

Title	INTRODUCTION TO THE ECONOMIC THOUGHT OF JAPAN
Sub Title	
Author	SHIMAZAKI, TAKAO
Publisher	Keio Economic Society, Keio University
Publication year	1968
Jtitle	Keio economic studies Vol.5, (1968.) ,p.11- 34
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	
Notes	
Genre	Journal Article
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AA00260492-19680000-0011

慶應義塾大学学術情報リポジトリ(KOARA)に掲載されているコンテンツの著作権は、それぞれの著作者、学会または出版社/発行者に帰属し、その権利は著作権法によって保護されています。引用にあたっては、著作権法を遵守してご利用ください。

The copyrights of content available on the KeiO Associated Repository of Academic resources (KOARA) belong to the respective authors, academic societies, or publishers/issuers, and these rights are protected by the Japanese Copyright Act. When quoting the content, please follow the Japanese copyright act.

INTRODUCTION TO THE ECONOMIC THOUGHT OF JAPAN

BY TAKAO SHIMAZAKI

CONTENTS

Preface	11
Chapter I. Political Consciousness in the Age of Civil Wars, the Last Part of the Mediaeval Period. Origin of the Idea of "Statesmanship and Popular Welfare" (Keisei Saimin Ron)	15
Chapter II. Elucidation of "Statesmanship and Popular Welfare" as Presented in the Typical Works in the Age of Civil Wars: <i>Instructions for the Control and Improvement of Agricultural Households</i> (Shinmin Kagami Gesshū)	17
Chapter III. Principles for the Control of Peasants as Explained in the <i>Honsaroku</i> (an abbreviation of the <i>Notes by Sadonokami Honda</i>)	19
Chapter IV. Samurai (Knighthood). Consciousness of the Samurai Class (Knightly Class)	23
Chapter V. The Way of "Statesmanship and Popular Welfare" As Expounded by Sokō Yamaga and Banzan Kumazawa in the First Half of the Tokugawa Period	26
Chapter VI. Conclusion. An Outlook for the Second Half of the Tokugawa Period	31
Notes	32

PREFACE

This is an analytical study of the economic thought of Japan, as seen from a specific angle.

Strictly speaking, no economic thought developed in Japan indigenously. This is true not only of economics, but of any other modern scientific knowledge.⁽¹⁾

This does not mean, however, that there were no such things as observation, analysis or comment on economic phenomena or policies in ancient Japan. Economics was studied and taught as an important item of learning; even books were written. As will be explained later in detail, economic phenomena, especially as related to politics, were fairly intensively researched, and various ideas concerning economics or finance seem to have attained a high level of study.

This economic learning, however, was not an unmitigated domestic production, that is, Japanese economics did not wholly originate at home; on the contrary it is largely of foreign extraction. There is no question that the economics of Japan today is the fruit of Western influence. It was imported from the West during the closing years of the Shogunate (1603–1867) and after the Meiji Restoration (1868).⁽²⁾ It is not an offshoot of the economics which was created and developed under the Tokugawa regime.

With the opening of Japan to the world, some Japanese scholars lost no time in contacting advanced countries, turning their eyes to the scientific economics of the West and dedicating their energies to its study. This does not mean, however, that we may properly disregard the importance of the ideological soil which served as

a foundation in which to accept, absorb and foster the economic thought of the West.⁽³⁾

Before Japan's door was opened to the world, the ruling class—the samurai (knightly class)—had developed the art of controlling the common people. Having gone through the closing years of the Civil War Age (about 1467–1573), the Oda Period (1573–1582) and the Toyotomi Period (1583–1598), Japan settled down with the establishment of the Tokugawa Shogunate (Feudal Government). Successful as the Tokugawa family was in organizing the country into a modern form of feudalism, the Shogunate then faced the difficult task of how to win over the people in general.

Under the feudalistic regime, each feudal province behaved like a kingdom, managing its own affairs—finances and defense—quite independently. Wealth and military strength was the uppermost concern of each feudal lord, giving rise or prevalence to such ideas as “statesmanship and popular welfare”,* “statecraft”, “the economic way”, and “the art of economy.”

Here we look into the meanings of these terms. Shundai Dazai defines in his *Notes on Economy* (Keizairoku): “By economy is meant the art of reigning over heaven and earth so as to administer the world and save the people.”⁽⁴⁾ Nobuhiro Sato states in his *A Digest of Economy* (Keizaiyōroku): “By economy is meant the art of administering the country and saving the masses.”⁽⁵⁾ Examining these words, we get the impression that these ideas are heterogenetic to the economic science of the West. They seem rather to have the connotation of politics or administration in the modern sense.

These ideas of “statesmanship and popular welfare” were varied and manifold in implication. It is very difficult to class them under one straight line of thought, as they differed according to the times in which they were formulated and to the ideological backgrounds on which they stood.

It is important to understand that the Tokugawa Period presented a wide divergence in its problems, according to whether they occurred in its first, middle or last part. Each part had its own social and economic problems and had developed its own theory of “statesmanship and popular welfare” to cope with them. Also, the persons who were generally called “statecraft theorizers” differed in their ideological backgrounds. For example, some of them depended on Confucianism including the System of Chu Hsi, the School of Wang Yang-Ming, Classical Learning and Eclecticism; while others depended on this National Classics; and still others depended on Western Learning or on some sort of mixture of these Learnings, each claiming its own theoretical independence.⁽⁶⁾

Different, however, as these “statecraft theorizers” were in their thoughts, they had a common characteristic. They were not mere abstract speculators on politics, statesmen or rulers. They came to embrace their ideas while living under certain

* The word “popular welfare” in this case should not be taken as a ruler's concern of the welfare of his citizens as free and independent individuals. The ruling class at the time looked upon the people's welfare as merely a tactic to control and exploit them.

historical conditions, developed them into workable systems and tried to put them into effect.

As Masahide Bito does in his *History of Japanese Feudalistic Ideas*, these “statecraft theorizers” will be defined as “the scholars—often different from each other in their stands—who developed political and economic theories to solve the social contradictions which became conspicuous in Edo in the latter half of the Shogunate regime.”⁽⁷⁾ The “statesmanship and popular welfare” theory, may be characterized as an “objective observation of the actual contradictions of the Shogunate regime for the purpose of changing the existing system by proposing some sort of reform plan.”⁽⁸⁾

As a more practical definition of the “statesmanship and popular welfare” theory, we cite here statecraft theorizers represented by such statecraft theorizers as Sorai Ogyū and his followers, and by those who stressed the importance of statesmanship in the closing years of the Shogunate. One of the typical publications on “statesmanship” is the *Political Discourse (Seidan)*⁽⁹⁾ of Sorai Ogyū. This work stands on the pre-condition of calling for a sort of political reform of the existing government. In other words, it seems correct to state that Sorai’s whole ideological system aimed at showing a theoretical basis for practical politics. Thus considered, we seem to be justified to state that it was Sorai who brought the “statesmanship and popular welfare” theory of the modern age to its grand consummation. Indeed it is Sorai’s *Political Discourse* which merits the praise of having provided a magnificent form for the “statesmanship and popular welfare” theory.

Before Sorai’s idea of “statesmanship and popular welfare” came to its theoretical completion, there had been a long prehistoric period preparing the way for its advent. This was the time when the study of Confucianism was in full swing. Coming into the Tokugawa period, Confucianism launched out into vigorous activity passing through such phenomenal events as the prosperity of the Chu Hsi system, the rising of the Wang Yang-Ming School, and the origin and development of Classical Learning. The National Classics and Western Learning also exerted some influence on Sorai.

Confining his remarks to politics, Professor Masao Maruyama gives a penetrating view of the foundation of Tokugawa politics in his work: *A Study of Japanese Political Thought*. In this work, the professor shows how politics changed from “naturalism” to “artifice”, or to put it differently, from “subjectivism” to “objectivism”, and explains that Sorai’s thought was characteristically formed on the basis of “artifice” and “objectivism.”⁽¹⁰⁾

More concretely put, the concept of “statesmanship and popular welfare” which Sorai brought to its theoretical perfection embraced in fact the general political awakening preceding his successful formalization of the theory.

This political awakening had been gradually gaining ground with the passage of time in the feudal age. It began with the regime started by the Oda and Toyotomi families, took root at the beginning of the Shogunate and became firmly established in its middle part.

It is important, however, to understand that political awakening as understood by Sorai and his followers is very different from the concept as held by people before them. Suppose we look at the term "statesmanship and popular welfare" in two historic periods—the first and second parts of the Tokugawa regime with the Genroku-Kyōho eras (1688–1735) as their dividing line. We can soon see that there was a marked difference in the meaning of the concept of "statesmanship and popular welfare" as held by the people in the first period and by Sorai and his followers in the second period, either affirmatively or negatively. In spite of a phenomenal similarity between the first period concept and the second period concept, they show a qualitative difference when it comes to the question of their ideological foundations and forms.⁽¹¹⁾

It seems necessary here to look into the historical development of the concept of "economy" in Japan and examine its ideological peculiarities as compared with the concept of "economics" developed in the closing years of the Shogunate and after the Meiji Restoration (1868). This should explain the reason why we should study the development of the "statesmanship and popular welfare" theory historically.

The dramatic establishment and the high speed growth of a capitalistic economy in Japan after the Restoration, followed by a rapid modernization of her industry and a miraculous rehabilitation after the Pacific War, have presented and are presenting scholars at home and abroad with a question of peculiar interest.

Putting aside the larger issue of the modernization of Japan, and confining themselves to the question of the industrialization of the country along the lines of a capitalistic economy, the scholars of Japan have spared no effort inquiring into the secrets which made the country's spectacular accomplishments possible. Many factors are mentioned as causes for this astounding feat. In this connection, the scholars never lose sight of the significance of the spiritual and ideological attitudes of the Japanese capitalists, enterprisers and managers—the three musketeers of the economy.⁽¹²⁾

The insight of scholars is generally international, that is, they think that the economic reform of modern Japan should be studied historically in the light of the people's spiritual and ideological attitudes which were cultivated in the "economy" or "commerce" carried on under Tokugawa feudalism. They investigate the basic concept of "economy" prevalent in Tokugawa Japan, and the process and characteristics, of its transformation, especially as related to modern capitalism as it developed in Europe. They think that herein lies the key to the clarification of the capitalistic development of modern Japan.⁽¹³⁾

There is no question that these scholarly works are very useful in explaining how the economic thought of Japan came to be formulated, and in showing how the national leaders after the advent of the Restoration introduced, implanted and developed Western economics. Certainly, their insight suggests an important angle from which to look at the economic thought of Japan.

The reason the author is presenting this essay on the origin and development of the "statesmanship and popular welfare" theory is that this concept, combined

with political and ethical thoughts, seems to exhibit palpably economy in a limited sense of the word.⁽¹⁴⁾

In other words, as will be explained in the following chapters, the idea of "statesmanship and popular welfare" appeared at first as an excellent theory of control and administration with frequent reference to economy and economic policy, and it gained in its economic aspect as economic life under the Tokugawa regime became increasingly complex through the transition from prosperity to depression. Finally, its economic phase came to take an independent stand as distinct from ethics and politics.

This connotative transformation of the "statesmanship and popular welfare" idea was accelerated in proportion to the dwindling of feudalism, that is, in proportion to the advance of capitalism. However, because of the inconclusiveness of the dissolution process of feudalism and because of an incomplete development of Japanese capitalism, economics failed to acquire the scientific nature worthy of a positivistic learning, as other ideological system did.

Briefly stated, it may have been possible for the primitive concept of economy in Japan to be elevated to the stern dignity of scientific knowledge when it had manifested an incipient tendency toward separation or independence from politics and ethics.

Here is another point which we should be aware of in studying Japanese economics. The development of Japanese ideas on economics is closely related to the process of importation, absorption and inculcation of Western economics; a fact which is a vital key to the understanding of economic science in Japan.

The following paragraphs are an introduction to the comprehension of the theory of "statesmanship and popular welfare", as a control tactic, and especially as the ideological agency which wielded a significant influence on scholars and statesmen in the first half of the Tokugawa regime.

CHAPTER I. POLITICAL CONSCIOUSNESS IN THE AGE OF CIVIL WARS,
THE LAST PART OF THE MEDIAEVAL PERIOD. ORIGIN OF THE
IDEA OF "STATESMANSHIP AND POPULAR WELFARE"
(KEISEI SAIMIN RON)

The idea of "statesmanship and popular welfare" began to gain its conceptual distinctness in the early years of the Tokugawa period, although the theory was then only in embryonic form. It does not follow that there had been no economic phenomena or financial policies in Japan before the appearance of the idea of "statesmanship and popular welfare." What is meant here is that at this period, it began to be a conscious thought formed from the fragmentary notions that had existed in confusion with other thoughts. As a result scholars became more politically minded than ever before.

To understand how such a situation came about, it is important to look into the historical conditions which made such a change possible. First, we must consider

the socio-economic and political conditions of the time. With the general stability of society which set in about this time, the increased productive power of peasants and the growth of towns resulting from a prevalent and prosperous money economy, the socio-economic structure of mediaeval age, that is, the militaristic way of thought, began to show a tendency toward transformation. Feudal lords became attentive to the general administration of their provinces. They were not in favor of the clannish relationship between local landlords and the native peasants working for them, and pursued a policy of attracting the former to towns and thus bringing the latter, along with townsmen, under the direct control of lordship.

In other words, the tendency of the Muromachi Shogunate to negate the mediaeval form of government encouraged the appearance of independent feudal lordships during the period of Civil Wars which followed. This in turn supported a political structure which aimed at national unification under the Oda-Toyotomi Regime (1573–1598) toward the end of the Civil Wars, and helped lay the foundation for a modern provincial lordship system. This latter system led later to the establishment of "Shogunate Feudalism" under the Tokugawa (1604–1868).

During the Civil War Period (about 1467–1573), the sole end of provincial lords was to enlarge their territories by war and finally to hold sway over the whole country. To realize this objective, it was necessary for them to enforce a policy of enrich the country and enhance military strength by developing or making good use of waste land and increasing the productive capacity of peasants. Also, they endeavored to reform agricultural management and to improve the administration of communities and villages thus bringing them under the lordship's direct control, so that the imposition of tax and service labor would be efficiently carried out. On the other hand, mining, the handicraft industries, commerce, and foreign trade were encouraged.

While pursuing these measures to enrich the country and enhance military strength, feudal lords took great pains to show their absolute authority as ostentatiously as possible in an effort to prove to others that they were proficiently equipped with wealth and dignity or overflowing with riches and ferocious in full of courage.

This strong current of the age worked at the same time as a useful opportunity for feudal lords to reflect on their administration and think of ways to improve it. Some of them became aware of the importance of economics and economic phenomena as the basis of politics, and took a greater interest in the subject than even before. Certainly the time was ripe for feudal lords to realize that the aggrandisement of their territories—the necessary condition for military and political ascendancy—could never be attained without economic prosperity.

On the other hand, the times seemed conducive to the formulation of a systematized theory for implementing practical designs for political ascendancy. In other words, society was awaiting the arrival of a theory justifying the political trends of the time.

In other words,, awakened to the political inevitability of the time having come

face to face with the problem at issue and feeling the necessity of establishing some sort of policy to solve them, feudal lords and their trusted vassals racked their brains for a solution to their dilemma. The following facts should be kept in mind as providing a background to their thoughts: (1) the productive power of peasants and industrial workers was rising in the mediaeval period which is generally considered a stagnant age; (2) the prosperity of peasants and townspeople (tradesmen and industrial workers) was tending to bring about a flowering of culture; (3) cultural contact with foreign countries was strong as was shown by the importation of Continental culture by priest scholars of Zen Buddhism at this time; (4) the Shogunate and feudal lords encouraged the study of new forms of culture and imported a large number of foreign books; and (5) the Shogunate and feudal lords were active in introducing and implanting this imported culture into the provinces, as well as letting urban culture penetrate into country. In addition the eager application of the knightly class, that is, the ruling class, to the study of the Chu Hsi school of learning in cooperation with Zen Buddhists was an important factor in preparing the ideological attitudes necessary to meet the economic, political, military and social requirements of the time.

The objective conditions of society, hand in hand with the subjective maturity of the ruling class, began to fall into place in the last years of the Civil War Period. This fact awakened the ruling class to their political responsibility and they began to have grand visions of bringing the whole country under the rule of the knightly class. This in turn made them conscious of the importance of the farming population, their welfare and technical improvement in their work. These were the conditions which brought about the ascendancy of the "statesmanship and popular welfare" concept ideologically, legislatively and administratively.⁽¹⁵⁾

CHAPTER II. ELUCIDATION OF "STATESMANSHIP AND POPULAR WELFARE" THEORY AS PRESENTED IN THE TYPICAL WORKS IN THE AGE OF CIVIL WARS

In this chapter some of the important works on administration and popular welfare mentioned in the last chapter will be discussed. First, we take up some of the *Laws of Provincial Possessions (Ryokokuho)*, such as the *Rules of the Chōsokabe Family (Chōsokabe Okitegaki)*,⁽¹⁶⁾ the *Laws of the Eastern Provinces (Togoku Hatto)*, *A Dust-heap (Jinkai-shū)* published by the Date Family, the various laws of the Takeda Family, and the *21 Provisions of Liege Lord Sōun (Sōunji-dono 21 Kajō)*, containing the rules for the conduct of samurai prescribed by Sōun Hōjō, one of the greatest feudal lords of the Civil War Period.

This last work discusses the standards of conduct worthy of the samurai in war time, and contributed much to the molding of the samurai spirit of the Hōjō Family.

Sōun teaches: "Respect superiors and be merciful to inferiors", stressing reverence for authority and compassion for the lowly. Although it is doubtful how merciful Sōun was in his own conduct, it is reported that he put up a notice

board to the following effect: "We hear that peasants are suffering from overtaxing by their manor lords. You used to pay 50% of what you reaped, but hereafter you will offer only 40%. Not a penny beyond that amount shall be levied. Any manor lord acting in violation of this rule shall be reported by the peasants in question. Such a manor lord shall be dismissed from their service."⁽¹⁷⁾ This announcement may have been made with the intention of winning the people's hearts. At any rate, it is worth noticing that such benevolence existed. In the *Laws on the Administration of Provincial Possessions*,* we find that similar legislative steps were taken in those days.

In addition to the *Laws on the Administration of Provincial Possessions*, we cite here the *Monthly Series on the Reeducation of the People (Shinmin Kagami Gesshu)*, Volume VII of the *Autobiography of Seiryō Doi (Doi-Seiryō-ki)*, as having been used by several research scholars concerned with the subject.⁽¹⁸⁾ This book is believed to have been edited by Sōan Matsuura, an old agriculturist, in response to questions asked by his Liege Lord Seiryō Doi in 1564 (the 7th year of the Eiroku Era). The substance of this work was written by Seiryō Doi in 1564 when he was returning to his old fief with an annual stipend of 150 *kan* of rice [worth of 3 villages yield], after he had been sojourning with the Ichijo Family in Tosa. Seiryō wrote this book as a commemoration of his investiture as a provincial lord, showing his interest in political administration. He states that an ideal feudal lord in war time should be attentive to the development of agriculture and prescribes some practical policies and the agricultural techniques necessary to implement them. He says that agriculture is a source of economic power which leads to final victory in war. Thus he thinks it essential for any war lord to maintain a powerful agricultural population as war potential, that is, as a dependable source of income.

To meet this objective, he goes on to discuss the improvement of agriculture both in technique and management. He says that "no matter how hard you may press peasants for land taxes, they will never yield to your satisfaction unless you take good care of them. The situation is something like a water reservoir. You will secure no water, if its source is dried up. The important thing is to guide peasants properly, if you want them to furnish abundant crops."⁽¹⁹⁾

Further, he instructs: As "the tradition goes that, properly encouraged, peasants will always bring in crops enough to meet a country's requirements",⁽²⁰⁾ "it is necessary that landlords direct their peasants to feed their vegetation well at its roots and keep on instructing them in cultivation so that the harvest will be plentiful and the tax will be amply paid."⁽²¹⁾

According, however, to the "editor" of the *Autobiography of Seiryō*, "peasants are ignorant and very few of them can manage their affairs effectively."⁽²²⁾ Should this view—the stupidity of the peasantry—be admitted, the key to successful administration in farming is in raising the productivity of generally low class peasants to a higher level. Peasants are merely farmland destroyers, that is, they are fools.

* This is a *Collection of the Historical Legislative Materials in the Mediaeval Age*. Its 3rd Volume *Samurai Family Codes (1)* presents typical examples of samurai family codes.

They may be taught to cultivate efficiently, but they would never endeavor to do it themselves, sticking instead to their old ways. It takes a good leader or a good administrator to tear them away from their obsolete practices.

The editor admits that some peasants are clever, but the most important duty of farm administrators, the local officials who come in direct contact with peasants such as manor officers or local deputies, is to instruct lower peasants in more practical agricultural techniques. What the editor of the *Autobiography of Seiryō* wanted to do was warn the feudal lords, who were generally engrossed in warfare, of the importance of looking for farming methods which were efficient both technically and managerially, and of promoting those in the actual administration of their fiefs so as to realize the traditional principle of wealth and military strength.

This is the substance of the agricultural wisdom described in this book. It is undeniable that it is a remnant of the warlike strategy which pervaded the Mediaeval Age. At the same time, however, it suggests the germ of the agricultural administration of the Modern Age, prescribing the basic principles of later agricultural administration and calling attention to the importance of revolutionizing agricultural techniques if the productive power of the peasants was to be increased.

It is to be noticed that agricultural administration and agricultural techniques are discussed here in an undifferentiated manner. The former, however, soon led to the establishment of the fundamental principles of agricultural administration by feudal lords and their trusted brains, testifying to the dawn of the political awakening of feudal lords in governing their territories more fully than ever before. This was a predecessor to the idea of "statesmanship and popular welfare." And the latter led to such practical measures as the publication of booklets like the *Local Notes* or the *Agricultural Notes* that were used by local low rank officials who were in charge of the practical technical guidance of peasants in order to raise their productive capacity.⁽²³⁾

CHAPTER III. PRINCIPLES FOR THE CONTROL OF PEASANTS AS EXPLAINED IN THE HONSAROKU (AN ABBREVIATION OF THE NOTES BY SADONO-KAMI HONDA)

Influenced by the thought of the Civil War Period and the local conditions of the district in Iyo Province, Shikoku, which produced the *Seiryō-ki*, the book treats very little of economic phenomena such as commodity trading, money economy and other similar activities.

With the advent of peace in Japan, however, the advanced regions of the country began to show positive signs of such economic phenomena as an increase of productivity in agriculture and industry, the development of a commodity and money economy, the origin and growth of towns and the flourishing of tradesmen in general. Economic phenomena began to loom large in the people's thoughts.

On the other hand, the ruling class, perceiving the trend of the times, spared no

effort in attempting to establish a feudalistic form of society. Having been initiated under the Oda-Toyotomi regime, feudalism became firmly entrenched under the Tokugawa Shogunate. In order to understand how the "statesmanship and popular welfare" concept formed, we here examine the political awakening at the beginning of the Tokugawa Period by examining the fundamental policies for the control of peasants and the Confucianism which supported these ideological trends, centering our study around the *Honsaroku*.⁽²⁴⁾

Confucianism was introduced into Japan many years ago and exerted a large influence in the molding of Japanese culture.⁽²⁵⁾ Coming, however, into the Mediaeval Period, its study was confined to a small number of urban intellectuals or was exclusively pursued by priests in temples. Its content often lapsed into the mere moral teachings that were prevalent under the Han and Tang Dynasties. More often, Confucian studies became only a sign of taste or a tool for the poetry of dilettantes. With the importation and digestion by Zen Buddhists Confucianism in Japan was delivered from its corrupted forms and began to manifest the original brilliancy of its positivistic, practical philosophy and its theoretical characteristics, as distinct from the debased forms of Confucianism, Buddhism and Shintoism.

Though space does not permit a full explanation of the Chu Hsi Philosophy here, we may briefly present its main points. The Chu Hsi Learning is a grand theory of philosophy, systematically clarifying the phenomena of Nature and Humanity, referring even to the common affairs of daily life, physical and spiritual, and the events of the Universe. All things under the sun are explained in terms of "Reason" and "Spirit." Similarly, the creation of man, the divine wisdom and the profundity of human ignorance, the confusion of purity and pollution which causes the evils and stupidities of man are discussed.

On this philosophical basis, the Chu Hsi Learning develops a theory of how to overcome the evils and stupidities of human beings and dwells on the significance of personality cultivation as the practical way to eradicate them. In other words, Chu Hsi thinks that "Reason" is immanent within man in the same way as it is within the physical world. When baptized with rationality, he thinks, the primary nature of the human being asserts itself. Further, it becomes disposition when it is psychologically or temperamentally exhibited. When disposition, however, overshadows the primary nature, that is, when rationality fails to function, the evils and stupidities of human beings get the upper-hand.

Thus, by overcoming the base proclivities of the disposition, the primary nature shines forth, and universal reason, that is, sincerity, manifests itself as the highest form of morality, perfecting human behavior to a goodness of highest merit. The disposition is overcome by so-called personality cultivation or the moral completion of the self. Here, for the first time, the human being becomes the creator of all things. Such a person is commonly called a sincere or a good person. He constantly reflects on himself subjectively by rectifying his mind and taking delight in the approbation of his own heart, and objectively by observing all the

things and happenings according to the dictates of natural law. Thus right mind and sincerity becomes the foundation of personal morality, stressing the importance of personal perfection, household management, statecraft and universal peace as the basis of everything and anything on earth. Such is the dictum of the Chu Hsi Learning which influences the core of the *Honsaroku*.

As is clear from the subtitle of the *Honsaroku*: "Instructions for a Ruler Reigning over a Country", the book tries to show "how a ruler should act in governing over a people." Really, the basic principles mentioned in this book had been repeatedly cited as the golden rule for agricultural administration ever since the beginning of the Shogunate.

The book consists of "Seven Articles Discussing the Essentials of Government"⁽²⁶⁾ and an opening chapter entitled. "How to be Awake to the Way of Heaven." These articles are the replies of Sadonokami-Masanobu Honda to a question asked by Daitokuinden: "What do you think are the causes of war and peace, of the ups and downs of a country, of the life or death of a sovereign, and of the joys and sorrows of people?"⁽²⁷⁾ They are an attempt by Sadanokami-Masanobu Honda, their apparent author, to clarify his idea, "The Sole Reason", as related to his answers.

While going over these answers, we understand—the same as when we studied the *Shinmin-kagami Gesshū*—what concerned rulers in those days. Briefly put, the essentials of the government Masanobu stood for can be summarised in the question "How to become awakened to the Way of Heaven". Heaven is to be attained through "Reason" as theorized by the Chu Hsi Learning. He says that "it is possible to reign over the whole country only by adhering to this thought" and that this "Heavenly Reason" is exactly what genuine Confucianism tries to inculcate.⁽²⁸⁾ Further, he says that, if we reign over a country with this "Heavenly Reason", we shall naturally create a noble realm without being bothered by anxieties and forms, and our descendants will prosper.

To be able to perceive Heavenly Reason, we should endeavor to learn real Confucianism, Masanobu explains. He harshly criticizes the various thoughts or teachings that were prevalent in his time, for example, false Confucianism, Buddhism and Literature. He says that these ideological systems will never contribute much toward producing a well-administered country as they lead people astray and cause turbulence generation after generation.

Such a concept of statesmanship, giving paramount consideration to politics, strikes us as really marvelous when we examine how the concept of "statesmanship and popular welfare" originated and developed in the modern age.

The *Honsaroku* in Section VI, entitled "Management of Peasants", prescribes well-known principles of agricultural administration, as follows: "Peasants are the foundation of a country. Here are administrative rules for them. First of all, the boundaries of their fields shall be fixed definitely; their annual needs shall be estimated and the remains shall be offered to the authorities as tax; they shall neither enjoy surplus nor suffer from destitution, that is, they shall have neither

more or less at the time of harvesting. This is the way of a wise ruler."⁽²⁹⁾

"About September and October, roads and bridges shall be constructed throughout the country to facilitate peasants' labor. All the necessary expenses shall be defrayed by the government, and no citizen shall be forced into service in this connection."⁽³⁰⁾

The basic principle of managing over peasants and reigning over a country is "benevolence",⁽³¹⁾ that is, "as the peasants are the foundation of the country, see to it that they suffer from no hunger, cold or destitution."⁽³²⁾ The ruler is like parents and the citizens are the basis of a country. The citizens shall be sufficiently provided with food, and in turn they will produce it amply. "A country is secure if its foundation is solid."⁽³³⁾

Not only "benevolence", but practical administration to put it into effect is essential. The secret of politics is that administrators indulge in no luxury, refrain from useless expenses, and impose taxes which are neither too heavy nor too light, so that citizens will suffer from no destitution, and their living will be secure."⁽³⁴⁾ No luxury, no useless spending and a proper amount of tax were considered the necessary conditions for successful administration. Good administrators should, therefore, economize and be prudent in consumption. Otherwise, they would naturally resort to exploiting citizens, reduce them to poverty and endanger the country's security.

Thus the most important guiding principle for an administrator is a thorough application of the golden rule of taxation mentioned above and an enforcement of the ban on the arbitrary pressing of peasants into service labor. The primary duty, therefore, of government officials is to be "loyally benevolent to peasants and townsmen so that they will be prosperous and happy."⁽³⁵⁾ This is what is meant by the word "loyalty" or "fidelity" to their sovereign.

"In actual practice, however, they are squeezing peasants to the greatest possible extent and collecting as much money as they can. What they are doing is the worst example of infidelity."⁽³⁶⁾ They drive peasants into misery and wretchedness without knowing that "a liege lord flourishes when peasants live in opulence."⁽³⁷⁾

The basic principles expounded in the *Honsaroku* are theories of inaction and constancy, continuation of the existing conditions and maintenance of a simple process of reproduction. They are reflections of the heed for a static, tranquil society that existed in the early years of Tokugawa feudalism. They are at the same time the social conditions which Confucianism described as ideal ones and which the statesmen at the time judged conducive to the peaceful rule of the country. And these notions, being justified by the logic of the Heavenly Way of Confucianism were advocated by contemporary scholars as useful for the betterment of agricultural administration.

Masanobu states: "A country prospers when administrators become aware of the Heavenly Way, but it will go to ruin, if they should cause distress to peasants without knowing it."⁽³⁸⁾ We can see how strong a conviction and what a great

dependence Masanobu had on statesmanship by the Heavenly Way.

As was explained before, the ideological foundation of the *Honsaroku* was derived from Confucianism in its true interpretation, especially the Chu Hsi Confucianism. The aim of the *Honsaroku* is to advise a man how he should rightly cultivate himself in various affairs, social or political. In this case, the subject of self-cultivation is an individual who is not a member of the masses, but is a ruler or a sovereign. Thus there are presented various ideas in the *Honsaroku*, such as the distinction between the ruler and the ruled; the ruled as conceived by the ruler, that is, the ruled masses are ignorant; and the justification by the ruler of his control over the ruled, that is, the ignorant should meekly follow the dictates of the wise. Thus, in the first place, the ruler feeds the ruled and then teaches them. The fact that feeding precedes teaching signifies that various measures are required to provide for the material well-being of the masses before they may be technically trained or culturally elevated.

Here is the key to wise statesmanship, that is, for the faithful performance of his duty by a ruler. Here is a quotation from the *Daigaku*: "The great principle for an ample supply of goods is in having a large number of people engage in production and having a small number of people to be fed. Have them work fast and be prudent in consumption! There will be plenty of goods available!"⁽³⁹⁾

To convince the people vividly, the government should endeavor to enrich the people materially, emphasizing the importance of production and the necessity of economy in consumption and enacting measures and policies in this regard. As is clear from this description, statesmanship in those days was quite emphatic in its insistence on the precedence of the material enrichment or the economic activities of the masses before they could be elevated culturally. This instruction was by no means an empty theory, but was a practical device applied to the solution of pressing issues.

It was different from the speculative economic policies advocated by the Chu Hsi Learning. These were abstract and ideological, not necessarily effective in coping with problems that are historical and living. Their final resort was always the ruler's gracious judgement.

Thus the Chu Hsi Learning were subjected to severe criticism for their abstractness, unrealistic nature and helplessness, as economic problems gained in intensity with the passage of time. This gave incentive to the study of economics, which is positive and realistic.

CHAPTER IV. SAMURAI (KNIGHTHOOD). CONSCIOUSNESS OF THE SAMURAI CLASS (KNIGHTLY CLASS)

Started by Ieyasu who was succeeded by the Second Shogun Hidetada and the Third Shogun Iemitsu, the Tokugawa Shogunate steadily strengthened its feudalistic structure. In other words, the process of systematizing the Shogunate effectively worked in the cause of feudal dictatorship.

Razan Hayashi⁽⁴⁰⁾ served the Shogunate for more than 50 years ranging over the rule of four Shoguns: Ieyasu, Hidetada, Iemitsu and Ietsuna. He contributed much toward solidifying the absolutism of the feudal regime through legal enactments, the institution of ceremonies and etiquette, as well as by ideological persuasion. His interpretation of the Chu Hsi Learning was completely in accord with the ideological stand of the Shogunate. With the political power of the Shogunate to back it up, the Chu Hsi Learning increased its capacity for leadership and showed its value as an indoctrinating agency in behalf of feudalism. Thus the Chu Hsi Learning became a perfect servant to Shogunate feudalism.

With the passing of the Civil War Period and having no chance to engage directly in warfare, the samurai class became conscious of the importance of their mission to control the common citizens in peace time. They happily accepted this duty of the ruling class ruling over the working people. Naturally, they had to cultivate themselves as human beings worthy of their ruling position, and they became intent on seeking the mind and the behavior of samurai by studying the teachings and the theories of past saints.

The Chu Hsi Learning, which had been almost solely studied by Buddhist monks like Razan, now became necessary equipment for the personal cultivation of the samurai class. Thus the Chu Hsi Learning acquired two characteristics about this time: it became learning at the service of the feudal regime and also the chief doctrine of the samurai class. These characteristics were manifested early in the person of Razan Hayashi.

Another reason why the samurai class became interested in the Chu Hsi Learning was the financial hardship which the Shogunate, the feudal lords and the samurai class were suffering as a result of economic growth in the feudal age. As a solution to this problem they felt the necessity of strengthening their own economic position as the foundation of their political power and sought ideological support for this in the Chu Hsi Learning. Because the samurai considered the learning an effective tool of political administration, it became very popular among them.

Further, it is important to understand that the samurai class at the time was denied a chance to rise in rank by military achievement. The quickest way for them to be recognized and get a better position was to apply themselves to studies, especially to Confucianism. Thus the samurai in general became very interested in Confucianism, and there were a number of accomplished scholars among them. Some of these scholars were called into the service of the Shogunate and of some feudal lords to take part in the planning and execution of their administrative policies.

On the other hand, there were some intellectuals who stayed away from official employment and criticized government policies, confidently expressing their views and contributing much to the promotion of the "statesmanship and popular welfare" concept.

The Confucianists who earned themselves a scholarly reputation from the early

modern age to the time just before the Genroku Era (1688–1703) were: Seika Fujiwara (1561–1619); Razan Hayashi (1583–1657), who worked for the Shogunate; Toju Nakae (1608–1648), who worked in no official capacity and became known as the Sage of Omi Province (Omi Seijin); Ansai Yamazaki (1618–1682), under Feudal Lord Masayuki Hoshina of the Aizu Clan; Banzan Kumazawa (1619–1691), under Feudal Lord Ikeda of the Bizen Clan; Sokō Yamaga (1622–1685), under Feudal Lord Asano of the Akoo Clan; Ekken Kaibara (1630–1714), under Feudal Lord Kuroda of the Fukuoka Clan; and some retainer scholars of the Feudal Lord of the Mito Clan.

As can be seen in the above cases, Confucianists often sought and received official patronage.⁽⁴¹⁾ Some of them, however, had no political principles of their own with which to influence leaders. It was natural that some of the proud samurai considered these Confucianists as mere playthings of dilettante feudal lords or regarded them as jester-like appendages of their masters.

Not all the Confucianists mentioned were of the Chu Hsi Learning. Some persons were quick to react against the course which the Chu Hsi Learning took, for example, the government servant attitude, the monopolistic trend of Confucian studies, as assumed by the samurai class, and the bureaucratization of the Chu Hsi Learning.

Tōju Nakae,⁽⁴²⁾ remaining a commoner savant as was mentioned before, never swerved from the orthodox path of the Wang Yang-Ming Learning. He criticized the Hayashi School as shallow and materialistic and contributed much toward the development of Confucianism in Japan by emphasizing its spiritual aspect.⁽⁴³⁾ However, with the gradual consolidation of the feudal regime, the Nakae School was thwarted in its advance, although it was faithfully taken up some time later by scholars who were tradesman by birth. Some samurai also came forward and condemned some of their own kind who had become government servants by twisting the Chu Hsi Learning to secure official positions.

The intense criticism which was levelled against the degradation of the Chu Hsi Learning was in fact due to a more significant cause. It was social conditions such as the material prosperity of tradesmen as a result of the development of a commodity or money economy in the peaceful era, the pressing economic hardship of the samurai and peasants, and a clearly perceived change in the times or thoughts, which brought about such a situation. Also, to the samurai who actually had the task of ruling the country, the prevalent Chu Hsi Learning was too speculative, ideological, abstract and powerless as an administrative tenet to dictate the country's destiny. The samurai were too closely tied to the actualities of society and were looking for an effective ideological agency which would help them solve the existing problems.

Two scholars arose to solve this problem: Sokō Yamaga and Banzan Kumazawa.⁽⁴⁴⁾ Their thoughts were critical commentaries on the Chu Hsi theory of political thought as developed by the samurai class.

As they were originally ardent students of the Chu Hsi Learning, their thoughts—

not satisfied with the theory then prevalent—naturally took the form of self-examination. Beginning with a strong enthusiasm for the Chu Hsi Learning, mastering military science and various other branches of learning, Sokō finally succeeded in establishing his own theory of divine learning.

Banzan was born of a poor family and worked to be able to study from his early youth. Having all sorts of experiences, being trained in the Wang Yang-Ming Learning and even actually taking part in the administration of the Ikeda Clan in Okayama Province, he developed his own thoughts on the “statesmanship and popular welfare” concept.

These two gentlemen severely criticized the Chu Hsi Learning for its lack of power. Neither of them, however, went so far as to develop their theories to the point of condemning the basic feudalistic structure of politics, although they were fully aware of the inconsistencies in the actual organization of the Tokugawa Shogunate. In other words, they indicated the inadequacy of the Chu Hsi Learning to take care of the Shogunate’s characteristic weaknesses and proclaimed that their theories were capable of supplementing what was lacking in the Chu Hsi Learning. In this sense, they seem to have contributed toward the maintenance and the perfection of feudalism as it then existed. They were ideologists typical of the first period of the Tokugawa Regime just preceding the Genroku Era (1688–1703).

CHAPTER V. THE WAY OF “STATESMANSHIP AND POPULAR
WELFARE” AS EXPOUNDED BY SOKŌ YAMAGA AND
BANZAN KUMAZAWA IN THE FIRST HALF OF
THE TOKUGAWA PERIOD

Examining the life, ideological transformation and academic activities of Sokō Yamaga (1622–1685),⁽⁴⁵⁾ we get the impression that the shift in his thought seems to represent the ideological transition of Japan from the Civil War Time through the early modern age, to the time just before the Genroku Era. In this period, political consciousness was awakened among the feudal lords as a result of their successful warfare. The principle of statesmanship and the feudalistic doctrine of politics were established on the basis of the Chu Hsi Learning, and there followed criticism of the Chu Hsi Learning.

An evolution of thought similar to the above occurred in Sokō. First, he applied himself assiduously to the Chu Hsi Learning and at the same time endeavored to reach the highest level of many branches of knowledge, so that he would be an accomplished samurai and rise in the world. Of course, he studied the Japanese classics and military science, that is, the requisites for any person of the samurai class. His ambition was the unification of military science with Confucian culture and in this attempt arose the germ of criticism of the Chu Hsi Learning. Soon, he came to advocate a divine learning of his own. He urged the samurai—the ruling class in the peaceful era—to become conscious of their mission and prescribed the standards characteristically worthy of the samurai in daily life, self-cultivation

and behaviors. Military science which is primarily the study of the art of war, proved through Sokō's perception to be the great law for statecraft which should be studied by the samurai. He considered it the rule for samurai to make perfection more perfect in their performance of duties and in their attempt to defend their country, and thus to be in accordance with the grand law of heaven and earth. This is the rule which a samurai should stand by even in the execution of the trivial affairs of daily life, it being in perfect agreement with the Confucian teaching: "Right mind and good faith are the foundation of family, country, heaven and earth." A samurai should be ready to fight not only against an enemy from abroad, but one in his own mind in a time of peace. Thus he emphasized the point that military science originates in the "way" or "reason" which pervades heaven and earth, as the Confucian doctrine says.

The theory, therefore, on the way of the samurai or the law of the samurai established by Sokō went on developing into a political theory or the "statesmanship and popular welfare" concept in its broadest sense. It was the basic principle of statecraft to be followed by the samurai, who are expected to render faithful service to their liege lords. At the same time it was the rule of conduct for the samurai in their peaceful daily life.

While Sokō eagerly inculcated morals on one hand, he dwelled, on the other, on the necessity of knowledge by which to adjust oneself to various things and react to them properly. He did not confine the application of his moral precepts to the samurai as individuals, but explained their political or social significance in practical situations. Thus he emphasized the importance of a knowledge of ceremony, law and institutions. The ideal samurai, as Sokō conceived it, was a man who was equipped with refinement and morals. He did not care for speculative law, but wanted one which concerned itself with practical contents that are political or social. Thus he stressed the importance of the knowledge of objective phenomena, as well as the practical techniques to manage them.

With the idealism or abstractness of the traditional Chu Hsi Learning being overcome in this way, he advocated the Sage's Way supported by the vehicle of the practical ingenuity of the samurai. Not satisfied with the optimistic politics of the Chu Hsi Learning: Heaven and Earth will be directed rightly, if your naive mind is held to the right path, Sokō explained to the people the significance of practical wisdom in politics.

Looking, however, at the facts or phenomena dealt with by Sokō, we find that his perceptions were not thoroughly objective. For example, his grasp of economic problems was very inconsistent, often lingering on an ideological and abstract plane.

Sokō was born of a samurai family. It is true that he aimed at developing the Military-Sage's Learning by criticizing and conquering the Chu Hsi and the Wang Yang-Ming Learning, but in the final analysis, he affirmed the existing feudalism. We cannot but call him a servant of the samurai class. We shouldn't be surprised if we find no positive sign in his thought of an attempt to expose

the inconsistencies—political, economic and social—of modern feudalism and reform them.

Now, we take up another scholar, Banzan Kumazawa (1619–1691, the 5th year of the Genna Era to the 4th year of the Genroku Era).⁽⁴⁶⁾ He proved an extraordinary person—unique in thought and varied in experience—among the scholars who were active in the first part of the Tokugawa Period. His life was full of ups and downs, his thought was broad and varied, and his writings ranged over diverse fields, exerting a great influence on the scholars who appeared in his wake. His thoughts are fairly well developed in two of his works: *The Collection of Essays, I (Shūgi Washo)* and *The Collection of Essays, II (Shūgi Gesho)*, but the *Some Questions in Advanced Politics (Daigaku Waku-mon)* is a concise summary of his thoughts. This is one of the greatest books on statesmanship produced in the Tokugawa Period. It contains practically all the issues in embryo which the scholars of later ages studied, although they were often approached differently.

Here we examine the formation of his thought. He professed to be bound by no ideology. He was, however, enthusiastic about the Chu Hsi Learning when he was quite young and poor and became a pupil of Tōju Nakae to study the Wang Yang-Ming Learning as he grew into manhood. This does not mean that he accepted Wang Yang-Ming's thought without reservation. He took a serious view of the inner momentum which was stressed in any study of the practical ethics prevalent in those days. In other words, while he was inclined toward the rationalism of the Chu Hsi Learning, his stand seems to have been midway between the Chu Hsi Learning and the Wang Yang-Ming Learning. Also, there is no denying that his idea of "statesmanship and popular welfare" was formed largely as a result of the practical experience he had while participating in the administration of Okayama under Ikeda, his liege lord. In other words, his great work, *Some Questions in Advanced Politics*, was the result of his own ingenuity and the practical experience he had as a statesman.

The *Some Questions in Advanced Politics*⁽⁴⁷⁾ is a candid criticism of the Shogunate. The same as Soko's, Banzan's thought was always centered around the notion of the samurai, the ruling class. His thought dwelled solely on the samurai, the people worthy of the paramount morals prescribed for the wise man or the gentleman. It was only the samurai class of people who could discern reason through knowledge; they were ideal people.

Expressed conversely, a samurai should earnestly endeavor to be a man of this sort. A samurai should make an effort not only to elevate his own self through training, but also should try to cultivate himself in the interest of public morals, so that the masses could be relieved of their economic distress, be delivered from their delusions, and walk in the path of emancipation.

To realize this path of emancipation, Banzan thought it essential to rule with benevolence and benevolent government, especially emphasizing the importance of practical techniques of administration. The person who actually executes this benevolent administration is the so-called enlightened monarch or good premier,

and he is exactly the person designated as a samurai. Thus Banzan defines an ideal samurai or administrator as a person who is amply provided with knowledge and virtue.

The way, therefore, to eradicate social evils is in understanding humanity and putting into effect practical political measures in accordance with the necessities of time, place and situation. Thus he requires the samurai not only to be bearers of knowledge and virtue, but to be the embodiment of the talent to perceive social conditions and to conduct politics accordingly, instead of hanging on to an abstract theory, especially as related to material goods and the economic policies essential for their production. Viewed in this way, Banzan's theory of "statesmanship and popular welfare" should be called full of merit.

Seeking the way to relieve the masses of their distress, he untiringly looked into its causes. His positivistic grasp of social realities is really amazing when we are aware of how ignorant the general populace was in those days, although we have to admit certain limitations to his theory.

He says in his *Some Questions in Advanced Politics*: "No benevolent government can operate without wealth."⁽⁴⁸⁾ Viewing, however, the realities as they are, he goes on to say "Being saddled with an ever augmenting debt, the whole world—rich and poor—is failing. Samurai, peasants, artisans and tradesmen are all in poverty. Really, the whole world is hovering in destitution!"⁽⁴⁹⁾

Banzan attributes the cause of this general distress not to individual luxury, but to such a costly institution as the "feudal lord's alternate-year residence in Edo" (Sankin-Kotai), more concretely put, to the social or economic situations, or the trends or the currents of the time, as he calls them; for example (1) the urbanization of population, (2) the development of a money economy, (3) the lack of agencies to take care of these newly-emerged complex affairs, (4) basically put, the economic prosperity of tradesmen with the result of their control of the country's finances, (5) further, the traditional system of wages paid in goods or rice, confusing the prevalent money economy.

It is by no means easy to relieve the people of such a situation, but Banzan claims that a properly administered politics, effectively adjusting the tripartite pay system—wages granted in money, goods or rice—will bring opulence replacing the pervading destitution.

Observing the actual economic conditions, the relationship between goods, money and wages paid in goods, and further noticing the relationship between rice or wages paid in rice and wages paid in other goods, he attributed the cause of the distress to a monetary system in which gold, silver and coins are used. He advocated the abolition of money and stood for a kind of barter system where rice was exchanged for goods and goods for rice. On the assumption of such a natural economy, he presumed that the trend would be overcome and poverty done away with. This is Banzan's well-known theory of "rice as an exchange medium."

Concerning the difficulties naturally expected with a theory of "rice as an exchange medium", Banzan was very optimistic stating: "Naturally, troubles may

occur in the actual execution of this theory, but it is easy to give it an extemporaneous interpretation."⁽⁵⁰⁾ Also, he offers excellent views or commentaries on the problems then existent, as his "Criticism of the Feudal Lord's Alternate-year Residence in Edo", "Masterless Samurai", "Forestry and Flood Control", "Production of Imported Goods", "Christianity", "Buddhism", "Shintoism", "Confucianism", "Education" and "Peasant Soldiers."

As has been mentioned, Banzan tackled such a pressing problem as poverty and presented his theory of "Rice as an Exchange Medium" for its solution with the object of restoring natural economic conditions. It must be remembered that Banzan's politics centered on the idea of a heaven-commissioned ruler; in other words, his thought was developed around the notion of the samurai as rulers.

To him, man was synonymous with samurai. It is vital, therefore, that a samurai should be awakened to his mission and be equipped with talent and virtue. This teaching of his can be taken as strengthening the then extant Chu Hsi Learning by supplementing what was lacking in it. It is true that Banzan aimed at educating the samurai class in the attitude or philosophy of life they should assume in solving the new problem of their time, that is, the financial problem; although the type of samurai he depicted was in actuality the old type of samurai. This was just the opposite of the picture he intended to convey, that is, the samurai of the mediaeval period or the Civil War Time when the samurai were characteristically inseparable from peasants; and he believed that Confucianism was the mainstay in the cause. At any rate, Banzan's intention was to present Confucianism in a fresh light, although the type he adopted was different from that of Sokō's. It was a new development of Confucianism as seen from the standpoint of the samurai. And because of this, he was condemned and confined by the Shogunate, the same as Sokō.

The fact, however, was that Banzan did not repudiate the Shogunate, rather he absolutely affirmed the existing feudalism. What he wanted to do was to overcome existing social inconsistencies by strengthening samurai control and establishing an improved, ideal feudalism.

The reasons Banzan and Sokō were politically condemned by the Shogunate were that they severely criticized the Chu Hsi Learning which was the official ideology; the Chu Hsi scholars in the service of the government were emotionally against them; that they were of samurai birth, but they were masterless, serving no particular feudal lord yet they had a large number of followers and appeared to be important figures among the dissenters. Yet, both of them should be praised for the useful service they rendered to the cause of promoting Confucianism among the samurai and their attempt to establish a better feudal society. Really, they were typical scholars of the "statesmanship and popular welfare" concept representing the first period of the Tokugawa regime.

CHAPTER VI. CONCLUSION. AN OUTLOOK FOR THE SECOND HALF
OF THE TOKUGAWA PERIOD

The peace which prevailed under the Shogunate gradually worked to undermine the foundations set to ensure its perpetuity, leading to urban development, elevating the consumption level of towns, stimulating a commodity and money economy, enabling the formation of commercial capital, and stirring tradesmen to activity, while the samurai class that had been dependent on peasants—producers of rice and tax-bearers—for their livelihood, were gradually driven into poverty.

Situations involving various political, economic or social problems that had never been expected at the beginning of the Shogunate occurred. The samurai—the ruling class—was then obliged to give serious consideration to politics, face the economic problems squarely and contrive some proper measures to cope with them.

The rise of the ruled, that is, the prosperity of townsmen ensuring them an increased influence in economics and society, began to create doubts about the political control so far unquestionably held by the samurai. Some scholars were against the way that the study of Confucianism was monopolized by the samurai and some scholars were for the way that they controlled and guided the masses. Tōju Nakae was one of the outstanding scholars who felt this way. Jinsai Itō was another of the same sort; in fact, he was more definitely that way. He advocated the Old Learning, standing for the masses. He exercised an ideological influence against political control by the samurai. Jinsai's theory in favor of the commoners' welfare, being supported by the elevated cultural standards of Kyōto, Osaka and other progressive places, proved a formidable menace to the absolutism of the samurai's political power.

Contrary to this popular welfare trend, the school of learning which served the Shogunate, upheld by the Hayashi's, was patronized by feudal lords under the Shogunate. Hakuseki Arai was one of these servant scholars who were given high positions in the government. He wielded power during the two successive reigns of Ienobu and Ietsugu as their personal steward, contributing much to such economic problems as recoinage in the Genroku Era and foreign trade. He was the motivating force in the administration in favor of the so-called ceremonial politics.

There appeared another scholar, a big figure in the revolutionary age. He was Sorai Ogyū. His ideological stand was the reaffirmation of feudalism and the consolidation of political control by the samurai, while on the other hand, he sided with the masses and resisted the Confucian pleading in behalf of the samurai class. He condemned the Old Learning of Jinsai that had weakened the position of the samurai and criticized the Hakuseki's ceremonial politics. His thought was certainly a unique one. The concept of "statesmanship and popular welfare" underwent a complete transformation at his hands, bringing it to perfect consummation.

NOTES

(1) So far, there have not been many historical studies of science as it developed in Japan so far. But in the *History of Science*, edited by Isao Sugimoto recently *Systematized Japanese History, Series No. 19 (Taikai Nihonshi-sōsho 19)* is a worthy work in this field.

It is stated on page 7 of this book: "Studying the situation before the wholesale importation of science, we come across a limited number of records on descriptive sciences such as medicine, herbage, astronomy, the calendar, mathematics and geography. At the time when these branches of science were brought over, such basic subjects of modern science as dynamics, physics and chemistry were not known, while looking over the pedigree of the descriptive sciences of ancient times, we find them having very little scientific value if examined in terms of modern science. They should rather be called arts the same as medicine, the calendar or arithmetic, for they were in an undifferentiated state.

Even these art forms were not indigenously developed in Japan. They were transplanted into Japan from the Continent. This is true of such cultural elements as religion, literature and the fine arts, as well as science and technology. Here is the reason why Japanese culture is often designated as retarded and deficient in originality."

(2) Economics was introduced into Japan in its regular form by such scholars or seers as Kohei Kanda, Amane Nishi, Mamichi Tsuda and Yukichi Fukuzawa around the closing years of the Shogunate, that is, just before the dawn of the Meiji Era. To know how economics was imported to and studied in Japan, we may turn to such meritorious past works as those published by Kinnoyuke Otsuka, Seiichirō Takahashi, Eijirō Honjō, Tsuneo Hori, Kanetarō Nomura and Takao Tsuchiya.

(3) For example, the strong influence exerted by scholars like Banri Hoashi in the last years of the Shogunate on such a person as Yukichi Fukuzawa, who introduced laissez-faire economics into Japan, contributed much to the development of science in the enlightenment period of Japan, and founded the Keiōgijuku University, is mentioned.

(4) Shundai Dazai: *Notes on Economics (Keizairoku)*, the *Lexicon on Japanese Economy*, Vol. 9, p. 394.

(5) Nobuhiro Satō: *A Digest of Economics (Keizaiyoroku)*, Iwanami Library (Iwanami Bunko), p. 13.

(6) Refer to Saburō Ienaga: *General Review of the Works by Modern Thinkers (Kinsei Shisoka Bunshu)*, *An Outline of Literary Classics of Japan*, No. 97, to see how varied the contents of the "statesmanship and popular welfare" concept and the stands of the controversialists were.

(7) Masahide Bitō: *History of Feudal Thought in Japan (Nihon Hōkenschisō-shi)*, p. 227.

(8) Masahide Bitō: *History of Feudal Thought in Japan*, p. 227.

(9) See, the *Political Discourse (Seidan)* in the *Lexicon on Japanese Economy*, No. 9. McEwan: *The Political Writings of Ogyū Sorai*, Cambridge University Press, 1962.

(10) See Masao Maruyama: *History of Political Thought in Japan (Nihon Seiji Shisō-shi Kenkyū)*, Chapter I.

(11) On this point, Chapter V: "Historical Significance of Banzan Kumazawa" of Mr. Masahide Bitō's previously cited work gives ample suggestion, focusing on Banzan Kumazawa in the first period, and Sorai Ogyū in the second period.

(12) Concerning the modernization of the Japanese economy as seen from various angles, consult the symposium: *Modernization of Japanese Economy (Nihon Keizai no Kindai-ka)* by Keiōgijuku researchers, edited by the Faculty of Economics, Keiō University, 1967.

(13) As a noteworthy work, refer to R. N. Bellah: *Tokugawa Religion*.

Concerning the origin of modern enterprisers in Japan, consult the *Origin of Modern Enterprisers (Kindai Kigyōka no Hassei)* edited by the Society of Social Economic History, 1963; Takao Tsuchiya: *History of Japanese Economic Thought (Nihon Keizai Rinenshi)*; 1964; Isao Denda: *A Study of the Economic Thought of Modern Japan (Kindai Nihon Keizai Shiso no Kenkyū)*, 1962.

(14) The author's essays as viewed from this angle: (a) On the Origin and Development of the Theory, "Statesmanship and Popular Welfare" in the Modern Age. *A Biography of Seiryō* (Seiryō-ki); *Principles of Political Administration (Honsaroku)*, Mita Gakkai Zasshi, 56-9. (b) Theory of "Statesmanship and Popular Welfare" as Developed by Sokō Yamaga, in the First Period of Modern Age, Mita Gakkai Zasshi, 58-6. (c) The Theory of "Statesmanship and Popular Welfare" in the First Period of the Modern Age, centering around Banzan, *Social Economic History (Shakai Keizai Shigaku)*, 32-3. In this essay, some part of the following work is discussed in detail.

(15) About this time, the modern idea of "statesmanship and popular welfare" was fairly clearly discussed. Concerning the conditions which awakened political consciousness and brought economic phenomena to people's attention, see (a) of *Note 14*.

(16) The "Laws on the Possessions of Provincial Lords" are presented in Volume 3: "Family Laws of Feudal Clans" (Buke-kaho) in the *Collection of Legislations of Mediaeval Age (Chusei Hosei Shiryoshū)*, co-edited by Satō, Ikeuchi and Momose.

(17) *The Five Generations of the Hōjō Family (Hōjō Godai-ki)*.

(18) *A Biography of Seiryō* was published by Professor Y. Irimajiri after World War II with detailed annotations by the author.

Also, refer to Toshio Furushima: *History of Agricultural Science in Japan (Nihon Nōgakushi)*, and to (a) of the *Note 14*, one of the author's essays.

(19) Y. Irimajiri, edited by: *A Biography of Seiryō (Seiryō-ki)*, *Shinmin-kagami Gesshū*, p. 162.

(20) *Ibid.*, p. 77.

(21) *Ibid.*, p. 77.

(22) *Ibid.*, p. 116.

(23) Refer for details to Toshio Furushima: *History of Agriculture of Japan* concerning the *Local Notes* and the *Agricultural Notes*.

(24) The *Honsaroku* is presented in the 3rd Volume of the *Lexicon on Japanese Economy*. Concerning the details of the principles on the administration of farmers in the First Period of the Shogunate, centering around the *Honsaroku*, refer to (a) of *Note 14*.

(25) It was in very remote times that Confucianism was imported into Japan from China. Of its development ever since, many books have been published.

Concerning the characteristics of the Chu Hsi Learning as it originated and developed in China, the latest work by Junichirō Morimoto: *History of Oriental Political Thought*, 1967 is a worthy one, while the characteristics of the Chu Hsi Learning as imported into Japan and criticized by the Old Learning are brilliantly treated in the *Historical Study of Tokugawa Thoughts* by Shirō Tahara, 1967.

Concerning the political thought of the Chu Hsi Learning, refer to the previously cited *History of the Political Thought of Japan*, by Masao Maruyama.

(26) The contents of the *Honsaroku* are as follows: The Instructions for the reign of the country:

- (a) Be awake to the way of Heaven;
- (b) Be upright in the bearing of yourself for fear that you may be amiss in your conduct and state administration;
- (c) Distinguish right from wrong in all affairs;
- (d) Be high-minded in state affairs;
- (e) Decide on your family successor, a guardian and an advisor for him;
- (f) How to manage farmers;
- (g) Affairs between foreign countries and Japan;

The above are the seven articles essential for the reign of the country.*

(27) The *Honsaroku*. Consult the third volume of the *Lexicon*, p. 6.

* Taken from the third volume of the *Lexicon on Japanese Economy*.

- (28) The *Honsaroku*. Consult the third volume of the *Lexicon*, p. 8.
- (29) Consult the third volume of the *Lexicon*, p. 21. The matters that are: stressed here are an exact measurement of a farmer's land, and the total amount of products thereof; all the remainder after the deduction of the annual expenses for farming and livelihood to be paid as tax; the farmers repeat the same simple process of production every year so as not to let them enjoy surplus or suffer from destitution.
- (30) The *Honsaroku*. The third volume of *Lexicon on Japanese Economy*, p. 21.
- (31) "The Fundamentals for Statesmanship." The third volume of the *Lexicon on Japanese Economy*, p. 57.
- (32) The *Honsaroku*. The third volume of the *Lexicon on Japanese Economy*, p. 10.
- (33) "The Fundamentals for Statesmanship." The third volume of the *Lexicon on Japanese Economy*, p. 57.
- (34) *Ibid.*, p. 57.
- (35) *Ibid.*, p. 65.
- (36) *Ibid.*, p. 65.
- (37) *Ibid.*, p. 65.
- (38) The "Way of Heaven" as the foundation of statesmanship, which is repeatedly referred to in the *Honsaroku*, is discussed here.
- (39) A paragraph from the *Daigaku*, stressing the importance of the strengthening of production and economy in consumption.
- (40) As to Razan Hayashi, refer to Isao Hori: *Razan Hayashi, Man of Worth Series*, No. 118, 1964.
- (41) If expressed in modern terms, these "scholars" were "intellectuals" at the time. Not all of them were received by their feudal lords as respectable scholars. One would not be surprised to hear that they were often treated like "patronized wrestlers." In those days when the provincial administration was generally under the control of high class samurai, it was very rare that a scholar took part in clan administration.
- (42) Concerning Tōju Nahae, see Masahide Bitō, *History of Feudal Thought in Japan*, Chap. 3-4.
- (43) As a pioneer of "practical ethics", Tōju exerted a great influence on Bai Gan Ishida in thought. Also, he largely affected the scholars of the Kaitokudō at Osaka.
- (44) For detailed information on Sokō Yamaga and Banzan Kumazawa, refer to the previously cited (b) of Note 14 and (c) of Note 14 by the author.
- (45) Refer to the previously cited (b) of Note 14 by the author.
- (46) Refer to the previously cited (c) of Note 14 by the author.
- (47) Refer to "Some Questions in the *Daigaku*" in the third volume of the *Lexicon on Japanese Economy*.
- (48) *Ibid.*, p. 117.
- (49) *Ibid.*, p. 117.
- (50) *Ibid.*, p. 120.