōsho: Shimoda Utako chosakushū* 香雪叢書: 下田歌子著作集 [Kōsetsu Collection: Selected Works of Shimoda Utako]. 5 vols. Tokyo: Jissen Jogakkō Shuppanbu, 1932.

_____. *Naikoku shōjo kagami* 内國少女鑑 [Stories of Exemplary Girls of Japan]. Tokyo: Hakubunkan, 1901.

_____. *Ryōsai to kenbo* 良妻と賢母 [Good Wives and Wise Mothers]. Tokyo: Toyamabō, 1912.

_____. *Taisei fujo fūzoku* 泰西婦女風俗 [Lifestyles of Western Women]. Tokyo: Dainihonjo Gakkai, 1899.

_____. *Taisei shoken katei kyōiku* 泰西所見 家庭教育 [Observations of Western Home Education]. Tokyo: Hakubunkan, 1901.

Terajima Ryōan 寺島良安. *Wa-Kan Sansai Zue* 和漢三才図会 [Illustrated Japanese-Chinese Bilingual Encyclopedia]. 18 vols. Modern Japanese Translation by Shimada Isao, Takeshima Atsuo, and Higuchi Motomi (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1985-1991).

Uchimura Kanzō 内村鑑三. *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū* 内村鑑三全集 [The Complete Works of Uchimura Kanzō]. 40 vols. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1980.

Umesao Tadao 梅棹 忠夫, *Bunmei no seitai shikan* 文明の生態史観 [Civilization from the Perspective of Ecological History]. Tokyo: Chūkō Bunko, 1974.

Yamamoto Hiro'o 山本博雄 ed. *Yōfu Shimoda Utako: Heimin Shinbun yori* 妖婦下田歌子：平民新聞より [Enchantress, Shimoda Utako: From Heimin Shinbun, Common People's Newspaper]. Nagoya: Fūbaisha, 1999.

Digital Sources

(accessed in December 2010)

"Bankoku shōka no zu 万国掌葉之図 [Pocket Map of the World]" by an unknown mapmaker (1850s-1860s). Kyoto University Library Muroga Collection <http://edb.kulib.kyoto-u.ac.jp/exhibit/muroga/bukkyo.html#5-8>

Heike monogatari 平家物語 [The Tale of the Heike]. The University of Virginia Library, The Japanese Text Initiative. <http://etext.virginia.edu/japanese/heike/heike.html>

Kamo no Mabuchi 賀茂真淵, *Kokuikō* 国意考. http://www2s.biglobe.ne.jp/~Taiju/1765_kokuikou.htm

Kabō Hyōzō's 花坊兵蔵. "Nanen budai shokoku shūran no zu 南閭浮提諸国集覧之図 [A Map of Various Countries of the World]" (1744). Kyoto University Library Muroga Collection <http://edb.kulib.kyoto-u.ac.jp/exhibit/muroga/bukkyo.html#5-8>

Kuchiki Masatsuna 朽木 昌綱. *Seiyō Senpu* 西洋錢譜 [Coins of *Seiyō*] (1787). Waseda University Library Japanese and Chinese Classics Collection. http://archive.wul.waseda.ac.jp/kosho/bunko08/bunko08_b0061/

Murasaki Shikibu 紫式部. *Genji monogatari* [The Tale of Genji]. The University of Virginia Library, The Japanese Text Initiative. <http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/japanese/genji/index.html>

Nampo Bunshi 南浦文之. *Teppōki* 鉄砲記 [Records of Firearms] excerpts.
http://www.eonet.ne.jp/~chushingura/p_nihonsi/siryo/0501_0550/0543.htm

Nishikawa Joken 西川如見, *Zōho Ka-I Tsūshōkō* 増補華夷通商考. Waseda University Library Japanese and Chinese Classics Collection.
http://archive.wul.waseda.ac.jp/kosho/i13/i13_00581/

Rōkashi 浪華子. "Nansen bushū bankoku shōka no zu 南瞻部洲万国掌菓之図" [A Pocket Map of the World] (1710). Waseda University Library Japanese and Chinese Classics Collection.
http://archive.wul.waseda.ac.jp/kosho/bunko08/bunko08_c0364/bunko08_c0364.html

Sei Shonagon 清少納言. *Makura no sōshi* 枕草子 [The Pillow Book]. The University of Virginia Library, The Japanese Text Initiative.
<http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/japanese/sei/makura/SeiMaku.html>

Taketori monogatari 竹取物語 [The Tale of the Bamboo Cutter]. The University of Virginia Library, The Japanese Text Initiative.
<http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/japanese/taketori/AnoTake.html>

Terajima Ryōan 寺島良安. *Wa-Kan Sansai Zue* 倭漢三才図会 [Illustrated Japanese-Chinese Bilingual Encyclopedia] Kyūshū University Library Digital Archive.
<http://record.museum.kyushu-u.ac.jp/Wa-Kan/>

Yoshida Kenkō 吉田兼好, *Tsurezuregusa* 徒然草 [Essays in Idleness]. The University of Virginia Library, The Japanese Text Initiative.
<http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/japanese/tsure/YosTsur.html>

Primary Sources in English

Books

Brace, Charles Loring. *Gesta Christi: Or, A History of Humane Progress Under Christianity*. New York: Armstrong, 1882.

Barnard, H.C. *Fènelon on Education: A Translation of the 'Traité de l'education des filles' and Other Documents Illustrating Fènelon's Educational Theories and Practice, Together with an Introduction and Notes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.

Bunsen, Christian Karl Josias. *God in History; Or, The Progress of Man's Faith in the Moral Order of the World*. 3 vols. London: Longmans, Green, and Co, 1868.

de Bary, Wm Theodore, Donald Keene, George Tanabe, and Paul Varley, eds. *Sources of Japanese Tradition*. Vol. 1. *From Earliest Times to 1600*. 2nd edition. New York: Columbia University Press, 2001.

de Bary, William Theodore, Carol Gluck, and Arthur E. Tiedemann, eds. *Sources of Japanese Tradition*. Vol. 2. *1600 to 2000*. 2nd ed. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.

Dyer, Henry. *Dai Nippon: The Britain of the East*. London: Blackie & Son, Limited, 1904.

Dykstra, Yoshiko Kurata, trans. *The Konjaku Tales: Indian Section*, 2 vols. Tokyo: Sanseido, 1986.

Emerson, Ralph Waldo. *Nature: Addresses, and Lectures*. Boston, etc: Houghton, Mifflin and co, 1893 [1836].

_____. *The American Scholar. Self-Reliance. Compensation*. New York: American Book Co, 1893.

Fenollosa, Ernest Francisco. *Epochs of Chinese & Japanese Art, An Outline History of East Asiatic Design*. 2 vols. New York: Dover Publications, 1963 [1912].

_____. *East and West*. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Literature House, 1970.

Fukuzawa Yukichi. *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization*. Translated by David A. Dilworth and G. Cameron Hurst. Tokyo: Sophia University Press, 1973.

_____. *Fukuzawa Yukichi's An Encouragement of Learning*. Translated by David A. Dillworth and Hirano Umeyo. Tokyo: Sophia University Press, 1969.

_____. *The Autobiography of Yukichi Fukuzawa*. Translated by Kiyooka Eiichi. New York: Columbia University Press, 1966.

Guizot, Francois Pierre Guillaume. *The History of Civilization from the Fall of the Roman Empire to the French Revolution*. 4 vols. New York: D Appleton and Company, 1902 [1828].

Guyot, Arnold. *The Earth and Man: Lectures on Comparative Physical Geography in Its Relation to the History of Mankind*. Revised ed. New York: C. Scribner, 1890 [1849].

Keene, Donald, trans. *The Tale of the Bamboo Cutter / Taketori monogatari* [Bilingual publication]. Modern Japanese translation by Kawabana Yasunari. Tokyo: Kodansha International, 1998.

Hegel, G.W. F. *Hegel: on The Arts*. Abridged and translated by Henry Paulucci. 2nd edition. Smyrna, DE: The Bagehot Council, 2001.

- Lu, David J. *Japan: A Documentary History*. 2 vols. New York: M.E. Sharpe, 2005.
- McCullough, Helen Craig, trans. *The Tale of the Heike*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988.
- Mitchell, S. Augustus. *Mitchell's New Intermediate Geography: A System of Modern Geography: Designed for Use of Schools and Academies*. Philadelphia, J.H. Butler, 1876.
- Morris, Ivan. *The Pillow Book of Sei Shonagon*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1992.
- Okakura Kakuzō. *Book of Tea*. New York: Duffield, 1906.
- _____. *The Awakening of Japan*. New York: Century Co, 1904.
- _____. *The Ideals of the East with Special Reference to the Art of Japan*. London: J. Murray, 1903.
- Okakura Koshirō, and Nakamura Sunao, ed. *Okakura Kakuzō: Collected English Writings*. 3 vols. Tokyo, Japan: Heibonsha, 1984.
- Parley, Peter. *Tales About Universal History on the Basis of Geography*. 4th ed. London: Thomas Tegg, n.d.[c. 1837].
- Political Economy for Use in Schools and for Private Instruction, Chambers's Educational Course*. Edinburgh: William and Robert Chambers, 1852.
- Seidensticker, Edward G. trans. *The Tale of Genji*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992.
- The British Printer*. vol. 8. London: Raithby, Lawrence & Co., 1895.
- Tyler, Royal, trans. *The Tale of Genji*. New York: Penguin Classics, 2002.
- Ury, Marian, trans. *Tales of Times Now Past: Sixty-Two Tales from a Medieval Japanese Collection*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 1979.
- Wenckstern, Friedrich. *A Bibliography of the Japanese Empire; Being a Classified List of All Books, Essays and Maps in European Languages Relating to Dai Nihon Published in Europe, America and in the East from 1859-93 A.D.* Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1895.

Digital Sources
(accessed in December 2010)

Swami Vivekananda, "Addresses at World's Parliament of Religions," Chicago; 11 September 1893, in *Complete Works of Swami Vivekananda*, vol. 1.
http://www.ramakrishnavivekananda.info/vivekananda/volume_1/vol_1_frame.htm

Primary Sources in Chinese

Digital Sources
(accessed in December 2010)

Nihonshoki 日本書紀. Chapter 22.
http://miko.org/~uraki/kuon/furu/text/syoki/syoki22_1.htm#sk22_05

Ricci, Matteo. "Kunyu wanguo quantu (J. Konyo bankoku zenzu) 坤輿万国全図 [The Map of the World]" (1604). Kyoto University Library website <http://edb.kulib.kyoto-u.ac.jp/exhibit/maps/map001/image/index.html>

Suishu 隋書(c. 630CE) [History of the Sui Dynasty] scroll 81, section 46, on Land of Wa, Eastern Barbarians 東夷倭國 <http://www.geocities.jp/intelljp/cn-history/zui/wa.htm>

Zhang Xie 張燮. *Dong Xi yang kao* 東西洋考[An Examination of Eastern and Western Oceans] 1617. Chapters from 5-8 available at <http://ia311003.us.archive.org/1/items/06046705.cn/06046705.cn.pdf>

Secondary Sources in Japanese

Books

Arima Seiho 有馬成甫. *Kahō no kigen to sono denryū* 火砲の起原とその傳流 [The Origin of Firearms and its Spread]. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1962.

Asahi Shinbun 朝日新聞 ed. *Saiyūki no Shiruku Rōdo : Sanzō Hōshi no michi* 西遊記のシルクロード:三蔵法師の道 [The Silk Road and the World of Xuanzang]. Osaka: Asahi Shinbun, 1999.

Ayusawa Shintarō 鮎沢信太郎, and Nobuo Muroga 室賀信夫. *Sakoku jidai no sekai chirigaku* 鎖国時代の世界地理学 [A Study of World Geography During the Era of Seclusion]. Tokyo: Hara Shobō, 1980.

Enchi Fumiko 円地文子 ed. *Kyōiku bungaku eno reimei* 教育・文学への黎明 [The Dawn of Education and Literature]. Vol. 12 of *Jinbutsu nihon no joseishi* 人物日本の女性史 [History of Japanese Women through Biographies]. Tokyo: Shūeisha, 1978.

Hamada Kōsaku 濱田耕作. *Kirishitan bunka* キリシタン文化 [Kirishitan Culture]. Vol. 5 of *Hamada Kōsaku chosakushu*, 濱田耕作著作集 [Collected Works of Hamada Kōsaku]. Kyoto: Dōhōsha, 1991.

Hayashi Hisao 林尚男. *Heiminsha no hitobito: Shūsui, Kosen, Naoe, Sakae* 平民社の人びと : 秋水・枯川・尚江・栄. [People of the Heiminsha: Shūsui, Kosen, Naoe, Sakae] Tokyo: Asahi Shinbun sha, 1990.

Hayashi Mariko 林真理子. *Mikado no onna* ミカドの淑女 [The Lady of the Emperor]. Tokyo: Shinchōsha, 1990.

Hayashi Shigeru 林茂. *Kindai Nihon no shisōka tachi: Nakae Chōmin, Kōtoku Shūsui, Yoshino Sakuzō*. 近代日本の思想家たち : 中江兆民・幸徳秋水・吉野作造 [Thinkers of Modern Japan: Nakae Chōmin, Kōtoku Shūsui, Yoshino Sakuzō]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1958.

Hirao Kazuko 平尾寿子. *Shimoda Utako kaisō roku* 下田歌子回想録 [Remembering Shimoda Utako]. Tokyo: Sanyōsha, 1942.

Hirayama Yō 平山洋. *Fukuzawa Yukichi no shinjitsu* 福澤諭吉の真実 [The Truth about Fukuzawa Yukichi]. Tokyo: Bungei Shunjū, 2004.

Ikeda Satoshi 池田諭. *Moeru Ajia to Nihon no genten: hadō ka ōdō ka : yomigaeru Tenshin to Shūsui no risō* 燃えるアジアと日本の原点 : 覇道か王道か : よみがえる天心と秋水の理想 [The Origin of Pan Asia and Japan: Hegemonic Way or Kingly Way: Revival of the Ideals of Tenshin and Shūsui]. Tokyo: Sanpō, 1974.

Ida Shinya 井田進也. *Rekishi to tekusuto: Saikaku kara Yukichi made* 歴史とテキスト : 西鶴から諭吉まで [History and Texts: From Saikaku to Yukichi]. Tokyo: Kōbōsha, 2001.

Itoya Toshio 糸屋寿雄. *Kōtoku Shūsui kenkyū* 幸徳秋水研究 [The Study of Kōtoku Shūsui]. Tokyo: Aoki Shoten, 1967.

Jissen Jogakkō ko Shimoda kōchō sensei denki hensanjo 実践女学校故下田校長先生伝記編纂所. *Shimoda Utako sensei den* 下田歌子先生伝 [Stories of Shimoda Utako Sensei]. Vol. 66 of *Denki sōsho* [Biography Series]. Tokyo: Ōzorasha, 1989 [1943].

Kaikoku hyakunen kinen bunka jigyōkai, 開国百年記念文化事業会 ed. *Sakoku jidai Nihonjin no kaigai chishiki : sekai chiri, Seiyōshi ni kansuru bunken kaidai* 鎖国時代日本人の海外知識 : 世界地理・西洋史に関する文献解題 [Index of Documents on Oversea Knowledge, World Geography and Occidental History of the Japanese during the Era of Seclusion]. Tokyo: Kangensha, 1953.

Kawano Kenji 河野健二. *Furansu Kakumei to Meiji Ishin* フランス革命と明治維新 [The French Revolution and the Meiji Restratriation]. Tokyo: Nihon Hōsō Shuppan Kyōkai, 1966.

Kobayashi Yoshiaki, 小林良彰. *Meiji Ishin to Furansu Kakumei* 明治維新とフランス革命 [The Meiji Restratriation and the French Revolution]. Tokyo: San'ichi Shobō, 1988.

Maeda Masayuki 前田 雅之. *Konjaku monogatari shu no sekai kōsō* 今昔物語集の世界構想 [Worldview of the Konjaku Tales]. Tokyo: Kazama Shoin, 1999.

Matsuda Kiichi 松田毅一. *Tenshō ken Ō shisetsu* 天正遣欧使節 [Tenshō Era Embassy to Europe]. Tokyo: Chōbunsha, 1991.

Nanjō Norio 南条範夫. *Yōketsu Shimoda Utako* 妖傑下田歌子 [Beautiful and Strong Shimoda Utako]. Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1994.

Nishio Toyosaku 西尾豊作. *Shimoda Utako den* 下田歌子傳 [A Biography of Shimoda Utako]. Tokyo: Kōsaijuku, 1936.

Nishio Yōtarō 西尾陽太郎. *Kōtoku Shūsui* 幸徳秋水. Vol. 20 of *Jinbutsu sōsho* [Biography Collection]. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1959.

Numata Jirō 沼田次郎, ed. *Nihon to Seiyō* 日本と西洋 [Japan and the West], Vol. 6 of *Tōzai Bunmei no kōryū* 東西文明の交流 [Interactions of the Eastern and Western Civilizations]. Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1971.

Okakura Kazuo 岡倉一雄. *Chichi Okakura Tenshin* 父岡倉天心 [My Father, Okakura Tenshin]. Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha, 1971.

Okakura Koshirō 岡倉古志郎. *Sofu Okakura Tenshin* 祖父岡倉天心 [My Grandfather, Okakura Tenshin]. Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 1999.

Ōkōchi Kazuo 大河内一男. *Kōtoku Shūsui to Katayama Sen; Meiji no shakai shugi*. 幸徳秋水と片山潜: 明治の社会主義 [Kōtoku Shūsui and Katayama Sen: Socialism of the Meiji Era]. Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1972.

Saitō Ryuzō 齊藤隆三. *Okakura Tenshin* 岡倉天心. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Hirobumi kan, 1960.

Seto'uchi Harumi 瀬戸内晴美 ed. *Meiji ni kaikashita saientachi* 明治に開花した才媛たち [Talented Women who Blossomed During the Meiji Era]. Vol. 2 of *Onna no issō: jinbutsu kindai joseishi* 女の一生: 人物近代女性史 [Women's Lives: Biographical History of Modern Japanese Women]. Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1980.

Shimoda Kageki 志茂田景樹. *Hana no arashi: Meiji no jotei, Shimoda Utako no ai to yabō* 花の嵐: 明治の女帝・下田歌子の愛と野望 [The Storm of Flowers: the Queen of Meiji era, Shimoda Utako's Love and Ambition]. Kyoto: PHP Kenkyūsho, 1984.

Shōgakukan 小学館. *Nihon kara mita ikoku* 日本からみた異国 [Viewing Foreign Lands from Japanese Perspective]. Tokyo: Shōgakukan, 1978.

Wakita Haruko 脇田晴子. *Sengoku Daimyō* 戦国大名 [Daimyo of the Warring Era]. Vol. 7 of *Taiei Nihon no Rekishi* 大系日本の歴史 [History of Japan]. Tokyo: Shogakukan, 1993.

Yamaguchi Kazuo 山口一夫. *Fukuzawa Yukichi no Amerika taiken* 福澤諭吉の亜米利加 体験 [Fukuzawa Yukichi's Experience in America]. Tokyo: Fukuzawa Yukichi Kyōkai, 1986.

_____. *Fukuzawa Yukichi no A-Ō kenbun* 福澤諭吉の亜欧見聞 [Fukuzawa Yukichi's visit to Asia and Europe]. Tokyo: Fukuzawa Yukichi Kyōkai, 1992.

_____. *Fukuzawa Yukichi no Seikō junreki* 福澤諭吉の西航巡歴 [Fukuzawa Yukichi's Travel to the West]. Tokyo: Fukuzawa Yukichi Kyōkai, 1980.

Yasukawa Junosuke 安川寿之輔. *Fukuzawa Yukichi no Ajia ninshiki: Nihon kindai shizō o torae kaesu* 福澤諭吉のアジア認識: 日本近代史像をとらえ返す [Fukuzawa Yukichi's Views of Asia: Rethinking Modern Japanese History]. Tokyo: Kōbunken, 2000.

_____. *Fukuzawa Yukichi no Sensōron to Tennōseiron: Aratana Fukuzawa bika o hihan suru* 福澤諭吉の戦争論と天皇制論—新たな福澤美化論を批判する [Fukuzawa Yukichi's Theories on War and Japanese Monarchy: Critique of New Fukuzawa Glorification]. Tokyo: Kōbunken, 2006.

Journal Articles and Pamphlets

Aichi Prefecture Library, "*Bunmei kaika to kyōkasho: Meiji no kyōkasho sono 2*," 文明開化と教科書 : 明治の教科書その2 <http://www.aichi-pref-library.jp/list/event/meiji.pdf>

Minamoto Masahisa 源昌久. "Fukuzawa Yukichi cho 'Sekai Kunizukushi' ni kansuru ichikenkyū: shoshi gakuteki chōsa 福沢諭吉著『世界国尽』に関する一研究: 書誌学的調査 [An Study of Fukuzawa Yukichi's "Sekai Kunizukushi:" Study of Source Materials]." *Kūkan, Shakai, Chirishisō* 空間・社会・地理思想 [Space, Society and Geographical Thought] 2 (1997): 2-18.

Secondary Sources in English

Books

Adas, Michael. *Machines As the Measure of Men: Science, Technology, and Ideologies of Western Dominance*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989.

Aydin, Cemil. *The Politics of Anti-Westernism in Asia : Visions of World Order in Pan-Islamic and Pan-Asian Thought*. New York : Columbia University Press, 2007.

Beasley, W.G. *The Japanese Experience: A Short History of Japan*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.

Berry, Mary Elizabeth. *Hideyoshi*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard, 1982.

Bharucha, Rustom. *Another Asia: Rabindranath Tagore and Okakura Tenshin*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Blacker, Carmen. *The Japanese Enlightenment: A Study of the Writings of Fukuzawa Yukichi*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964.

Blaut, J. M. *The Colonizer's Model of the World: Geographical Diffusionism and Eurocentric History*. New York: The Guilford Press, 1993.

Boxer, C. R. *The Christian Century in Japan, 1549-1650*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1951.

Buruma, Ian, and Avishai Margalit. *Occidentalism: The West in the Eyes of Its Enemies*. New York: Penguin Press, 2004.

Cortazzi, Hugh, and Gordon Daniels. *Britain and Japan, 1859-1991: Themes and Personalities*. London: Rutledge, 1992.

Craig, Albert M. *Civilization and Enlightenment: The Early Thought of Fukuzawa Yukichi*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2009.

de Bary, William Theodore, Irene Bloom, Wing-tsit Chan, Joseph Adler, and Richard John Lufrano, eds. *Sources of Chinese Tradition*. Vol. 1. *Introduction to Asian Civilization*. 2nd ed. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.

Dower, John W. *War Without Mercy: Race and Power in the Pacific War*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1986.

Elias, Norbert. *The Civilizing Process: Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations*. Translated by Edmund Jephcott. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1994.

Fujita, Neil S. *Japan's Encounter with Christianity*. New York: Paulist Press, 1991.

Hardcre, Helen, and Adam L. Kern, ed. *New Directions in the Study of Meiji Japan*. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1997.

Havia, James L. *English Lessons: The Pedagogy of Imperialism in Nineteenth Century China*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2003.

Hay, Stephen N. *Asian Ideas of East and West: Tagore and His Critics in Japan, China, and India*. Vol. 40 of *Harvard East Asian Series*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970.

Hirakawa, Sukehiro. *Japan's Love-Hate Relationship with the West*. Kent: Global Oriental, 2005.

Hopper, Helen M. *Fukuzawa Yukichi: From Samurai to Capitalist*. New York: Pearson Longman, 2004.

Horioka, Yasuko. *The Life of Okakura Kakuzo: Author of "the Book of Tea."* Tokyo: Hokuseido, 1963.

Howes, John. F. *Japan's Modern Prophet: Uchimura Kanzō, 1861-1930*. Vancouver and Toronto: UBC Press, 2005.

Howland, Douglas R. *Translating the West: Language and Political Reason in Nineteenth-Century Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2002.

Iriye, Akira, ed. *Mutual Images: Essays in American-Japanese Relations*. Vol. 7 of *Harvard Studies in American-East Asian Relations*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Irokawa, Daikichi. *The Culture of the Meiji Period*, Translation edited by Marius B. Jansen. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985.

Jansen, Marius B. *Japan and Its World: Two Centuries of Change*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980.

_____. *The Making of Modern Japan*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000.

Jennings, Raymond P. *Jesus, Japan, and Kanzō Uchimura: A Study of the View of the Church of Kanzō Uchimura and Its Significance for Japanese Christianity*. Tokyo: Kyōbunkan, Christian Literature Society, 1958.

Keene, Donald. *The Japanese Discovery of Europe: 1790-1830*. Revised edition. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1969.

Kent, Susan Kingsley. *Gender and Power in Britain, 1640-1990*. London and New York: Routledge, 1999.

Lewis, Martin, and Kären Wigen. *The Myth of the Continents: A Critique of Metageography*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

Lidin, Olof G. *Tanegashima: The Arrival of Europe in Japan*. Copenhagen: NIAS, 2002.

Liu, Lydia H. *The Clash of Empires: The Invention of China in Modern World Making*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Mazlish, Bruce. *Civilization and Its Contents*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004.

Miura, Hiroshi. *The Life and Thought of Kanzo Uchimura, 1861-1930*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1996.

Moore, Ray A. *Culture and Religion in Japanese-American Relations: Essays on Uchimura Kanzō, 1861-1930*. Vol. 5 of *Michigan Papers in Japanese Studies*. Ann Arbor: Center for Japanese Studies, University of Michigan, 1981.

Moran, J. F. *The Japanese and the Jesuits: Alessandro Valignano in Sixteenth-century Japan*. London and New York: Routledge, 1993.

Morris-Suzuki, Tessa. *Re-Inventing Japan: Time, Space Nation*. New York: M.E. Sharpe, 1998.

Nara International Foundation. *The Silk Roads Nara International Symposium 2001: Soaring Over the Silk Road: Japanese Envoys to the Sui and Tang*. Nara, Japan: The Nara International Foundation, 2001.

- Narsimhan, Sushila. *Japanese Perceptions of China in the Nineteenth Century: Influence of Fukuzawa Yukichi*. New Delhi: Phoenix Pub. House, 1999.
- Nish, Ian Hill, James Hoare, and Hugh Cortazzi. *Britain & Japan: Biographical Portraits*. Folkestone: Japan Library, 1994.
- Notehelfer, F[rederick] G[eorge]. *Kōtoku Shūsui: Portrait of a Japanese Radical*. Cambridge, UK: University Press, 1971.
- Reischauer, Edwin O. *Ennin's Travels in T'ang China*. New York: The Donald Press Company, 1955.
- Reynolds, Douglas R. *China, 1898-1912: The Xinhai Revolution and Japan*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993.
- Rimer, J. Thomas, ed. *A Hidden Fire: Russian and Japanese Cultural Encounters, 1868-1926*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1995.
- Saaler, Sven, and J. Victor Koschmann, ed. *Pan-Asianism in Modern Japanese History: Colonialism, Regionalism, and Borders*. London: Routledge, 2007.
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. 25th Anniversary Edition. New York: Vintage Books, 2004 [1979].
- Sansom, George. *A History of Japan to 1334*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1958.
- _____. *The Western World and Japan: A Study in the Interaction of European and Asiatic Cultures*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1968 [1950].
- Shoemaker, Robert, and Mary Vincent, ed. *Gender and History in Western Europe*. London: Arnold, 1998.
- Sullivan, Michael. *The Meeting of Eastern and Western Art*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1997.
- Tanaka, Stefan. *Japan's Orient: Rendering Pasts into History*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- Tankha, Brij, ed. *Okakura Tenshin and Pan-Asianism: Shadows of the Past*. Folkestone: Global Oriental, 2009.
- Toby, Ronald P. *State and Diplomacy in Early Modern Japan: Asia in Development of the Tokugawa Bakufu*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.

Totman, Conrad. *Early Modern Japan*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

Vicinus, Martha, ed. *A Widening Sphere: Changing Roles of Victorian Women*. Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press, 1977.

Watanabe, Masao. *The Japanese and Western Science*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990.

Weston, Victoria. *Japanese Painting and National Identity: Okakura Tenshin and His Circle*. Vol. 45 of *Michigan Monograph Series in Japanese Studies*. Ann Arbor: Center for Japanese Studies, University of Michigan, 2004.

Wriggins, Sally Hovey. *The Silk Road Journey with Xuanzang*. Revised edition. Bolder: Westview Press, 2004.

Zachmann, Urs Matthias. *China and Japan in the Late Meiji Period: China Policy and the Japanese Discourse on National Identity, 1895-1904*. London: Routledge, 2009.

Thesis / Dissertation

Narsimhan, Sushila. *Japanese Perceptions of China in the Nineteenth Century: Influence of Fukuzawa Yukichi*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Delhi, 1995.

Tachiki, Satoko Fujita. *Okakura Kakuzo (1862-1913) and Boston Brahmins*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1986.

Yada, Kinji Ken. *Confucian Path to Meiji Socialism: Kōtoku Shūsui's Radical Reaction to Modernization*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Southern California, 1972.

Journal Articles

Adas, Michael. "Contested Hegemony: The Great War and the Afro-Asian Assault on the Civilizing Mission Ideology." *Journal of World History* 15, no. 1 (2004): 31-63.

Blacker, Carmen. "Fukuzawa Yukichi on Family Relationships." *Monumenta Nipponica* 14 (April-June 1958): 40-60.

Guth, Christine. "Charles Longfellow and Okakura Kakuzo: Cultural Cross-Dressing in the Colonial Context." *Positions: East Asia Cultures Critique* 8, no. 3 (Winter 2000): 605-636.

Hanihara, Kazuro. "Emishi, Ezo and Ainu: An Anthropological Perspective." *Japan Review* 1 (1990): 35-48.

Havens, Thomas R. H. "Comte, Mill, and the Thought of Nishi Amane in Meiji Japan." *The Journal of Asian Studies* 27, no. 2 (February 1968): 217-228.

Heehs, Peter. "Foreign Influences on Bengali Revolutionary Terrorism 1902-1908." *Modern Asian Studies* 28, no. 3 (July 1994): 533-556.

Ike, Nobutaka. "Western Influences on the Meiji Restoration." *The Pacific Historical Review* 17, no. 1 (February 1948): 1-10.

Judge, Joan. "Talent, Virtue, and the Nation: Chinese Nationalisms and Female Subjectivities in the Early Twentieth Century." *The American Historical Review* 106, no. 3 (June 2001): 765-803.

Kinmonth, Earl H. "Fukuzawa Reconsidered: Gakumon no Susume and its Audience." *The Journal of Asian Studies* 37, no. 4 (August 1978): 677-696.

Korhonen, Pekka. "The Geography of Okakura Tenshin." *Japan Review: Bulletin of the International Research Center for Japanese Studies* 13 (2001): 107-127.

Nagai, Michio. "Herbert Spencer in Early Meiji Japan." *The Far Eastern Quarterly* 14, no. 1 (November 1954): 55-64.

Soviak, Eugene. "The Case of Baba Tatsui. Western Enlightenment, Social Change and the Early Meiji Intellectual." *Monumenta Nipponica* 18, no. 1/4 (1963): 191-235.

Willcock, Hiroko. "Traditional Learning, Western Thought, and the Sapporo Agricultural College: A Case Study of Acculturation in Early Meiji Japan." *Modern Asian Studies* 34, no. 4 (October 2000): 977-1017.

GLOSSARY

ban 蛮 (Ch. man)	barbarians; barbaric. The character was traditionally used to denote "southern" barbarians.
bunmei 文明	civilization
bunmei kaika 文明開化	civilization and enlightenment
Chūgoku 中国 (Ch. <i>Zhongguo</i>)	the middle kingdom
<i>Dai Seiyō</i> 大西洋	Greater Western Ocean. The term appears in pre-Meiji world maps. (c.f. <i>Tai Seiyō</i>)
<i>Dai Tōyō</i> 大東洋	Greater Eastern Ocean. The term appears in pre-Meiji world maps.
<i>dōhō</i> 同胞	of the same womb
Ebisu 夷	barbarians
Emishi 蝦夷	barbarians
Ezo 蝦夷/夷/狄	barbarians
<i>fukoku kyōhei</i> 富国強兵	enrich the nation and strengthen the military
<i>gaikoku</i> 外国	outside country; foreign country. Also pronounced <i>totsukuni</i>
<i>hankai</i> 半開	half-civilized; semi-developed; semi-civilized
<i>Hokuteki</i> 北狄 (Ch. <i>Beidi</i>)	northern barbarians
Honchō 本朝	Literally means "this imperial court." A way to refer to Japan in old Japanese.

<i>I</i> 夷 (Ch. <i>yì</i>)	barbarians; barbaric. The character was traditionally used in China to denote "eastern barbarians." The Japanese historically used the character for hunter-gathers in northern Honshu (Tōhoku region) and Hokkaidō.
<i>ikoku</i> 異国	literally means "different" country; foreign country
<i>i-teki-jū-ban</i> 夷狄 戎蛮	barbarians. The four letters represent barbarians of the four directions traditionally recognized by Chinese.
<i>jikoku</i> 自国	one's own country
<i>Ka</i> 華 (Ch. <i>Hua</i>)	the center, the flower, the best place, the place of prosperity, and the place of splendor. Used to mean China.
<i>Ka-I</i> 華夷	the center surrounded by barbarians
<i>Kara</i> 唐	An old Japanese expression for China. Also pronounced "Tō." (Ch. Tang as in Tang dynasty, 618-907CE)
<i>Kyokutō</i> 極東	Far East
<i>Li</i> 禮 (礼) (Jp. <i>Rei</i>)	ritual, propriety, etiquette, decorum. One of the key concepts in the Confucian tradition.
<i>liyi</i> 礼義	ritual and justice
<i>mikai</i> 未開	yet-to-be civilized; semi-developed; semi-civilized.
<i>Morokoshi</i> 唐土	An old Japanese expression for China.
<i>Nanban</i> 南蛮 (Ch. <i>Nanman</i>)	southern barbarians
<i>Ō-Bei</i> 歐米	Europe and America
<i>sangoku sekai kan</i> 三国世界觀	The Three-Land View. Traditional Japanese worldview based on Buddhism, consisting of Japan, China and India.
<i>secchū</i> 折衷	eclecticism

<i>sei</i> 西	west; western
<i>sei'iki</i> 西域	western region
Seiyō 西洋	literally means "Western Ocean." The Japanese equivalent of "Occident" or "the West."
Shina 支那	An old Japanese expression for China. It derives from the European name "China."
<i>Shintan</i> 震旦/晨旦	An old Japanese expression for China. It derives from the Sanskrit term referring to China based on the name of the "Qin" dynasty (pronounced by the Japanese as <i>Shin</i>).
<i>Shō Seiyō</i> 小西洋	Lesser Western Ocean. The term appears in pre-Meiji world maps.
<i>Shō Tōyō</i> 小東洋	Lesser Eastern Ocean. The term appears in pre-Meiji world maps.
<i>shufu</i> 主婦	Today the term <i>shufu</i> is used to describe married women who do not work outside the home. Shimoda Utako used the term to mean being a female (<i>fu</i> 婦) lord and also (<i>shu</i> 主) of her own domain within the house.
Taitō 泰東	Extreme or Far East
Taisei 泰西	Extreme or Far West
<i>Tai Seiyō</i> 大西洋	The Atlantic Ocean. Literally means "Great Western Ocean." (c.f. <i>Dai Seiyō</i>)
<i>Teki</i> 狄 (Ch. <i>dì</i>)	barbarian. The character was traditionally used in China to denote "northern barbarians."
<i>Tenjiku</i> 天竺	Old Japanese name for India.
Tō 唐	Japanese pronunciation for Tang (as in Tang dynasty, 618-907CE). An old Japanese expression for China. Also pronounced <i>Kara</i> .
Tō 東	east; eastern
Tōhō 東方	eastern direction

Tōyō 東洋	literally means "Eastern Ocean." The Japanese equivalent of "Orient" or "the East."
Tō-Zai 東西	East-West
<i>Tōzan</i> 唐山	An old Japanese expression for China.
<i>Wa</i> 和	As a prefix, it means "Japanese."
<i>yaban</i> 野蛮	barbaric; barbarism
<i>Yō</i> 洋	Literally means "ocean." As a prefix, it means "Western."
Zettō 絶東	Far East; Absolute East