FUKUZAWA, UCHIMURA, AND OKAKURA

— Meiji Intellectuals and Westernization —

MARUYAMA MASAO

I

When the names of the three thinkers, Fukuzawa Yukichi 福澤諭吉, Okakura Tenshin 岡倉天心, and Uchimura Kanzō 內村鑑三 are cited together, it is difficult to call to mind by direct association some keynote common to them all. For those who know something about them, it may be even natural to sense discord before anything else. Not only were their main spheres of activity different but they were of marked individuality both in their characters and attitudes in life, so that if one compares any two of them, one will be easily struck with certain features diametrically different between them. Nevertheless, a little closer examination will bring one to notice that the fate of the times when they lived had formed between their minds a ramification of many "inner lines" of which they themselves were perhaps unaware.

They all sprang from *samurai* families in feudal fiefs whose lords were relative, or in hereditary vassalage, to the Tokugawas: Fukuzawa came from the Nakatsu 中津 clan of Buzen 豐前, Uchimura from the Takasaki 高崎 clan of Jōshū 上州, and Tenshin the Fukui 福井 clan of Echizen 越前. The circumstances where they found themselves were therefore such that, contrary to men from the Satsuma 薩摩 and Chōshū 長州 clans who could triumphantly take the tide of the upheaval, they had to suffer more or less a by-blow from the Restoration and be tossed about by the waves of the time. In addition, they were all brought up in cities such as Ōsaka 大阪, Edo 江戸, and Yokohama 横濱 where the impact of the "opening of the country" appeared earlier and on a larger scale than elsewhere, and where they were given the opportunity of acquiring excellent ability in foreign languages in their youth. Eventually Uchimura and Tenshin were to make "the Japanese" and "the Japanese civilization" known to the West by their equal proficiency in English whereas Fukuzawa transplanted with a surprising skill various

categories of western civilization into the context of the Japanese language, all three thereby providing the most excellent cultural bridge between Europe and Japan. Again, Fukuzawa made it a principle to remain a non-official civilian all his life, and Uchimura became the most shrewd critic of the clan government following the lèse-majesté affair in which he was involved when he refused to make obeisance before the Imperial Rescript for Education (1891). Tenshin, who stood closest to power among the three, was to play a role in establishing the first non-official academy of arts in Japan when he was so occasioned by his eviction from office at the Tokyo Fine Art School (*Tokyo Bijutsu Gakkō* 東京美術學校). In short, their way of life or thought was attended on by something which had to lead them to swerve from the orthodox pattern of Imperial Japan, and which provided them with the very source of vitality as thinkers.

Diametrically different in views of their religion as they were, Fukuzawa and Uchimura had in their intellectual education such important assets in common with the concepts of European civilization of Guizot and Buckle. Also Tenshin was related to Uchimura in that they both studied in their school days Hegelian philosophy and Darwin's theory of evolution which were to form a special "compound" deposited in their views of history, though they were greatly different in its practical application. In respect of age, Uchimura was Tenshin's senior by one year, while Fukuzawa was twenty-five or twenty-six years older than the two others. The years around 1870 happened to mark a turning-point of history on the quickly revolving stage of world affairs, and it was no wonder that disparity in generation should, in itself, have caused a substantial difference to the manner in which these three were to comply with "modernity." Nevertheless, both Uchimura and Tenshin grew to maturity by fully absorbing the lively spirit of enlightenment immediately following the Restoration, and the hoard of nutriment thus built up in their youth was never exhausted even in the close of their days. Not to speak of Fukuzawa, for Uchimura, too, at least in the period when he was most active in intellectual life through the *Yorodzu Chōhō* 萬朝報, "History is the record of progress of mankind," and the progress of civilization was another word for the development of the nation.[1] Even Tenshin, who professed to be a conservative, spoke of the "lively individualism of the Meiji era" at the same time, and did

1 Uchimura, *Kōkoku Shidan* 興國史談. *Uchimura Kanzō Zenshū* 內村鑑三全集 (Complete Works of Uchimura Kanzō), 20 vols., Tokyo, Iwanami-shoten, 1932–1933. Vol. I, p. 663.

not lose sight of a possibility open to civilization, when he said, "Japan in the future will not be what she was in the past. The Japan of today, at a strategic point of world affairs, should not be regarded in the same light with what she was during the 300 years of seclusion. In meeting trade demands from abroad, she must be informed of conditions and life in foreign countries, and keep pace with the times."[2] The romantic sense of history did not yet break off its original relations with the enlightened spirit of freedom and progress.

Intellectuals educated in international culture, none of these three thinkers was content to be a mere mediator of enlightenment between East and West. They inseparably united their mission in Japan with Japan's mission in the world and persistently held fast to that strong sense of "mission" all their life. A profound sense of crisis concerning inevitable effects of the "opening of the country" and a pathetic aspiration for the independence and security of Japan were both main motivations behind their expression of views on intellectual problems. Fukuzawa, who was acknowledged both by himself and by others as a pilot of the western civilization, wrote that "we cannot discuss the matter of civilization unless there exists the country and the people of Japan";[3] preferred patriotism which he took upon himself to call "prejudice" as against the universalist corollary of the concepts of *tenchi no kōdō* 天地の公道 (universal justice) or *benri* 便利 (reason) and found valuable energy for national independence in the "spirit of trained endurance" which may seem "almost childish from the point of view of cool calculation." This assertion of Fukuzawa exactly corresponds to the fact that the passionate glorification by Tenshin of Asian identity and tradition was simultaneously supported by his universal idea of mankind. Tenshin said, "Art is a universal possession which has nothing to do with a discrimination between East and West. A sect is the source of abuses,[4] and "we can be more human only by becoming more universal."[5] Fukuzawa had written, "What is the plight of the countries of the East and of the islands of Oceania? Within reach of the hands of Westerners is there any country which secures its national rights and interests and maintains real independence? How about Persia, India,

2 A speech made at an art exhibition in November, 1887, Tokyo.

3 Fukuzawa, *Bunmei-ron no Gairyaku* 文明論之概略 (An Outline of Civilization). *Fukuzawa Yukichi Zenshū* 福澤諭吉全集 (Complete Works of Fukuzawa Yukichi), 21 vols., Tokyo, Iwanami-shoten, 1958–1964. Vol. 4, p. 208.

4 Speech in 1887.

5 A lecture at St. Louis in 1904. "Modern Art from a Japanese Point of View," in *The Heart of Heavan*, Tokyo, Nippon Bijutsu-in, 1922, p. 202.

Siam, Luzon, and Java?... What does it mean when civilization is talked about? It means only that the natives of the island have come to abstain from cannibalism and have accomodated themselves to slavery in the service of the white men.... In my conjecture of the future, the Chinese Empire would also be little more than a garden of the Europeans."[6] His voice of deep regret was thus to resound in India and America through Tenshin's agitating cry of "The Awakening of the East" and also Uchimura's scathing denunciation of Imperialism.

Furthermore, they were unanimous in their criticism of the superficial appearances of enlightenment in the period following the Restoration. It is true that when they pitted against them "the immanent spirit of civilization" (Fukuzawa) or "realization of the self within" (Tenshin), their central ideas were different from each other. But, to cite an example, Fukuzawa's scathing criticism of "ready credence and ready doubt" peculiar to "reformers"[7] were repeated by the two others almost in the same context. It is noted, however, that in the case of these thinkers, Japan's self-assertion *towards* the world was restrained by their sense of Japan's position *in* the world. What should be the way of Japan's contribution to the world? This was the question they had to ask in common out of their "sense of mission" and also it was a corollary of the idea of "independence." Needless to say, these thinkers' concern stands out in sharp contrast with the "self-multiplying" sense of mission of the Japanese Empire noted among the later nationalists.

Fukuzawa, Tenshin, and Uchimura devoted themselves respectively to the causes of "exhortation" to learning and education, developing art in Japan and "Japanizing" Christianity, all expecting that the future of their father-land would lie in this direction. However, Fukuzwa was not entirely a "professional scholar," Tenshin not a mere "art critic" and Uchimura not a "teacher of religion." Rather they were all "critics of civilization" who deliberately rejected the confines of professionalism. In their respective spheres of learning, art and religion, they brought their themes to a broader scope of cultural correlation and probed deeply into problems of the mental structure of the people. Further they were eventually led to attack their common problem of how to fight hard against conventional formalism in their respective fields and push forward the "reformation" of learning, art and religion. It is well

6 *Bunmei-ron no Gairyaku. Complete Works of Fukuzawa*, Vol. 4, pp. 202–203.

7 Fukuzawa, *Gakumon no Susume* 學問のすすめ (Exhortation to Learning), Part 15. *Complete Works of Fukuzawa*, Vol. 3, p. 129.

known that in his *Nihon Bunmei no Yurai* 日本文明の由來 (The Origins of Japanese Civilization), Fukuzawa scathingly criticized the convention of learning as a passtime and the exclusionism of scholars under the ancient régime. With greater emphasis, it must be pointed out that Fukuzawa never advocated *jitsugaku* 實學 (practical learning) in the sense of rejecting futile studies "of little practical use"—as noted of Confucian and Shingaku 心學 learning in the Tokugawa period—or of a mere continuation of the traditional idea of uniting study and life. According to Fukuzawa, the guild-man or craftsman mentality of scholars who "are confined in a cage called government, which they regard as the cosmos for them to live in, and agonized in that small cosmos"[8] was nothing but another expression of the absence of independence from learning. It was the "conception" of his *jitsugaku* that learning could not have the effect of improving actual life unless it is freed from the vulgar type of artisan-cult, meaning adjustment to the established social relations, and is based on "true principles."

The direction in which Tenshin sought to reform Japanese fine arts is most evidently shown in his lecture given at the Tokyo Fine Art School in 1891. Here he rejected the idea of "art for art's sake" when he said, "If on earth the sole aim of art is to give aesthetic pleasure to human minds and not to seek *jitsuyō* 實用 (practical use), then it will be no more than a craft after all. I cannot side with such arguments. Unless a work of art conveys beauty in itself and in the meantime ranges with the highest level of religion as well as literature of the time, it cannot be taken as a genuine one." What he meant here by *jitsuyō* is an opposite to the artisan-cult in the name of "art for art's sake." This flow of ideas, in a sense, finds an echo in Uchimura's view of religion, as well as having something in common with his view of literature. This of course does not mean that Uchimura rejected a "religion for religion's sake" in the sense parallel to art for art's sake. When he pitted the relentless principles of "non-church" against the existing Christian orders which seemed to rest complacent with the self-sufficiency of their tradition and systems, was not it that what he called the Second Reformation was designed to criticize the "church for the churches' sake"? Uchimura repeatedly pointed out that the moment the absolute of religion transformes itself into that of the church, on the one hand, it begins to attain the level of an entrenched religion which eventually takes the course of compromising with and following such secular authorities as power and wealth, and on the other, finds

8 *Bunmeiron no Gairyaku. Complete Works of Eukuzawa*, Vol. 4, p. 160.

expression in the hypocritical missionary work designed to favour uncivilized heathen countries with the opportunity of benefitting from "civilization." The acceptance of the church as the supreme authority only changes clergymen into craftsmen whereas the purer the belief in the Gospel is, the more effective is the "practice" of religion in the proper sense of the word—this was the conviction that Uchimura gained under the intellectual influence of Calvinism and through his personal observation of the facts about Japanese and foreign missionaries in Meiji Japan. The foregoing may have brought to light the fact that there was certain affinity between these thinkers concerning the manner in which they took their places in their respective spheres of activity and in which they set forth their respective problems.

II

The three, who lived against the background of similar circumstances in their time, picked out therefrom problems which were more or less common to them and which played roles in their respective fields in which more parallel factors are found than might be casually imagined. This is, however, no excuse for one's shutting eyes to an immense cleavage which separates them in individuality, thought and life. Since this occasion does not allow me to compare them on each point of such differences, I may try below to focus attention, by citing some examples, on a dimension where the lines of their thought met with one another, thereby groping for a few clues towards an understanding of how the initial differences in their mental reactions eventually led to a great divergence of views in the context of intellectual history.

As already stated, they became reformers in their respective spheres through the "exhortation" to learning, art, and religion, and by uniting their own "mission" with that of Japan. The very sense of mission was, in its inner structure, fundamentally conditioned by their innate dispositions and original spheres of activity, a fact which was to leave a particular mark on the nature of the "nationalism" of the three. Fukuzawa's way of thinking was thoroughly pragmatic concerning his sense of mission, too. The current problem for him to attack was determined first of all in consideration of the existing conditions. In a traditional community or in a status society, the ground of human behaviour is fixed, and no need to judge the existing conditions is keenly felt. Depending on what one is—a feudal lord, a peasant or a city commoner—what one is to do is "automatically" decided. Human

relations are usually connoted in a few norms such as the Five Human Relations and Five Virtues or the Ten Commandments of Christianity. As civilizations grow, with human relations getting more complicated internally and internationally and with social functions diversified, the situational changes intensify and the pattern of behaviour becomes versatile to that extent. As the old social status no longer exists and the "innate criteria" for discerning men and things go out of existence, men must be judged by "works" or by what they do rather than what they are. In the past it could suffice to make distinction between the good and the bad, but now the actual conditions are such that "the good with virtues do not always do good: the bad without virtues do not always do bad." In addition, as there are more "problems" to solve, there will be the need to establish an order of priority among them and make choices between relative values. Here involved is the problem of how to judge existing conditions. Thus a matter which was once decided easily by customs, "intuition" or traditional norms, is to be brought to the dimension where intelligent cognition prevails. Such was the general trend Fukuzawa himself perceived in civilization. He writes, "At this point, the duty of the Japanese is nothing but to preserve the nationality of the country. What is meant by preserving nationality is not to lose one's sovereignty. If we would not lose our sovereignty, we have to develop the intellect of the people..... In the course of developing the intellect, the most urgent thing is to adopt the spirit of civilization originating in the West and defy completely the addiction to old customs."[9] This famous declaration of Fukuzawa should therefore be taken to imply both the immediate task for Japan as a nation which had just joined the international community and his own immediate mission in Japan. Also it was itself based on his consideration of the existing conditions. Fukuzawa represented a rare case of a mind awakened to his "role." His views and choice were, in many cases, decided through exceedingly cool judgement as to what aspect of a matter needed to be emphasized in the current situation. When it was charged that, in *Gakumon no Susume*, Part VII, he had equated the loyalty of a petty servant to his master to the devotion of the great warrior of the 14th century, Kusunoki Masashige 楠木正成, to the Emperor (the well-known Nanko-Gonsuke controversies), Fukuzawa in his vindication contributed to the *Chōya Shimbun* 朝野新聞 under the pen-name of Gokurō Semban, criticized his opponent and wrote: "They confuse one thing with another by making conjectures and suppositions.

9 *Bunmei-ron no Gairyaku. Complete Works of Fukuzawa*, Vol. 4, p. 32.

For they assume that equality of rights for the people derives from republicanism, republicanism from Christianity, and Christianity is a western teaching. Thus they are indignant, presuming that because Fukuzawa is a scholar of western learning his theory of popular rights is certainly tantamount to Christianity and republicanism."[10] To such a dogmatic assumption coming from the habit of "seeing things with one eye closed," he returned a few lines of allegory which read, "A wine merchant is not always a drinker, a cake dealer does not always go in search of sweets. You should not make hasty judgment of the dealer's taste for what he sells in his shop."[11] This allegory not only gives an adept contrast of the conception of "emanation" and that of "function," but seems to symbolize the basic motive in Fukuzawa's sense of mission more clearly than he was aware. At the same time, there is no denying that an overall understanding of Fukuzawa's thought has been made very difficult by the fact that the goods to be produced and sold at his "shop," the products of his literary work, were determined not always by what his "natural" taste would dictate him but by current "demands," or what judged these to be. In this regard, there may be need to entertain some suspicion from the first as to the extent to which even his "Autobiography" may represent his self-expression or else "acting," originating in his sense of a "role" to play. Relevant to his point is the interlocking of rational *moments* with irrational ones in Fukuzawa's thought. Lurking deep in his heart and blood was the old *samurai* spirit. Seeking his primary mission, above all, in playing the role of a preacher of "the spirit of civilization," however, Fukuzawa, in principle, forbade himself to give an intellectual expression to and make "shipment" of such samurai sentiments. Had he been successful in completely excluding the matter of his natural likes and dislikes from the expression of his views originating in his situational thinking and thus controlling every bit of his speech and behaviour in consideration of his "role," something of a hopeless distaste would have been a ferment therein. If Fukuzawa is free from such an impression, would not the secret lie in his irrational pathos and its intermittent bursting?

When Uchimura ws in the extreme of sorrow and solitude following his ousting from the teaching post at the First Higher School (*Daiichi Kōtō Gakkō* 第一高等學校) and the almost simultaneous loss of his

10 November 7, 1874. *Complete Works of Fukuzawa*, Vol. 1. p. 47.

11 *Complete Works of Fukuzawa*, Vol. 1, p. 47.

wife, he wrote to Struthers, an American friend of his, as follows: "Yet *I* must understand Liberty and freedom of conscience was not at bought in any country without some such trials among some of her devoted children, and must I not be thankful that God hath chosen me to bear such burdens!"

His sense of mission represents a type closest to that of a "rational and ethical prophet" in the terms of Max Weber. His ardent love of the two J's, namely, Jesus and Japan, and the confidence with which he stood against all kinds of persecution originated not in the belief in tha oneness of ego and the ultimate, as in the case of a "model prophet" or a romantic pantheist, but exclusively in his awareness of himself being a very tiny, faithful servant of God. Compared with Fukuzawa, who emphasized "working" rather than "being" out of his pragmatism, Uchimura had to ask himself constantly "what is to be done" just because he found his mission in serving as a "tool" to realize the absolute will of God. He was thus to be a "patriotic Christian of the extreme left,"[12] who was ready to fight against the drift of "*de*nationalizing influences." This "leftmost inclination" has the same inner motivation as that type of radicalism that inevitably brought the prophets of ancient Israel, who were breaking down the stereotyped legislation and informing it with a new life, into sharp opposition to the hierarchy as the day-to-day executors of feasts and rites and, for that reason, lead them to cut off the gradation of values from established gradation of ranks in society, thus unleashing the potential energies of the masses of the lower classes. As his "Second Reformation" meant a reversal of the values of all the religious routine, Uchimura's sense of "patriotism," both internal and external, would be inconceivable without reversing the worldly and everyday concept of patriotism. In the internal sense, it was to shape into democratism (*heimin-shugi* 平民主義) and, in the external sense, into the absolute defiance of war and armament. According to Uchimura, "The Upper Ten Thousand of the Japanese society is perhaps the *lowest* Ten Thousand of Japanese morality,"[13] while the commoners were no doubt "the born aristocracy of the country." Also, war and territorial expansion meant to him the road to decline rather than the rise of the country. When he says "skepticism is needed for faith and destruction for construction" or "the world makes progress on account of antagonism and opposition,"

12 Letter to David C. Bell in 1888. *Complete Works Uchimura*, Vol. 20, pp. 195, 196.

13 "The Upper Ten Thousand of Japanese Society," *Yorodzu Chōhō*, June 1, 1897. *Complete Works of Uchimura*, Vol. 16, p. 170.

his conception is quite similar to that of Fukuzawa, who writes: "There are many falsehoods in the world of faith: there are many truths in the world of suspicion," or "the spirit of freedom exists only where there are controversies." As Fukuzawa wrote "the authority of the Japanese military is like rubber.... It has the quality of greatly swelling out before the lower, and suddenly shrinking before the upper" and formulated the structure of Japanese society in the expression "preponderance of power"[14] Uchimura, too, regarded Japanese society as "inverted pyramid society" where "We are bound upwards, and free downwords."[15] Both saw individual freedom and spiritual independence internally related to national independence. Here noticeable is the influence of their common educational assets already mentioned, such as Buckle and Guizot. In confronting to the "world" surrounding him, however, Fukuzawa's sole concern was how he could be pragmatic in adapting his own self to it, while for Uchimura, who was "standing only with God," the relationship of the "world" to himself was, by implication, one of absolute division and tension between what was in the nature of everyday affairs and what was not. It was on this point that Uchimura was to diverge from Fukuzawa, and the difference between the two was to come further to the fore as the contrast between two types of solution to the problem of "preponderance of power," as Fukuzawa sought an equilibrium of values, while Uchimura the reversal of them. It was a contrast between Fukuzawa's idea of democratism with the middle classes" as its nucleus and Uchimura's supported by the "lower-class Japanese"; and between the former's hopes for the continuous progress of Japan and the latter's expectations of a discontinuous of rather eschatological "rise of the nation." When in the face of an imminent partition of Asia by European imperialist powers Japan's defense could hardly be told from her expansion, Fukuzawa's "conception" of preferentially chosing the most urgent task in consideration of the existing conditions was led to the same conclusion Tenshin reached, that "if we do not like to be crushed under the wheels of the Juggernaut, we have to get on it."[16] Uchimura's sense of mission was so categorical that he was not affected by the situational theory and continued to predict and warn against a catastrophe which would fall on Japan if she should "get on the Juggernaut." It must

14 *Bunmei-ron no Gairyaku. Complete Works of Fukuzawa*, Vol. 4.

15 "Lack of Japanese Morality," *Yorodzu Chōhoō*, March 23, 1897. *Collected Works of Uchimura*, Vol. 16, p. 85.

16 Lecture at St. Louis.

be remembered, however, that his denunciation of the authority and the ruling groups, even in the first decade of this century when it was most violent, remained "extreme leftist" from an entirely transcendental point of view and, so to speak, represented *political* radicalism from an *anti*-political position. There is no wonder in this connexion that as the historical course of Japan and the world got far away from his wishes and expectations, the view of history based on civilization and progress which he entertained in his youth receded, and instead the *moment* of religious eschatology came further to the fore.

In 1892 when he wrote on "Nihon-koku no Tenshoku 日本國の天職 (The Mission of Japan)" for *Rikugō Zasshi* 六合雜誌, Uchimura could be so optimistic as to expect Japan to play the role of a mediator who would make "mechanistic Europe" known to "idealistic Asia" and open up the doors of the conservative East by way of the progressive West. In 1924, when he wrote once again on the same theme, however, he sought Japan's future solely in rehabilitating Christianity which had been deserted by and lost from the whole world. Japan would not accomplish this mission and thus rise as a nation in the true sense until she "discarded her position as a first-class power, if not she declines as a nation."[17] It is noted here that the inner renovation in the Christian sense and the reversed meaning of the "rise as a nation" remained as firmly unified as they were in the third decade of Meiji. Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that the political-social aspect of Uchimura's patriotism had become remarkably colourless. In other words, Uchimura's sense of mission disclosed its nature where it shifted from anti-political activity to non-political resignation leaving his religious "radicalism" alone to get steadily accelerated.

If it can be said that Fukuzawa was an allout prose-writing mind, while, with some dissidence, Uchimura a poet, Tenshin was certainly a poet to the bottom of his heart both in attitude to life and mode of conception. Retaining some of the spirit of enlightenment, on the one hand, his nationalism was deeply permeated with romantic sentiments, on the other. Furthermore, it clearly shows a pitfall particular to the "conception" of political romanticism.

Underlying his sense of mission and Asianism was an aesthetic and hence contemplative character. Like his contemporary, Uchimura, Tenshin, too, contrasted the "idealistic" East with the "mechanistic"

17 "Nihon no Tenshoku 日本の天職 (The Misson of Japan)," *Sheisho no Kenkyū* 聖書之研究, Nov., 1924. *Complete Works of Uchimura*, Vol. 14, p. 599.

West. While Uchimura's "ideals of the East" meant, more than anything else, religious values including Christianity itself, Tenshin's "ideals" had in their core the "aesthetic." Of course he did not talk about oriental art in a sense opposed to religion. Rather Tenshin laid emphasis on the religious nature of art in the East. Important here is, however, that his concept of religion itself has an aesthetic nature and is subjected to it. When he characterized the East by "love for the ultimate and universal," the ultimate did not mean *advaita* (state of undividedness) where a fundamental breach of ego from non-ego was not known.

Contrary to the ethics of the prophets and Calvinists who seek to resist "the world" by taking an active part "in the world" to realize the divine will therein, ideals here mean a state where one, remaining "in the world," transcends it by uniting onself with the cosmos through meditation and ecstasy. There is, in this sense, a shade of difference between mysticism and aestheticism. That was the source of difference between Uchimura and Tenshin in the reception of the "method of thinking" of modern science, and it implies much more than the apparent fact that the former was a fishery scientist by training, while the latter an artist.

Originally, romanticism was given birth where the minds awakened to ego by the revolution but disillusioned at what it actually accomplished sought a flight into the arena of history and recovered from the lost actual or imaginal sense of ego through idealizing of past times or figures. If such a recovery is sought in a flight of mind into the world of history, then history must be something that gives, among other things, a sense of security to the ego. This could be given by great personalities of the past, on the one hand, and by some "spirit" continuing throughout the changing phases of history, on the other. The romanticist *chooses* such personalities or spirit out of history. It is *by* his present self and *from* his present position that the choice is made. Insofar as this is the case, it can be said that the "spirit" of romanticism has two vehement drives contradicting each other, one seeking to thrust back pressures from history and the other aspiring to become one with the historical past through personal experience. Such a passionate champion of the history and tradition of the East and Asia as he was, Tehshin was at once vigilant against allowing "our historical sympathy to override our aesthetic discrimination," and maintained "art is of value to the extent that it speaks to us" and "it is indeed a shame that despite all our rhapsodies about the ancients we pay so little atten-

tion to our own possibilities."[18] The intellectual structure of romanticism, however, has another aspect: two such drives in his self are not felt in a clear-cut contradiction or opposition but left to fuse into an indistinct and unqualified sense of freedom. This is because the romanticist idealizes histry above all through rediscovery of "beauty" in the past. Aesthetic evaluation is found to depend more on direct sensibility than rational and ethical judgments. Therefore the "choice" from history depends all the more on subjective likes and dislikes. Such tendencies exactly fit for the romantic spirit which enjoys "unhackled" self in defiance of the laws of reason or ethical norms. So respect for the givenness of history and an arbitrary choice from history would seem to fuse without contadicting each other. Herein originated the irony that, while attacking the non-historicity of the enlightened minds, romanticists often coined from historical data a "national spirit" or "national character" by far less historical than the frameworks employed by the enlightenment thinkers.

How did Tenshin unite his individualistic idea of freedom with his nationalism? It has already been mentioned that he found the driving force of progress in the "realization of the self within"[19] and pitted it against the external influence of westernization. As far as this point is concerned, Fukuzawa, Uchimura and, as well known, Natsume Sōseki 夏目漱石, too, presented the question in the same manner, but Tenshin diverged from them where his assertion of emanation from within is connected with the organicist conception common to romantic thought as apparent in his words, "No tree can be greater than the power that the power that is in the seed."[20] For since emanation from within and originality are presented here as the revelation of what has been originally immanent, in defiance of their dynamic interaction with the existing conditions, the "Ideals of the East" have to be sought for exclusively in the historical past prior to "the impact of modern times." Thus, while willingly admitting that modern times for the first time brought about the concept of individual freedom, Tenshin praises the eastern freedom of living under the roof of clouds and sleeping on the bed of mountains as representing a higher level of values than the European based on "that crude notion of personal rights."[21] The freedom of self-realization is channelled into the eastern "spirit" of becoming one with

18 Okakura, *The Book of Tea*, New York, Fox Duffield, 1906, pp. 117, 113, 119.

19 Okakura, *The Awakening of the Japan. Complete Works of Okakura*, Vol. 2, Tokyo, Sōgen-sha, 1945, p. 4.

20 Okakura, *The Ideals of the East*, London, John Murray, 1903, p. 240.

21 Okakura, *The Awakening of the East*, Tokyo, Seibunkaku, 1940, p. 37.

the Universal, dropping almost all its historical character. Furthermore, when he sees the glory of Asia in " that harmony that brings together emperor and peasant " and " that sublime intuition of oneness," and also when he praises the Meiji Restoration solely from the viewpoint that " high and low become one in the great new energy,"[22] it is indisputable that the joint current of organistic thinking and the aesthetic view of history overflows into the realm of politics to conceal the fact of class and beautify unjustifiably the social stagnation. Could it be attributed to the non-political mind of an artist that Tenshin's nationalism, compared with Fukuzawa's and Uchimura's was noticeably lacking in criticism of the dominant state system? In fact, a passage from " The Ideals of the East " reads, " In spite of political squabbles—natural-unnatural children of a contitutional system such as was freely bestowed by the monarch in 1892—a word from the throne will still conciliate the Government and Opposition."[23] What a contrast is this to Uchimura, who writes, " Rightly understood, the Japanese parliament can be no more than a body of advisers. It can scarcely be called a parliament, therefore;—a parliament that expresses the will of the people, *against* the will of the sovereign if need be."[24] (emphasis as in original) If underlying Fukuzawa's thinking was pluralistic equilibrium and Uchimura's were opposition and strain, Tenshin's catch phrases were always harmony, oneness and " *advaitas*." " The true infinity is the circle, not the extended line. Every organism implies a subordination of parts to a Real equality lies in the due fulfilment of the whole respective function."[25]

Tenshin thus understood even Hegelian dialectics simply in terms of the organic theory. Nevertheless, there was a consistent conflict in Tenshin's thought, too. That is, a conflict between European " science " and Asian "ideals" or art. The central problem in his view of "Western encroachment" was that the beautiful was sacrificed to "sysem," "division," and " classification." When he pointed out vulgarism in tastes and standardization of individuality as resultant from industrialization and mass democracy and also a strange alliance of Christianity and torpedoes, his criticism of modern times was certainly fierce and in itself to the point. Such criticism was emotionally exhalted through the " disintegration of concepts " particular to romanticism. Consequently Asia or Japan was, on the one hand, to be denied an internal co-ordination

22 *The Ideals of the East*, p. 216.
23 *The Ideals of the East*, pp. 216.
24 "Lack of Japanese Morality." *Complete Works of Uchimura*, Vol. 16, p. 86.
25 *The Awakening of the East*, p. 38.

because of such ideals as "harmony" and "non-duality," and, on the other, to be driven into a categorical correlation with the external influence, Europe. This is symbolized in the relationship between *genres* such as "art" and "science." Needless to say, Tenshin should be "rehabilitated" from the pulpit where he was thrust up by Fascists in later years as "the prophet of the New Order in Greater East Asia," and it is not difficult to do so. Nevertheless, when the conception of development emanating from within Asia became connected with the formula of emulation of modern Europe, as just mentioned, Tenshin's view of his mission, whether or not he was aware, had crossed the Rubicon at a fatal point.

III

Although the structure of thought in these three thinkers' sense of mission shows patterns "typically" different from—even for such a prophet of "national decline" as Uchimura—each other, underlying them invariably was an infinite confidence in the future of Japan and the Japanese which was based on the energies unleashed in the early Meiji years. Such confidence, constantly mixed with their grave worries about "existing conditions" and their sense of almost hopeless difficulty in solving the "problems" facing them, always made their patriotic appeals resound simultaneously in major and minor modes and thus, along with their unique styles of writing, would captivate the audience with fascinating allurements. Probably relevant to this may be the strange unanimity in paradoxes or ironic expressions which everywhere attend on their voice in society. Even in that case, however, the three are divided on the internal structure of paradoxes or ironies. For instance, when Fukuzawa wrote that in terms of the check and balance of powers or values, the Tokugawa period enjoyed greater freedom than the Meiji period, or that "priests, having emerged from the secular, are more secular than the secular," he also passed judgment on the given conditions, as a passage taken from his writing reads, "the people's minds in Japan are liable to be one-sided. ... They are strongly prejudiced towards their likes and opposed to their dislikes. ... They seem to run in one direction along a straight road which abruptly discontinues without leaving them even a little room alongside for a nimble adaptation."[26] Based on this judgment, he sought to apply his "tactical"

26 Fukuzawa, "Shakai no Keisei Gakusha no Hōkō 社會の形勢學者の方向 (The Condition of Society and the Direction of Scholars," *Jiji Shimpō* 時事新報, Jan.–Apr., 1888.

consideration for the purpose of undoing such a "concentrated pattern of thinking" (indulgence) as seen above. In contrast, the paradoxes in Uchimura's writings sound like something in the nature of the groans a prophet would heave at the climax of despair and indignation, and therefore involve virtually no factor of "play" seeking. For instance, he writes: "I dislike superstitions. Superstitions are, however, by far more amiable than the Christianity of modern men. They are at least sincere and serious, and differ diametrically from the religion of modern men which is a kind of hobby."[27]

Compared with this, Tenshin's remarks are more of an irony than a paradox, when he writes:

"He [the average Westerner] was wont to regard Japan as barbarous while she indulged in the gentle arts of peace: he calls her civilised since she began to commit wholesale slaughter on Manchrian battle-fields."[28]

The irony here is typical of a romanticist who seeks to reserve his own realm indefinitely between decadance and soberness. In short, the difference of "philosophy" between the three leaves an imprint on their modes of conception, too, and yet it remains worth noticing that each of them, out of the profound sense of crisis, unintentionally turned to paradoxes and ironies for a remedy. Needless to say, they come under the category of men different from that of mere "paradox-lovers" who proudly sport their talent.

Fukuzawa's motto of "independence and self-respect" represented the creed or attitude in the actual life that in a sense applied also to Tenshin and Uchimura. At the same time, the three had a savour of the frankness and innocence of children in their manner: instead of taking a dauntless attitude, they were unreserved in disclosing their weaknesses to others. This aspect of character of Fukuzawa and Tenshin is relatively well known. The same can be noted of Uchimura, too, who lived with the unshakable confidence which appears in his statement that "I dare to go my way even in spite of an enemy of tens of thousands of men" and who boasted of "being a son of a *samurai*." For instance, learning that Nakae Chōmin 中江兆民 had started preparing his famous *Ichinen Yūhan* 一年有半 (One Year and a Half) on hearing the doctor's pronouncement of the time of his death,

Complete Works of Fukuzawa, Vol. 11, p. 184.

27 Uchimura, "Bungakusha no Kirisuto-kyō 文學者の基督教 (Christianity of Literary Men)," *Seisho no Kenkyū* May, 1920. *Complete Works of Uchimura*, Vol. 9, p. 111.

28 *The Book of Tea*, p. 7.

Uchimura is said to have told Narusawa Reisen 成澤玲川 "I could stand that by no means. If my doom were pronounced like that by the doctor, I would weep all night away and would pray."[29] How uncritically Fukuzawa was pleased at the victory in the Sino-Japanese War has been described in his "Autobiography" (*Fukuō Jiden* 福翁自傳), and this is not quite surprising. One should have certainly been suprised at the contrast in the behaviour of Uchimura who had been so passionately crying against war before and after the Russo-Japanese War broke out and who, on hearing the news of the great naval victory at Port Arthur, expressed his delight in a letter to Yamagata Isoo 山縣五十雄 and wrote: "I gave three loud 'Teikoku banzai' (Three cheers for the Empire!) to be heard throughout all my neighborhood."[30] All this may be explained by the simple fact that he, too, was after all a Meiji personality. Towards the end of his life, Uchimura wrote in anarticle "Self-Contradictions":

"Said Walt Whitman: 'I have self-contradictions, because I am large.' and God the largest is the most self-contradictory of all beings. He loves, He hates. He is love itself, and a consuming fire at the same time. And His true children are always like Him. Paul, Luther, Cromwell,—what combinations of self-contradictions, of mother-loves and father-angers."[31]

These words may be taken as telling of himself unasked. If such was the case even with Uchimura, it is no boubt easy to pick a good many contradictory propositions out of Fukuzawa who always spoke in consideration of particular circumstances and Tenshin a romantic poet. However, as a man has little personal attraction if he is completely guarded against getting out of himself, a system of thought which is constructed in perfect order like a textbook of formal logic is not always high in value as *thought*. On the other hand, a mere promiscuous collection of casual ideas, no matter how novel these may be, will not produce an original thinker. The views and behaviour of these three have some basic tone which is resounding persistently in their writing, despite all the contradictions they have. Or rather, something that is in them gives those contradictions refreshing vitality and tense spirit. Is not a truly individualistic thinker like that? The thought that is most individualistic, to the point of including in it the most universal

29 Suzuki Toshirō 鈴木俊郎 ed., *Kaisō no Uchimura Kanzō* 回想の内村鑑三 (Uchimgra Kanzō in Memories), Tokyo, Iwanami-shoten, 1956, p. 266.

30 Suzuki, p. 207.

31 Uchimura, "Self-Contradictions," *Seisho no Kenkyū*, Aug., 1923. *Complete Works of Uchimura*, Vol. 15, p. 498.

is indeed worth studying. It is, at the same time, a form of thought not easy to "learn." Here lies the reason why it is often from among epigones of the thinker who really deserves the name that a thought-peddler who has the greatest smack of a thinker comes.

"Does the Soul speak or not? Oh, the Soul no longer speaks," said Schiller. The moment thought leaves the flesh and blood of the thinker to obtain an "objective figure," it begins to go all by itself. When it goes into the hands of an epigone to be praised and even "worshipped," its original, internal strain is relaxed, diversity polished into smoothness and lively contradictions unified or inherited only partially with dynamism therein replaced by coagulation. Like Uchimura, who said in his posthumous manuscripts, "I am not a non-churchist now in fashion," Fukuzawa or Tenshin, had they been alive during and after the Second World War, would have entertained the same emotion, with indignation and also with a tincture of resignation, about the Fukuzawa-ism or Tenshin-ism "now in fashion." That known lamentation of Karl Marx—"*je ne suis pas Marxist*"—may therefore be a murmur breaking from the lips of any great thinker who has witnessed his thought irresistably following its destined course.