

Profile of Asian Minded Man -VII-

SAKUZŌ YOSHINO

TAKAYOSHI MATSUO

INTRODUCTION

Sakuzō Yoshino was, together with Tatsukichi Minobe, a distinguished theoretical leader in the Taishō Democracy. Both of them were faculty members of the Law School of Tokyo Imperial University. Tatsukichi Minobe engaged within the university in theoretical and academic studies of the Meiji Constitution based on the Emperor-Organ Theory, and provided a legal basis for operating the political institutions of the Emperor system according to the principles of constitutional monarchy, as in Great Britain. Sakuzō Yoshino advocated "Mimpon-shugi," the leading ideology of Taishō Democracy in the initial stage, in journalistic activities outside of the university, directly attacked the tyrannical control of the Emperor system, and guided public opinion. His influence over the general public was much greater than that of Minobe.

The studies concerning these two persons were promoted with the increasing academic interest in Taishō Democracy shown in recent years. Studies of Minobe, however, have been far superior to studies of Yoshino both in extent and depth.¹ The Emperor-Organ Theory of Minobe is much more popular than the Mimpon-shugi of Yoshino among foreign scholars studying Japan.

Among the few studies on Yoshino there have been several works which have treated his view of Asian affairs. Judging from the fact that about one-sixth of his numerous writings dealt mainly with China and Korea, it would be quite improper to try to evaluate Yoshino without a careful reading of these works.

Such remarks regarding this side of Yoshino's opinion as had rarely appeared up to this time, resulted in his being accused of being weak-kneed towards Japanese imperialism because of his ambiguous attitude,² and further, some of them denounced him and attributed to him responsibility for the

¹ Two extensive works concerning Tatsukichi Minobe have been published: Juichi Nakase, *Kindai no Tennō-kan* (Emperor from the Modern Viewpoint), Tokyo, Sanichishobō, 1964 and Saburō Ienaga, *Minobe Tatsukichi no shisōshi-teki kenkyū* (Studies of Minobe in the History of Thought of Japan), Tokyo, Iwanami-shoten, 1965. As for the biography of Yoshino, Sōgorō Tanaka's is the only publication (Tokyo, Miraisha, 1958).

² For example, Kiyoshi Inoue, "Gendaishi gaisetsu" (Outline of Modern History), in *Iwanami kōza: Nihon rekishi* (Iwanami Lectures: History of Japan), Vol. 18, Tokyo, Iwanami-shoten, 1963.

Japanese invasion of China on the grounds of their perversion that Yoshino supported imperialism and opposed the Chinese nationalism.⁸ Those antagonists must have obtained an illusory profile of Sakuzō Yoshino from reading only a portion of his works.

From reading all Yoshino's works on China and Korea, I have arrived at a conclusion: from 1916 on Yoshino consistently criticized the invasion policy of Japan and hoped to establish friendly relations among Asian nations on the principle of self-determination. In the following pages his life history will be briefly outlined and the developments of his opinions concerning China and Korea will be explained.

I

Sakuzō Yoshino was born at Furukawa-chō in Miyagi prefecture, in 1878. His family were merchants engaged in the manufacturing and sale of cotton yarn and cotton cloth, and belonged to the middle class. In 1900 he was admitted to the Law School of Tokyo Imperial University where he specialized in political science. The teachers who greatly influenced him while he was a student were Kiheiji Onozuka, the founder of democratic political science in Japan, and Kitokurō Ichiki, a forerunner of Tatsukichi Minobe in the Emperor-Organ Theory. But the most influential person in shaping Yoshino's personality and thought was Danjō Ebina, rector of the Hongō Church. Danjō Ebina believed in Free Theology and was an excellent liberal critic of politics and social affairs. Thus, noted liberal politicians and journalists of the time such as Saburō Shimada, Kazutami Ukita, and Aizan Yamaji, and Christian socialists such as Isoo Abē, Naoe Kinoshita, gathered in the Hongō Church. The church was, so to speak, the castle of progressive-minded men in Tokyo before the Russo-Japanese War. Particularly noted among those under the influence of the church were Sakuzō Yoshino and Bunji Suzuki, his spiritual brother and founder of the Yūaikai (Friendly Society), the beginning of the modern labour movement in Japan. These two persons under the influence of the church may well qualify it as the native home of Taishō Democracy.

After graduating from the university Yoshino wrote his first paper on politics in 1905. It was entitled "Hompō rikken seiji no genjō" (Japanese Constitutional Policies), and was published in *Shinjin*, the magazine of the church. In it he advocated "Shumin-shugi" as the fundamental principle in politics. He said: "The aim of sovereign actions should be in protecting and enhancing the mental and material profits of the common people as a whole." This aims at creating a government "for the people" as was declared in Lincoln's famous Gettysburg Address. He believed that, in principle, in order to bring the ideology of Shumin-shugi into effect the common people should be the judges of government policy. But the political reform he demanded

⁸ Yukio Kobayashi, "Teikoku-shugi to minpon-shugi" (Imperialism and Democracy), in *Iwanami kōza: Nihon rekishi* (Iwanami Lectures: History of Japan), Vol. 19, Tokyo, Iwanami-shoten, 1963.

at the time was only the realization of a responsible cabinet system; neither a party cabinet system nor universal suffrage were asked for because of the meagre political ability of the common people. The Shumin-shugi proposed by Yoshino during the Russo-Japanese War is worthy of attention as a criticism of the tyrannical politics of that period, but what he put forth did not go beyond the thinking of Kiheiji Onozuka and Saburō Shimada. At the same time Yoshino clearly expressed his view of upholding the Russo-Japanese War.

The reasons for supporting the Russo-Japanese War were first that whether it succeeded in maintaining Japan's possession of Manchuria or not would be the fork in the road determining the future development of commerce and industry in Japan, and second that the defeat of tyrannical and oppressive Russia would bring freedom to the Russian people and thereby peace to Europe and Asia. Yoshino took it for granted that Japan would be the "master in Manchuria and Korea."⁴ "Constitutionalism at home and imperialism abroad" was the general opinion among the liberals after the Russo-Japanese War; Yoshino also held the same view. This attitude lasted until the change in his thinking in 1916. During this period he was favoured with more opportunities of becoming interested in Korea and China than any other young intellectual of the time. At the beginning of 1905 he organized the Association for the Study of Korean Affairs with Saburō Shimada as its leader, and attempted a search for a means of revising government policies in Korea upon a humanitarian point of view. Shortly thereafter he withdrew from the association because he thought it premature to be concerned with actual policies considering the political situation.

In 1906 he was invited to be a private tutor to the son of Yüan Shih-k'ai, and went over to China to stay in Tientsin for three years. This stay was mainly for his livelihood. He was not particularly interested in the Chinese revolutionary movements, and remained silent in regard to Japanese policies in relation to China. Yoshino was appointed an assistant professor in the Law School of Tokyo Imperial University immediately after returning to Japan, and went to Europe and America for three years to study politics. In 1913 he came home and was made a Professor of Tokyo Imperial University, and taught political history. In the following year he described the process of the negotiations over the Twenty-one Demands of Japan against China in his paper entitled "Nisshi kōshō ron" (Negotiations Between China and Japan). In the third section of the paper he wrote that "the Twenty-one Demands were minimum demands... well-timed," and "the most proper measures." He also described the ideal of Japanese policy in relation to China as "helping China become strong, self-reliant, and independent." However, he approved the Japanese imperialistic invasion policies on the basis of the judgment that "Japan naturally cannot sit still and be idle

4 Sakuzō Yoshino, "Rokoku no Manshū senryō no shinsō" (Facts about the Russian Occupation of Manchuria), *Shinjin*, May, 1904, "Ōini kōkaron no okore kashi" (Hope for Rising Yellow Peril), *Shinjin*, Nov., 1904 and "Rokoku ni okeru shumin-teki seiryoku no kinjō" (Present Democratic Trends in Russia), *Shinjin*, May, 1905.

without doing anything" when the European and American powers had actually established their spheres of influence in China and were trying to enlarge them. Above quotations seem to be ground for arguing that Yoshino was not free from responsibility for the Japanese invasion of the continent.

The year 1916 was an important year in Yoshino's life; it was the year in which the direction of this thought changed. These changes might be properly termed a "reformation." From this year on he came to pay serious attention to continental questions; in particular the future prospect of Chinese revolutionary movement. In the March issue of the *Chūōkōron* he published a paper entitled "Tai Shi gaikō kompon-saku ni kansuru Nippon seikaku no kommei" (The Erroneous Policies towards China of Japanese Politicians). This paper could be regarded as certain evidence of his change of view. What he emphasized in the paper was that "hundreds of youths advocating reform of their motherland would probably be the eternal forces in the future China." He perceived for the first time the bright future of the revolutionary forces in China and publicly expressed his appreciation and support of this movement.

Hereafter Yoshino frequently discussed Chinese affairs in his articles in the *Chūōkōron*, one of the leading magazines of the time. He abused the government's policy of giving support to the anti-revolutionary régime in China in one paper,⁵ and in another⁶ he criticized "Asianism," the ideology of Japanese expansion on the continent, saying that the principle was produced for the good of the Japanese people only, and tended to lead to anti-foreign ideas and isolation policies. He insisted in the same paper on respect for the racial self-determination of the Chinese people, saying that "the independence of China should be determined by the Chinese people themselves" and it should not be interfered with by the Japanese. During this period Yoshino supported the Ishii-Lansing Note; he assumed the agreement would help maintain Japanese rights in Manchuria and Inner Mongolia.⁷ However, he consistently supported the Chinese revolutionary forces and tried to have Japanese interference policies against the extension of the revolutionary forces abandoned. This reformation of Yoshino's thought was a tremendous leap over his previous attitude and was an admirable stand for him to have taken in the midst of the general tendency of despising the Chinese.

What caused these remarkable changes? The first cause to be mentioned is the direct effect of his studies of the Chinese revolutionary movement. While staying in Europe Yoshino heard of a Chinese prodigy, Wang Cheng-

⁵ Sakuzō Yoshino, "Gen naikaku no iwayuru Nisshi shinzen no sasshin" (Reform of the So-called Friendly Relations between China and Japan of the Present Cabinet), *Chūōkōron*, Feb. 1917.

⁶ Sakuzō Yoshino, "Ōtani Kōzui shi no 'Teikoku no kiki' wo yomu" (Criticism on Kōzui Ōtani's 'Vicissitudes of the Japanese Empire'), *Chūōkōron*, Apr., 1917.

⁷ Sakuzō Yoshino, "Nichi-Bei kyōdō sengen no kaietsu oyobi hihan" (Explanation and Criticism of the U. S.-Japan Joint Statement), *Chūōkōron*, Dec., 1917.

ting (later Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Kuomintang government), at the Young Men's Christian Association in Paris, and came home hoping to meet Wang some day. When Yoshino knew that Wang was in the Revolutionary Party, he began to be interested in this movement. Then he started to write a Chinese revolutionary history (published as *Shina kakumei shōshi* in 1917) at the request of Mitsuru Tōyama, head of the right-wing political segments, and Tōru Terao, Professor of Tokyo Imperial University. He came into contact with Tai Chi-tao and Yin Ju-keng, both Chinese political refugees, and read *Sanjū-san nen no yume* (Dreams of Thirty-three Years) written by Tōten Miyazaki. He came "to know the rising great revolutionary spirit in recent China," and started "to study Chinese affairs with great enthusiasm."⁸

This sympathy of Yoshino towards the Chinese Revolution was closely connected with his strong, positive attacks against tyrannical government in Japan. In the January, 1916 issue of the *Chūōkōron* he wrote a long, laborious paper, "Kensei no hongi wo toite sono yūshū-no-bi wo nasu no michi wo ronzu" (The Cardinal Principle of Constitutional Government and the Way to Its Achievement), and clearly announced for the first time his political idea of "Mimpon-shugi." To the previous Shumin-shugi principle of "emphasizing the profit and happiness of the general public as the objective of the use of sovereign power," was added definitely the idea of "the common people determining finally the use of sovereign power." In other words, "by the people" was added to "the government for the people."

The idea "of the people," which meant the people's sovereignty, was carefully omitted in his Mimpon-shugi. This might be explained partly by assuming that Yoshino was still a captive of the magic influences of Emperor worship, as was the case with many of the liberal intellectuals of the time, and partly by supposing that he intentionally tried to escape possible pressure from the government. It might be said that Yoshino was not a republican democrat of the French type, but was a democrat of the English type, of a constitutional monarchy. He earnestly urged the establishment of a party cabinet system based on universal suffrage as the Mimpon-shugi government which should be realized, and a very fierce discussion campaign against the military authorities and conservative bureaucratic forces that opposed Yoshino's opinion. His discussion activities, which were taken to represent popular demands for political freedom among the urban middle-class people of Japan, were heartily greeted by the intellectuals. Now Yoshino was at the very front of the Taishō Democracy movement. Yoshino's anti-régime stand developed into cordial, friendly feelings towards the Chinese youth in the Chinese revolutionary movement who were fighting to overthrow the feudal, military forces.

One more thing to be mentioned is that Yoshino also wrote a paper

⁸ Sakuzō Yoshino, "Shina mondai ni tsuite" (On the China Problem), *Reimei Kōenshū* (Collection of Speeches at the Reimeikai Assembly), Vol. 1, No. 4 (1919), and Yoshino's preface to the second edition of Tōten Miyazaki's work, *Sanjū-san nen no yume* (Dreams of Thirty-three Years), Tokyo, Fukunaga-shoten, 1926.

criticizing the politics for governing Korea in 1916. Since the annexation of Korea in 1910 Japan had enforced extreme military governing policies there. Very few people dared to stand up to criticize the military rule of the time. Yoshino, however, exposed the evils of military governing policies in Korea in his paper "Man-Kan wo shisatsu shite," (An Investigation Trip to Manchuria and Korea) which appeared in the June issue of the *Chūōkōron*. He explained that the Japanese intention to assimilate Koreans and Manchurians with the Japanese could not be realized. He insisted that the ideal of governing different nations would be respecting their independence and urged that their political self-rule should at least be acknowledged and that their psychological aspects should not be ignored. Thus, he strongly abused the oppressive Korean policies. His daring discussions, which must have required remarkable bravery at the time, were inseparably linked to Yoshino's popular stand as was the case with his discussion on China.

II

Since the rice riots in the summer of 1918, various democratic movements rapidly developed in Japan with the spreading of a world-wide tide of reformation in politics and social organization after the First World War. Yoshino organized the radical, representative intellectuals, including the editors of the principal magazines, to form the Reimeikai (Dawn Society), which fulfilled the role of being the theoretical leader of the democratic movements of the time; he was then at the zenith of his social activities.

Two very important incidents, the March First Independence Movement in Korea and the May Fourth Movement in China, broke out one after another. These two movements were both anti-Japanese. Moreover, the prevailing atmosphere in pre-war Japan was anti-foreign. Therefore the Japanese were naturally predisposed against these movements, and it was difficult in such mood to correctly evaluate the movements, much less to know how to establish the real friendship between the two nations and Japan. What was Yoshino's attitude at the time? His attitude would illuminate conclusively to what extent Yoshino was democratic, and how thoroughgoing was his criticism of imperialism.

In the March First Movement the Korean nationalists issued a declaration of independence for Korea and hundreds of thousands of Koreans, centring around students, staged a demonstration procession in Seoul on the day of the national funeral of the previous Korean King, Li-t'ai-wang (Li-hsi), March 1, 1919. The effects of this immediately spread all over Korea. The Japanese government strongly opposed such peaceful processions and suppressed the movement; even the inaccurate statistics of the Japanese government showed that about eight thousand Koreans were killed.

The principal newspapers and magazines in Japan at that time ascribed the cause of the incident to a plot by Chon-to-kyo believers and Christians who were mainly agitated into the movement by American missionaries, and abused the people's movement, saying that the common people were happier

after the enforcement of annexation, but even those in journalism saw the errors of the military governing policies up to that time. They demanded changes in the policies and discussed the necessity of respecting the traditional customs and manners of Korea, increasing opportunities of official appointments for Koreans, respecting freedom of speech, and allowing Korean participation in suffrage. But self-determination for Korean nationals was urged in the editorial of the *Tōyōkeizai shimpō*,⁹ and by a very small number of people, such as Shigeo Suehiro, Professor of Kyoto Imperial University.¹⁰

In August, 1919 governing policies in Korea were improved to a certain extent; the military Governor-General system, and the military rule supported by the military police were discontinued, to be succeeded by "civilized rule," and a new Governor-General declared that the rights of the Korean people would be recognized as equal to the Japanese. The public responses to these changes in Korean policies were rather complex; the changes were greeted superficially on the one hand, but on the other, the independence movements were regarded with hostility, and the need to control insurgents was urged.

These general trends in journalism, which accompanied the oppressive measures of the Japanese government against the press with regard to Korean affairs, helped to breed among the Japanese people a feeling of contempt for the Korean people, and at the same time a fear of them.

From the outset the response of Yoshino to the independence movements was quite different from that of the general public. He opposed the popular belief that the movement started through agitation by outsiders, and asked that the state of affairs in Korea be observed from the Korean standpoint. To conclude, he urged that not only individual governing policies in Korea but also fundamental principles such as racial assimilation and the historical fact of annexation itself should be reconsidered.¹¹ As urgent reforms to be put into practice he demanded freedom of speech, abolition of discrimination against Koreans, and the abandonment of military rule.¹² In August, when the new Governor-General was appointed, he expressed himself content with this designation and the new governing policies issued.¹³ This was along the same general lines as the trends in journalism, but Yoshino's true merit was displayed when he willingly spoke for the independence movements in the face of public opinion opposed to it.

⁹ Editorial of the *Tōyōkeizai shimpō*, "Senjin bōdō ni kansuru rikai" (True Understanding of the Korean Disturbance), May 15, 1919.

¹⁰ Shigeo Suehiro, "Chōsen jichi mondai" (The Korean Autonomy Problems), *Taiyō*, Vol. 25, No. 9 (July, 1919).

¹¹ Sakuzō Yoshino, "Taigai-teki ryōshin wo hakki" (Conscientious Attitude Towards Foreign Countries), *Chūōkōron*, Apr., 1919.

¹² Sakuzō Yoshino, "Chōsen tōchi no kaikaku ni kansuru saishōgen no yōkyū" (Minimum Demands for the Reformation of the Japanese Reign in Korea), in *Reimei kōenshū*, op. cit., Vol. 1, No. 6.

¹³ Sakuzō Yoshino, "Shin sōtoku oyobi shin seimusōkan wo mukau" (At the Appointment of the New Governor-General and the New Civil Governor), *Chūōkōron*, Sept., 1919.

At the beginning of 1920 the Japanese government authorities, who looked upon the Young Men's Christian Association of Koreans in Tokyo as one of the sources of the Korean independence movements, transferred administration of the Association buildings to the Japanese Congregational Church, abolished the dormitory attached to the Association, and made plans to accommodate Korean students in the dormitory under the supervision of the Korean Governor-General's Office. Yoshino wrote a paper, "Chōsen seinenkai mondai" (Korean Young Men's Association Problem) in the February and March issues of the *Shinjin*, the Hongō Church magazine, in which he pointed out the ineffectiveness of the government's measures taken on the problem, and put forth his opinion of the independence movements as follows:

"My greatest regret is that many people...looked upon them as criminals who disobeyed the Japanese constitution and laws...It cannot be denied that Koreans are legally Japanese subjects, but Koreans do not in fact belong to the *Yamato* (Japanese) race. It is natural, in my opinion, that Koreans, who do not belong to the pure *Yamato* race but who were annexed to Japan under circumstances beyond their free will and governed under a terrible military rule, should not think of the Japanese in the same way that the Japanese do, although it is a matter of great regret to us. From the Koreans' standpoint and from the purely moral point of view, defiance of the Japanese legal order does not appear to be unwarranted... Thus, moral abuses by Japan sting our consciences."

Tsurukichi Maruyama, a high official in the police department in the Office of the Governor-General of Korea and in charge of controlling the independence movements, attacked Yoshino's statement in the next issue of the *Shinjin*. "It is legally correct and morally good that Koreans comply with the Japanese legal order. Yoshino treats independence-minded Korean agitators as patriots, but this treatment is almost equal to giving up Japanese territory in Korea."¹⁴

In replying to this Yoshino wrote another paper in the April issue of the magazine, and introduced once again the subject of the proper relations to be realized between Korea and Japan, as follows:

"I am definitely against keeping Korea united with Japan by compelling the Korean people legally and formally to be in slavish submission. Japan should, in my opinion, give up Korea in the formal sense, but giving up Korea in the formal sense is the beginning of achieving true union with Korea. It is my ideal to unite with them from a much higher moral standpoint.

"Scientific studies over many years make me assert that assimilation of a race is almost an impossibility. If the ideal of governing policies for Korea were to try to make Koreans formally Japanese, nothing would be more unscientific than that. Thus, co-operation between the Korean and the Japanese in the highest moral sense must be the ideal of governing in Korea. Here it is quite clear that we have to co-operate with them in the generally acceptable human basis when we get in contact with them or if we want to improve our relations between Korea and Japan. No unity would be possible under prejudiced conditions. Be obedient to the Japanese legal order. That is the Japanese

¹⁴ Tsurukichi Maruyama, "Chōsen tōchisaku ni kanshi Yoshino hakushi ni tadasu" (Questions to Dr. Yoshino on Governing Policies in Korea), in *Zaisen yonen-han* (Four Years and a Half in Korea), Tokyo, Shozanbō, 1924.

standpoint. Be it the Japanese, the Koreans, or the Chinese, it is a universally accepted moral to hope to recover one's fatherland. It is my opinion that the way for the true co-operation between the Koreans and the Japanese will be discovered by having the universally accepted moral made the supreme principle for the co-operation of the two nations."

Yoshino wrote a paper to the same effect entitled "Iwayuru Ro Un-kyō jiken ni tsuite" (So-called Yu Un-hyoung Incident) in the *Chūōkōron* of January, 1920, in which he clearly asserted that only on the general principle of racial self-determination would co-operation between the Korean race and the Japanese be made possible. As early as 1919, Yoshino demanded not simply the improvement of Korea policies for governing, but the very independence of Korea. He did not remain content in the sphere of the racial emancipation movement in general, but supported the struggles for racial emancipation directed against the imperialism of his own fatherland in particular. This was incomparable and supreme international thinking from Yoshino and made public in the face of personal danger. Yoshino himself represented the conscience of the Japanese common people when not even one of the socialists, supposed believers in proletarian internationalism, stood up to announce support of independence.

III

Although Yoshino's attitude to the May Fourth Movement was fundamentally the same as in the case of the March First Movement, he went ahead and tried to communicate with the leaders of the May Fourth Movement. On the 4th of May, 1919, students in Peking demonstrated against the Japanese invasion policies in relation to China. This was the trigger for firing up anti-imperialistic, anti-feudalistic patriotic campaigns in all classes of China all over the nation. This movement is termed the May Fourth Movement. The direct cause of the movement was the fact that Chinese demands such as the restitution directly to China of German rights in Shantung, the abolition of the Twenty-one Articles and of the foreign privileges of the world powers in China, were all rejected at the Peace Conference in Paris. Students of Peking University and others demonstrated with the slogans "refuse to sign the treaty," "abolition of the Twenty-one Articles," and "reject Japanese goods." They demanded the dismissal of Tsao Ju-lin, the person in charge of signing the Twenty-one Articles, and Chang Tsung-hsiang, the person in charge of the Nishihara loan, and attacked the private house of Tsao Ju-lin. Corresponding to the above movement joint struggles among students, labourers, industrialists, and merchants extended to principal cities in May and June.

Chinese demands were presented at the Peace Conference in Paris. The United States of America was friendly to the demands; Japanese public opinion unanimously rejected them, and insisted on securing Japanese rights, and encouraged the government with the saying, "Don't compromise," and thus generally looked down on the outbreak of the movement. To cite an example, the Osaka *Mainichi* scolded the movement as being equal to the

violence of a hysterical woman who had committed arson and thrown herself into a well." (May 6, 1919) Many journalists emphasized that the movement arose through American agitation and of them some criticized the movement at being due to the effects of the traditional Chinese policy of "befriending distant states and of antagonizing neighbours." Only a minority ascribed the origin of the movement to the racial aspirations of the Chinese people.

Some of the articles on the Japanese attitude towards the movement, such as the June 6 article of the Osaka *Mainichi*, insisted on the one hand that, in order not to commit the errors of causing an upheaval similar to the Russian Revolution, the Japanese government should offer arms and loans to the military régime in Peking, and should also help train and organize their military corps.

On the other hand some articles, such as the June 7 article of the Osaka *Asahi*, opposed the adoption of aggressive measures, and asked for the promotion of the unreserved policies of co-operation with the European and American powers in diplomatic affairs in China. Shintarō Inagaki, a critic of Chinese problems, insisted on adopting the following policies for the revision of the Twenty-one Articles Treaty: the abolition of consular jurisdiction, the amendment of customs duties, and the withdrawal of Japanese troops from China. He advised the cessation of political interference by the military authorities in internal affairs in Japan, which invited misunderstanding on the part of China. In any case, voices friendly to the Chinese revolutionary movement, again as at the time of the Chinese Revolution of 1911, were very few.

In the midst of this situation the leading article of the *Chūōkōron*, "Peking gakuseidan no kōdō wo manba suru nakare" (Don't Scorn the Actions of Peking Students Groups), appeared on the front page of the June issue in 1919, the main contents of the article being as follows:

"We should be very careful so as not to commit the following two errors when we criticize their [Peking student groups] actions. The first is to accept the young politicians of Tsao Ju-lin and Chang Tsung-hsiang group as friendly to Japan. The second is to regard the anti-Japanese feelings of the Chinese people, particularly as represented by the students, as something indomitable.

Tsao and Chang have hitherto been considered friendly to Japan, but how far did their friendly actions to Japan satisfy the real needs of the Japanese people? No doubt they were friends of bureaucrats, militarists, and plutocrats, but it is still very doubtful whether they were friends of the Japanese people themselves. Anti-Japanese feeling among the Chinese people themselves is nothing but their antipathy against the Japan represented by the bureaucrats, militarists, and plutocrats.

"...Therefore the effective means of nullifying anti-Japanese incidents in China is not to help the pro-Japan group, Tsao and Chang, to suppress complaints among the common people. We ourselves should restrain the Chinese policies of the militarists and the plutocrats to make the real, peaceful demands of the Japanese people understood by our friends in neighbouring countries. In order to achieve this aim we have striven hard to free our beloved Japan from the hands of militarists and bureaucrats. Does not the movement of the student groups in Peking aim at attaining the same goal as ours? Suc-

cess to our emancipation movement at the first opportunity! May success be with the peoples' movements of neighbouring countries. Only after emancipation from the hands of bureaucrats and militarists will firm national friendship be realized. The previous so-called friendly relations were great obstacles in disguise to real friendly relations."

This paper was much superior to the popular articles at the time in the following three points: First, the paper made it clear that the anti-Japanese sentiments of the Chinese people were directed against the governing classes in Japan, that is, the bureaucrats, militarists, and plutocrats, but not against the Japanese people. Second, the objectives of the May Fourth Movement were the same as those of the Taishō Democracy. Third, friendly relations between China and Japan could be realized only if the two peoples had been emancipated from the control of the militarists and bureaucrats. It may be not too much to say that this was the first paper since 1900 that pointed out the true way to friendly relations between China and Japan, and is worthy of being recorded in history.

The writer of this paper was Sakuzō Yoshino himself. In the next issue of the *Chūōkōron* he rejected the prevailing view that the May Fourth Movement was caused by the agitation of Great Britain and the United States, or by the intrigues of small numbers of Chinese tacticians. He asserted that "the present movement is the movement of the Chinese people themselves." He clearly defined the characteristic of the May Fourth Movement as being anti-feudal and anti-imperialist: "One of the objectives of the movement is the rejection of the aggressive policies of foreign countries, and another is the elimination of tyrannical bureaucracy at home. Because Japan is regarded as the champion of foreign invasion policies, and because a few so-called pro-Japanese young politicians have been taken to be the villains of bureaucracy, the movement is directed against Japan."¹⁵ Moreover, he was the most sympathetic of the Japanese to the so-called "new civilization movement" which lay at the bottom of the May Fourth Movement and which aspired to destroy feudal culture.¹⁶

As has been mentioned above, Yoshino emphasized the struggles towards common political objectives by the peoples of both China and Japan, and as a step forward he planned co-operation among those in the democratic movement of the two countries through exchanges of progressive-minded professors and students. Thus, he talked the above matter over with the members of the Reimeikai, and in June, 1919 he communicated the plan to Li Ta-chao, Professor of Peking University and one of the leaders of the May Fourth Movement and one of the founders of the Chinese Communist Party. Li heartily responded to the plan, and advised Yoshino to visit China. The All-China Students Association, the nucleus of the movement, sent an ardent letter to the Reimeikai proposing mutual help in order to destroy the

¹⁵ Sakuzō Yoshino, "Shina ni okeru hai-Nichi jiken" (Anti-Japan Incidents in China), *Chūōkōron*, July, 1919.

¹⁶ Sakuzō Yoshino, "Pekin daigaku ni okeru shinshichō no bōkkō" (The Rise of New Ideas in Peking University), *Chūōkōron*, June, 1919.

militarists.¹⁷

This plan did not materialize during 1919, but early in the following year a student of Tokyo Imperial University, Ryūsuke Miyazaki, the son of Tōten Miyazaki and a student of Yoshino's, went over to Shanghai and spoke at the general meeting of the All-China Students Association, and in May, 1920 five Chinese students came over to Japan, headed by Kao I-han, Professor of Peking University. They visited Tokyo Imperial University, Waseda University, and other universities where they were warmly received with open arms by progressive professors, students, and leaders of labour unions, and exchanged opinions with these Japanese. In order to repay the Chinese visit it was planned that Yoshino and others visit China. But the Japanese government prohibited their trip on the grounds that "their visit would not be favourable to diplomatic relations between China and Japan." Thus the hope of friendly relations between the two was cut off at the outset.¹⁸

IV

After the First World War various strata of the common people, such as workers, farmers, *burakumin*, students, women, and others, voluntarily organized themselves into groups. These organized working people, together with urban middle-class people, became the base for the support of Taishō Democracy. First anarcho-syndicalism and then Marxism came to lead these organizations. Yoshino opposed materialism from the Christian point of view, and direct action or violent revolution from the viewpoint of parliamentary democracy, had the effect of lessening his public influence after 1920. Yoshino, however, was not against the organized movements of the people themselves, and he supported the economic system of socialism. He attacked tyrannical institutions in Japan at every opportunity. Although he retreated from the very front line of government opposers, he was one of the most formidable enemies of the governing authorities. In 1923, at the time of the Great Earthquake in the Kantō District, he barely escaped assassination by the militarists. In the following year Yoshino resigned from the post of Professor of Tokyo Imperial University in order to work for the Osaka *Asahi* Newspaper, but the Kiyoura bureaucratic cabinet forced the Osaka *Asahi* to dismiss Yoshino after only three months at the *Asahi* because of an article by Yoshino which attacked the Privy Council.

Yoshino went back to Tokyo Imperial University as a lecturer, organized the Society for Studies of Meiji Civilization, and became engaged in the collection of and research into fundamental material on various fields such as politics, thought, society, and civilization before the promulgation of the Meiji Constitution. The achievements of the society resulted in the publica-

¹⁷ Sakuzō Yoshino, "Nichi-Shi kokumin-teki shinzen no shokkō." (The Dawn of the People's Goodwill between China and Japan), *Kaihō*, Aug., 1919.

¹⁸ Takayoshi Matsuo, *Taishō demokurashī no kenkyū* (Studies on Taishō Democracy), Tokyo, Aoki-shoten, 1966, p. 286.

tion of the twenty-four volumes of the *Meiji bunka zenshū* (Meiji Civilization Series). At the same time Yoshino again began to write enlightening and influential papers on current affairs for the *Chūōkōron*. In 1926 he assisted in the formation of the Social Mass Party (Shakai minshūtō) which advocated a socialist parliamentary democracy, and helped the development of this democracy outside of the party. He was still engaged in socio-political activities.

During this period Yoshino's proposals on Chinese and Korean affairs were not so bold and daring as those of the previous period. However, he did not hesitate to make efforts to establish friendly relations between these two nations and Japan. In the midst of the disorders in the Great Earthquake in the Kantō District rumours of Korean riots were heard. Scared by the situation, the military, bureaucrats, and bodies of vigilantes murdered thousands of Koreans—this was the most disgraceful in the history of modern Japan—but very few articles referred to the incident because of the government's control over speech.

Under these circumstances Yoshino tackled the incident with great vehemence. He frankly declared that "the incident is the greatest disgrace by which Japan lost her authority to the world," and urged the "necessity of devising concrete measures in order to express national regrets and apology." Further, he urged the need of reconsideration of the fundamental issue of the government of Korea itself.¹⁹ In order to study the truth of the incident he investigated the numbers of victims in each district, and accused the bureaucrats and military of responsibility for the incident in his paper on the *Taishō taishin kasai shi* (The Great Earthquake and Fire of Taishō Period, Tokyo, Kaizōsha, 1924), the publication of which was prohibited by the Ministry of Home Affairs.

In the summer of 1926 the Kuomintang government forces started their northern expedition, and the tremendous task of establishing a unified country of Chinese people was achieved after two years; the sun-in-the-blue-sky flag flew in the Japanese spheres of influence, Manchuria and Mongolia. The Tanaka cabinet sent military forces to Shantung, and intervened militarily over the Northern Expedition. It tried to have Manchuria and Mongolia cut off from China proper by appealing to such extreme measures as assassinating Chang Tso-lin, which ended in miserable failure. Japan's public opinion at the time accused the military of intervention, but cried out for the securing of Japanese rights in Manchuria and Mongolia. This was suggestive of the subsequent development of the Manchurian Incident which took place three years later. Yoshino, this time in line with public opinion, did not clearly demand immediate withdrawal of military forces, but opposed military intervention and welcomed the unification of China by the Kuomintang government. With regard to the Manchurian and Mongolian issues, he opposed

¹⁹ Sakuzō Yoshino, "Chōsenjin gyakusatsu jiken ni tsuite" (The Incident of Slaying Koreans), *Chūōkōron*, Nov., 1923. Also refer to Takayoshi Matsuo, "Kantō daishinsai-ka no Chōsenjin gyakusatsu jiken" (Incident of Slaying Koreans in the Great Earthquake of Kantō District), *Shisō*, Nos. 471 and 476 (1963 and 1964).

the independence of Manchuria and Mongolia, and insisted on cleaning the slate of particular rights in both regions.

He wrote: "The future relationships between China and Japan should be decided through purely reasonable channels, and not on the basis of previous agreements; the thing should be started from the very beginning, and the interests of the two countries should be newly taken into account."²⁰

Yoshino could not understand the coalition principle between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party of Sun Yat-sen in his later years because Yoshino hated communism, and strongly opposed the strengthening of Communist influences within the Kuomintang government. His insight into the future development of Chinese history was mistaken, but until his death he consistently opposed Japan's intervention in the destiny of China.

In 1931 Japan militarily invaded Manchuria. Public opinion supported the action, and the Social Mass Party, which was legally allowed to exist, tolerated the military action on the pretext that the maintenance of the Japanese rights in Manchuria was indispensable for the security of Japan. A small portion of radical socialists opposed military action, but were immediately suppressed by the government. Yoshino dared to criticize the government's actions. He wrote:

"Although imperialistic expansion in certain cases may be required for racial survival, and although a certain degree of rationality may consequently be found therein, the present imperialistic expansion is actually open to the criticism that it is going too far, . . . and even if based on legal and proper right, appeal to . . . [some words were deleted by the authority; these can be assumed to be 'military action'] in order to realize its demands is accompanied by certain anxieties and deep regrets."

"Much more free criticism might naturally be expected in Japan, the land of justice, but against this expectation the newspapers applaud the military expedition and the proletarian political parties remain silent, certain segments of them even supporting the expedition. Can the socialistic ideal be realized in Manchuria and Mongolia as they expect?"²¹

The last of Yoshino's paper in *Chūōkōron*, in which he had many papers published over a number of years, was subjected to inspection by the authorities concerned, and many parts of the paper were censored, to an extent Yoshino had not experienced in his previous writings. This was an honourable wound in the battle for peace. One year after this affair tuberculosis took the life of Yoshino at the age of fifty-five.

What were the characteristics of Yoshino as an Asian minded man? The answer lies in the fact that from his first appearance in the world of criticism until his death, Yoshino consistently advocated establishing friendly relations without any ethnocentric thinking on the part of any Asian country, on

²⁰ Sakuzō Yoshino, "Shina keisei no hen" (Changes in the China Situation), *Chūōkōron*, July, 1928.

²¹ Sakuzō Yoshino, "Minzoku to kaikyū to sensō" (Races, Classes, and War), *Chūōkōron*, Jan., 1932.

the basis of mutual respect for racial self-determination in each country. What supported his standpoint? One thing was probably the spirit of "equality of each man before God," and "neighbourly love." But the fact that many Japanese Christians at the time did not resist the aggressive actions of Japan over Asian nations suggests existence of another element. He was a really democratic person who throughout his life aimed at overthrowing despotic powers in Japan, and looked upon the patriots of independence and revolutionary movements of other nations as comrades. From the time of the Liberty and Popular Rights Movement considerable numbers of people had been deeply interested in the destiny of Asia, and did not hesitate in helping revolutionary movements in China. Without respect to whether they liked it or not, many of these people disgraced themselves by being the guides of Japanese imperialism under the slogan of the Asianism after the outbreak of the First World War. They could not expel their feeling of racial superiority and gave up the role of advocates of democratic reformation at home. Sakuzō Yoshino was not a man of this Asianism, but was a real Asian minded man who led the way to true friendly relations among the Asian nations.

A Short Life History

- 1878 Born on January 14 at Furukawa-chō, in Miyagi prefecture.
- 1899 Married Miss Tama Abe in the autumn.
- 1900 In September admitted into Law School of Tokyo Imperial University after graduating from the Second High School, and became a member of the Hongō Church.
- 1904 In July graduated from Tokyo Imperial University.
- 1905 In January wrote a paper, "Hompō rikken seiji no genjō" in the *Shinjin*, and organized the Association for the Study of Korean Affairs about this time.
- 1906 In January went over to China, and became private tutor to the son of Yūan Shih-k'ai.
- 1909 In January returned from China, and was appointed assistant professor at the Law School of Tokyo Imperial University.
- 1910 In January went to Europe to study.
- 1913 In July came home via the United States of America. In November got in touch with the *Chūōkōron*.
- 1914 In July was appointed Professor of Tokyo Imperial University and taught political history.
- 1916 In January wrote a paper, "Kensei no hongī wo toite sono yūshū-no-bi wo nasu no michi wo ronzu" in the *Chūōkōron*, and became a favourite in the world of the critics. In April travelled in Manchuria and Korea.
- 1918 Organized the Reimeikai in December.
- 1923 In September the Great Earthquake of Kantō District occurred. Criticized the murdering of the Koreans.
- 1924 In February resigned as professor of Tokyo Imperial University and worked for the *Osaka Asahi*. In May dismissed by the *Osaka Asahi*. Appointed lecturer of Tokyo Imperial University. In November organized the Society for the Studies of Meiji Civilization.

- 1926 In May Shantung military expedition. Attacked the expedition.
 1932 In January wrote, "Minzoku, kaikyū, sensō" in the *Chūōkōron*.
 1933 In March died in hospital at Zushi in Kanagawa prefecture.

A List of Works

SELECTED WORKS

- Yoshino Sakuzō hakushi minshu-shugi ronshū* (Dr. Yoshino's Papers on Democracy), Tokyo, Shinkigensha. 1946-1947.
 Volume 1. Minshu-shugi ron (Discussions on Democracy)
 Volume 2. Minshu-shugi seiji kōwa (Lectures on Democracy)
 Volume 3. Nihon seiji no minshu-shugi-teki kaikaku (Democratic Reformations of Japanese Politics)
 Volume 4. Sekai heiwa-shugi ron (Discussions on the Peace of the World)
 Volume 5. Shakai mondai oyobi shakai undō (Social Problems and the Social Movement)
 Volume 6. Nikka kokkō ron (Relations between China and Japan)
 Volume 7. Chūgoku kakumeishi ron (Chinese Revolutionary History)
 Volume 8. Meiji bunka kenkyū (Studies of Meiji Civilization)

BOOKS

- Ōshū dōranshi ron* (History of Disturbances in Europe), Tokyo, Keisei-shoten, 1915.
Nissshi kōshō ron (Diplomatic Negotiations between China and Japan), Tokyo, Keiseishoten, 1915.
Gendai no seiji (Modern Politics in Japan), Tokyo, Jitsugyō-no Nippon-sha, 1915.
Ōshū seikyoku no genjō oyobi shōrai (The Present and Future of the European Political Situation), Tokyo, Banda-shobō, 1917.
Shina kakumei shōshi (A Short History of the Chinese Revolution), Tokyo, Banda-shobō, 1917.
Futsū Senkyo ron (Universal and Equal Suffrage), Tokyo, Sanda-shobō, 1919.
Shakai kaizō undō ni okeru shinjin no shimei (The Role of the Younger Generation in the Social Reform Movement), Tokyo, Bunka seikatsu kenkyūkai, 1920.
Daisan kakumei-go no shina (China after the 3rd Revolution), Tokyo, Naigai-shuppan, 1921.
Nijūseifu to Iakujōsō (Compound Government and the Direct Appeal to the Throne by the Military Authorities), Tokyo, Bunka seikatsu kenkyūkai, 1922.
Arai Hakuseki to Giovanni Sidotti (Arai Hakuseki and Giovanni Battista Sidotti), Tokyo, Bunka seikatsu kenkyūkai, 1924.
Rokoku hikan no hyōryūmin Kōdayū (Kōdayū, A Shipwrecked Person Returned from Russia), Tokyo, Bunka seikatsu kenkyūkai, 1924.
Kaku shinji kaku kataru (I Say What I Believe in), Tokyo, Bunka seikatsu kenkyūkai, 1924.
Kōjin no jōshiki (Common Sense of a Public Person), Tokyo, Bunka seikatsu kenkyūkai, 1926.
Mondai to kaiketsu (Problems and Their Solution), Tokyo, Bunka seikatsu kenkyūkai, 1926.
Gendai seiji kōwa (Lectures on Modern Politics), Tokyo, Bunka seikatsu kenkyūkai, 1926.
Musan seitō no tadorubeki michi (The Way for a Proletarian Political Party), Tokyo, Bunka seikatsu kenkyūkai, 1927.
Furuī seiji no atarashii mikata (Old Politics from New Viewpoints), Tokyo, Bunka seikatsu kenkyūkai, 1927.
Kōgaku yodan (Miscellaneous Essays on Modern History and Culture in Japan), Tokyo,

Bunka seikatsu kenkyūkai, 1927.

Nihon musan seitō ron (Criticism of the Proletarian Political Parties in Japan), Tokyo, Ichigen-sha, 1929.

Gendai kensei no unyō (Modern Constitutional Politics and Their Practical Application), Tokyo, Ichigen-sha, 1930.

Gendai seikyoku no tembō (Outline of the Present Political Situation), Tokyo, Nippon hyōron-sha, 1930.

Kandan no kandan (Miscellaneous Essays), Tokyo, Shomotsu tembō-sha, 1933.

Sūfu to naikaku (The Privy Council and Cabinet), Tokyo, Asahi shimbunsha, 1950.