

The Source and Development of Japan's Philosophies of Non-Violence

This article is a summary of a public lecture hosted by this Institute and held in Tokyo on 24 November 2009

Shinichi Yamamuro

I have been asked to talk on this occasion on the theme of “non-violence” which I have studied for over thirty years. This has given me a good opportunity to reexamine the questions: “What is violence? What is non-violence?” Today, I would like to think about this theme together with you, rather than to give a one-way lecture, so that we can consider how to achieve peace.

Does Civil Disobedience Alone Constitute Non-Violence?

“Non-violence” often comes to mind when we think of the term *ahimsa*, which, for example, Gandhi used. The word *himsa* in Hindi means “to inflict injury on a person,” in other words to hurt a person. The word *ahimsa*, “non-violence,” is formed by adding the negative adverb *a*. What exactly is “inflicting injury”? Naturally, it is easy to understand physical violence, such as war, in which people are harmed, but are there other ways of inflicting injury? If so, how should we understand non-violence?

When we think of non-violence what generally comes to mind is “civil disobedience,” which comes from the history of European thought. This is an active rejection of a law or orders from government or other authorities through non-violent means. Examples include the independence movement from the British Empire, such as “the Salt Satyagraha” led by Mahatma Gandhi, the anti apartheid struggles of Nelson Mandela in South Africa, or the civil rights movement in the 1960s in the United States led by Reverend Martin Luther King. These have been called “civil disobedience,” and in Japan the methods employed in these examples have been understood as “non-violent philosophies.”

The Oriental Idea of Non-Killing and “Moral Influence”

The non-violent thought of Gandhi derives originally from ancient India, together with a digested version of ideas of civil resistance promoted by American thinker Henry David Thoreau. In order to avoid any misunderstanding, I'd like to point out something in advance: I am not taking issue over whether this philosophy emerged from Europe or Asia. I believe we have the right and duty to inherit intellectual heritage as members of humanity from any country or historical period. Working on this premise, in Asia, or more specifically East Asia, were there any philosophies similar to these, such as non-violent philosophy? For instance, in the spirit of resistance or non-violence as civil disobedience, physical force lacking in legal basis or justification was regarded as violence. Assuming violence means to subdue others by force, then “non-violence” can be defined as the state in which such force does not exist. If we consider this from a religious and philosophical standpoint however, “non-violence” refers to not killing living beings. I believe that absence of conditions that promote killing can also be called “non-violence.” In addition, if we assume that humans are part of nature, then violence and non-violence exists not only in human relationships. If we assume that any action or behavior that humans commit toward living beings including animals and plants is violent and causes harm to the other party, this must be taken into account. I think that *Jinsei Chirigaku* (A Geography of Human Life) written by Makiguchi Tsunesaburō dealt with rethinking issues like this from the fundamental level.

If we consider the issue of whether other forms of non-violent philosophies apart from European “disobedience” exist, the ideas of the precept forbidding the taking of life and “moral influence” come to mind. “Moral influence” is explained as follows in the Chinese philosophical work *The Caigentan* (literally “Vegetable Root Discourse”) and in simple terms, this means that “if you encounter someone who cheats or lies, you should respond solely in good faith and change the other party through our sincerity.” We change the other party through good faith, never through force. If we meet a person who is unjustifiably violent, we do not react with violence but respond with the harmonious intention to understand the person with all our being. Through this you can change the person, just as fragrant incense can eliminate bad odors. This is what “moral influence” means. I will come back to this later as it is an extremely important concept.

The idea is to suppress violence by changing the person through responding not with violence but with utmost sincerity, no matter how much they may try to inflict injury onto you. In Chinese philosophy,

there is a notion that no matter how mistaken the path one may have chosen, they can return to the correct path without fail. Furthermore, *The Caigentan* is not just referring to human relationships but human relationships with nature.

In the *Shōbōgenzō Zuimonki* (Gleanings from Master Dōgen's Sayings) states as follows: "When one worries about killing someone and at the same time not being killed himself, he is tense and on guard. But someone who has no desire for revenge, even if he should be killed, finds no need to worry about robbers. There is no time when he is not at ease." (Reihō Masunaga, *A Primer of Sōtō Zen: A Translation of Dōgen's Shōbōgenzō Zuimonki*, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1971, pp. 51–52.)

This may refer the state of enlightenment. However, if you try exact revenge just because the other party is evil then you also become evil at that point. Therefore this must be avoided.

Are the Japanese a Warlike Race?

I wrote a book entitled *Kenpō 9 jō no Shisō-Suimyaku* (The Thought Lineage of Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution, Tokyo: Asahi Shimbunsha, 2007) and one reason for writing it was because I held some unresolved feelings within my heart. When I was a child, there was an old man in the neighborhood who would get angry even if we tried to kill a mosquito. He would shout out, "don't kill it!" We used mosquito nets in our rooms and it was the children's job to hang the nets. I was short so it was a tough job. Mosquito nets probably developed from a culture of living together with nature harmoniously and not killing insects and other beings. In any case, this man would admonish me and say that if I caught a fish in the river I should return it if I had no intention of eating it. At the same time, however, he would tell me how he had killed people in China at the battlefield. For a long time I was not able to understand this. In short, I have always wondered why Japanese people can be cruel on the battlefield when they treat life as something precious saying, "Tread on a worm and it will turn." What is more, these two aspects do not contradict each other with one person.

I suppose there are some systems that drive people to engage in war and turn them into devils who will actively participate on the battlefield even if at home they live in accordance quite naturally with the idea of no killing. Japan fought wars almost every ten years from the Sino-Japanese war until 1945. So there was an unresolved question in my heart about whether the Japanese are a warlike people or not. This was one of my motivations to write *Kenpō 9 jō no Shisō-Suimyaku*: I wanted

to retrace this question comprehensively. That is to say, I believe that maybe the Japanese did not just rush madly into war but rather thought about how they could stop war. Certainly this did not turn into a great movement. However, I came to think that these ideas resided under the surface and gradually drifted up to us now.

In this sense, I would like to think about non-violence in relation to no war and peace today, because non-violence has issues related to its aspect as “philosophy” as well as its “system” to stop violence. We cannot just summarize this as simply an issue of the heart or mind. Thus, I would like us to think together about how we can eliminate violence and war from society and what direction we should aim at in order to achieve this goal.

1. Non-violent Philosophy at the end of Edo- and early Meiji Periods

When I traced the history of Japan and Asia, I found philosophies that have potential connections to the idea of non-violence.

“Japan should become the World’s Caretaker”

One example is Yokoi Shōnan, a philosopher who was very active at the end of the Edo period. He was originally from the Higo-Kumamoto domain and was a Confucianist. He advocated revising Japan’s international relations on the basis of universal brotherhood, whereby all people of this world are equal and are compatriots, brothers, regardless of national borders or any other differences. Yokoi took the lead in trying to implement this idea. “Let us reveal the paths of Emperor Yao, Emperor Shun, and Confucius, and strive to learn the skills of Western technology. The goal is to spread great morality throughout the world. Why be content with enriching the nation and strengthening the army?” Yokoi stated that the great morality should be spread to the “four oceans,” that is, to the entire world. At the end of the Edo period he advocated that the mission of the Japanese was to reveal the ideal governance of Emperor Yao, Emperor Shun, and Confucius, the path of peace, and morality, and spread these to the world.

As stated here, Yokoi began the idea of “enrich the country, strengthen the military.” He held that it is difficult to spread this “great morality” to the world though moral correctness alone. His position was that in case the nation of Japan is attacked, the people must defend it. However, the premise is to promote peace to the world and its purpose is not to “enrich the country, strengthen the military.” He stated that Japan should

be “the world’s caretaker,” meaning Japan should take the lead in demilitarization. Rather than arming itself to attack other countries, Japan should focus only on being defensive. At the same time, Yokoi called for an appeal not just to Japan but also to the United States to stop war. He stated that “in cooperation with the United States, we must do more to eradicate the poison of war.”

This may sound very strange considering that this was proposed amid the turbulence of the end of the Edo period. However, Yokoi was not an ordinary man. In fact, Katsu Kaishū wrote in his *Hikawa Seiwa*, “up until now I have met two formidable individuals in particular: Yokoi Shōnan and Saigo Nanshū (Takamori).” He held that if Yokoi’s philosophy had implemented by Saigo, the shogunate would have crumbled and Japan would have become a better country. Since Yokoi was assassinated soon after the Meiji Restoration his ideas did not come to fruition. However, he had a great influence on people from the Tokutomi family, including the literary figure Tokutomi Roka. Although Sakamoto Ryōma from Tosa used to say “Japan must be cleaned up once and for all,” these were originally Yokoi’s words. Furthermore, “all matters decided by open discussion,” which is set down in the Charter Oath, also originates from the ideas of Yokoi. Yuri Kōsei, who studied under Yokoi, took these ideas and drafted the Charter Oath.

Conceptions of “United Governments of the World” and “Constitution of the World”

Another person I would like to mention is Ono Azusa. He was the central figure in the establishment of Tokyo College, which is now Waseda University. Although Ōkuma Shigenobu is the official founder, it was Ono who actually made the school system and formed the founding spirit of the college.

At the age of eighteen Ono went to China and saw the harsh reality of suppressed peoples’ lives under colonization in places like Shanghai. Seeing this, he thought about how the injustice perpetrated by great and powerful nations could be stopped. He proposed that the “Great United Governments of the World” be created and advocated the ideas of world governance and federation to establish “One Great United Government” formed by the gathering of great minds from around the world.

As you probably know, the Japanese Diet is supposed to have been making efforts during the sixty years of the postwar period toward the creation of a World Federation. In fact, the World Federalist Movement of Japan comprising of bipartisan upper and lower house members has been active since its foundation in 1949. In fact, this was proposed by

the eighteen-year-old Ono Azusa at the beginning of the Meiji period.

Another figure is Nakamura Masanao. Through his translations of works such as *Self-Help* by Samuel Smiles and *On Liberty* by John Stuart Mill into Japanese, he was very influential during the Meiji period. He also thought it was wrong to categorize the people of the world as strong, weak, superior, or inferior based on national borders. He was influenced somewhat by European philosophy but he believed that all humans share the world as their mutual homeland and they can never be segregated based on race or national borders. He declared that everyone should make efforts to establish peace as members of the same world. Nakamura established a school named Dōjinsha and he was the first person to provide education to women. He started educating women from around the seventh or the eighth year of the Meiji period based on the idea that creating good mothers leads to the development of a good country and society. This led him to the early trial of opening Dōjinsha Girls' School. Nakamura's ideology of "good wife and wise mother" confines women to the home so it is problematic in some regards. However, he thought of the social role of families, mothers, and wives. His ideologies were gradually taken up and spread by exchange students from Asia he interacted with. A similar ideology took hold in Korea.

Another noteworthy individual is Ueki Emori. He played an important leading role in the popular rights movement. His idea was to eradicate war through the establishment of the "Best Constitution of the World" (*Udai mujō kenpō*). He also believed in "citizens' right to resist," which refers to the civil disobedience mentioned above. In other words, people have the natural right to resist their government if it were to trample on their rights that are stipulated in the constitution. Of course they cannot resist the government when it is in the right, but the idea is that if the government is in the wrong, resistance itself is the right of the citizens. As there are various opinions on this, whether this notion is good or bad is a separate issue. The point is that this was how Ueki thought, and it is another manifestation of non-violent philosophy.

Let Us Be the "Wind" of Demilitarization

Nakae Chōmin, a theorist of the popular rights movement, wrote a famous book entitled *Sansuijin Keirin Mondo* (A Discourse by Three Drunkards on Government). This book is about a fictitious debate conducted by three people from different perspectives. One of them is Yōgaku Shinshi, a Gentleman of Western Learning. He asserts that Japan should be a country of total demilitarization while referring to the works of Saint-Pierre and Kant's theory of perpetual peace.

Yōgaku Shinshi says that some people raise the issue that other countries could attack Japan if it becomes total demilitarized but this is not the case. If Japan used its money for the development of a highly-cultured nation or for the construction of railways or advancement of science in other countries instead of spending it on the military, then those countries that would attack such a cultured nation would be criticized by the world and could not survive. As you know, this notion of “constructing of a nation of culture” is the path Japan took after the Second World War. For example, the United States did not bomb Kyoto. While I’m not sure whether this is a good thing to say or not, if the United States had bombed Kyoto, which is a city of world cultural heritage, then it would have been accused forever as being a destroyer of culture. It is said that the United States did not destroy Kyoto out of fear of being accused in this way.

Nakae Chōmin stated, “Let us be the wind.” Be the wind with bare hands, not even with a gun. This means that even if the other party displays a sword, you should respond in a moral and courteous manner. Wind is something that cannot be slashed by swords. If both parties have swords then it turns into a swordfight, but the other party cannot slash you if you are the wind. He stated that the other party would be deeply ashamed and not know what to do.

Of course there may be counterarguments questioning how to respond if the other party was not so considerate, but the point here is that a person with such ideas existed at that time.

2. The Sino-Japanese War, the Russo-Japanese Wars, and Pacifism

Up until the Sino-Japanese War, the Japanese had not experienced war. However, after 1894 Japan was engaged in that war and then the Russo-Japanese Wars. Within this environment, the idea of pacifism emerged at the time of the Russo-Japanese Wars. During the Sino-Japanese War, virtually no one opposed it apart from Katsu Kaishū. He pointed out that Korea was just about to revitalize itself and there was no need for Japan to intervene. China is a country that Japan should learn from as its great mentor. Sending soldiers to these countries is an action analogous to forgetting one’s debt of gratitude. Rather, it is far more meaningful for Japan and China to help one another through trade. However, as can be seen from Fukuzawa Yukichi’s reference to the Sino-Japanese War as “the war between the civilized and the savage,” almost everyone apart from Katsu Kaishū supported the war. Even Uchimura Kanzō, who later

turned to pacifism during the Russo-Japanese War, stated “the Sino-Japanese War is the war of justice.” However, Uchimura later realized that he was wrong.

Interaction between Tolstoy and the Commoners' Society

In relation to pacifism and “not engaging in war,” we need to consider the issue of “why war occurs?” There are two ways of thinking about this. One is the kind of idea that is expressed in the UNESCO Constitution: “since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed.” The other is an idea that “war is fundamentally born out of the social structure called capitalism.” As you know, some say the reason why the United States engages in war almost every decade is to renew its arms. Wars occur because of the existence of a military-industrial complex, which is a unification of military and industry. These ideas were also prevalent in Japan. So-called socialists, such as Kōtoku Shūsui and Sakai Toshihiko, were famous figures of pacifism during the Russo-Japanese Wars. They thought that capitalists cause wars for their own benefit and that war can never end unless the capitalistic social structure itself is changed. Tolstoy, on the other hand, thought that this was not the case. There is an article of Tolstoy's called “Bethink Thyselfes!” The title means “you should repent” and “you should reflect on yourselves,” and it was published in the *London Times* in England on 27 June 1904. It was first published in Japan in the *Tokyo Asahi* newspaper, and the entire translation by Kōtoku Shūsui and Sakai Toshihiko was then published in the 7 August 1904 issue of *Heimin Shimbun* (the Commoners' News) produced by Heimin Sha (the Commoners' Society).

As you can see, during the Russo-Japanese War starting from 1904, the world became a much smaller place. For example, when people from The Commoners' Society wrote on pacifism and these writings travelled to the United States and were translated into English by American socialists. These then went to Europe and were translated into German. After that they appeared to have gone to Russia. In fact, within a period of about one month, opinions on war and revolution were exchanged between Russian socialists and members of The Commoners' Society. The twentieth century is an age when this kind of simultaneous linking of thoughts around the globe has occurred, and this is a typical example of this.

Although The Commoners' Society believed that capitalism was the cause of war, Tolstoy insisted that this was not the case. To the end, he held on to the idea that the cause of war lies in people's hearts and

lamented that once again that “universal stupefaction and brutalization of men” was about to occur. On the one hand the Japanese were Buddhists who forbid killing while on the other Russians were Christians who advocate philanthropy. Tolstoy questioned relentlessly why these two countries, which were “separated from each other by thousands of miles,” engage in war and insisted that they reflect and reconsider each other’s actions once again.

There is nothing more violent than war because people kill complete strangers merely by encountering them on the battlefield one day. It is more human-like behavior if there is some reason to hold a grudge against the other party in certain situations but war is not like this. During wartime, complete strangers who have never even met before face and kill each other one day on the battlefield. Tolstoy questioned how such inhumane actions could occur. As he thought in this way, he also believed that men were the ones who could stop it. Actually there were people who put this thought into practice: the Dukhobors. They absolutely refused to be drafted and burnt all the weapons they were given. The money Tolstoy received for *Resurrection*, a saga he wrote, was donated to them so that they could migrate to Canada.

Tolstoy supported actions such as burning weapons and tried putting this into practice. The Dukhobors were also known to the Japanese people of the Meiji period. Their activities were introduced through people like Uchida Roan and in publications such as *Heimin Shimbun*. Generally Tolstoy’s philosophy is considered to be the “philosophy of absolute non-violence.” As no violence is tolerated and people can only influence others through their hearts, it is described as absolute non-violence.

“To Die like Beasts”

I assume everyone is familiar with the name Yosano Akiko. She wrote a very famous poem titled “Don’t Lay Down Your Life” (*Myojo*, September, 1904).

Mother and Father didn’t educate you
to wield weapons and to murder; they didn’t
bring you up, to the age of twenty-four,
so that you could kill, or be killed yourself.

After these lines, it continues:

The Emperor himself doesn’t go
to fight at the front; others
spill out their blood there.

In other words, although the Emperor tells the citizens to go to the war, but he himself does not go. Nevertheless, she continues:

If His Majesty be indeed just
and magnanimous, surely he won't wish
his subjects to die like beasts,
nor would he call such barbarity "glory."

She questions that men are being asked to die like beasts by spilling each other's blood. But she asserts that it cannot possibly be that death is "glory" because the Emperor's heart should be filled with deep compassion and there is no way he could say such a thing. This is an extremely strong protest. What Yosano wants to state is that if the Emperor tells the citizens to go to war, then he himself should go to the front and fight. If he truly possesses compassion then he should be the first one to say the war should be stopped.

The reason why I raise this now is that it also seems to have been influenced by Tolstoy, as is indicated in the words *kemono no michi* ("like beasts"). In the original text of "Bethink Thyselfes!" Tolstoy remonstrates men to not become "animals" or "beasts." He uses expressions such as "Animals and beasts engage in war, not humans." This seems to be reflected in Yosano's expression *kemono no michi* (the way of beasts). As mentioned before, she suggests that killing complete strangers rather than killing someone who has some relationship to you is the way of beasts. Furthermore, she uses the expression:

What does it matter if that fortress
on the Liaotung Peninsula falls or not?
It's nothing to you, a tradesman
with a tradition to uphold.

(Arthur Binard: *Nihon no meishi, eigo de odoru* [Japanese good poems in English], Tokyo: Misuzu Shobo, 2007)

In other words Yosano is saying that because he is the son of a tradesman, whether the fortress falls or not has no relation to his life. Of course, this was met with strong criticism. Ōmachi Keigetsu condemned her by saying, "If we examine Yosano's poem from the eyes of loyalty to the Emperor, she is a dangerous traitor. There is no choice but to cry out that she is a criminal who should receive national punishment."

Yosano retorted by saying that although her words were criticized as being dangerous, surely the trend of the times to say “fight to the death, fight to the death” was far more dangerous. Surely phrases like “loyalty and patriotism” and the “respectful words” of the Imperial Rescript on the Education (Kyōiku Chokugo) were actually dangerous. Since Ōmachi quoted the words “Offer yourselves courageously to the State” from the Imperial Rescript on Education, Yosano’s poem was criticized as being against them. But she rejected this, saying that such a statement was itself strange.

Yosano Akiko was not the only one influenced by Tolstoy. Nakazato Kaizan, the author of *Daibosatsu Toge* (Great Bodhisattva Pass), was deeply affected by Tolstoy as were the literary figures in the Shirakabaha (the White Birch Group), including Mushanokoji Saneatsu and Arishima Takeo. Their way of thinking was called “Humanism” during the Taishō period. In other words, people who put Tolstoy’s philosophy into practice were sometimes called “Humanists.” It is impossible to talk about the history of non-violent philosophy in modern Japan without mentioning Tolstoy.

“A Law to Abolish War” is the “Law of Victory”

Another important figure is Uchimura Kanzō. Uchimura was in one sense more inclined to support the Sino-Japanese War while it was being fought. Ultimately, however, he realized that he had been following “the way of beasts.” There is a famous essay titled “My Personal Benefits from the Russo-Japanese War.” One part reads: “The Sino-Japanese War was fought in the name of peace in the Orient. However, this war gave rise to an even bigger war, which is the Russo-Japanese War. This war was also fought in the name of peace in the Orient. Nevertheless, I believe that this will probably cause another even greater war in the name of peace in the Orient. War is like a beast that can never be satisfied” (November, 1905).

An imperial rescript issued at the start of the Sino-Japanese War declared that the purpose of the war was for the sake of “peace of the Orient.” In the case of the Russo-Japanese War, the rescript declaring war states that it was started in order to “maintain security of the Orient permanently.” After this, it was said that these Japanese wars had been conducted for the sake of “the peace of the Orient.”

In October 2009, I attended a symposium held in Seoul. 26 October was the day when Ahn Jung-geun killed Itō Hirobumi, former Japanese Prime Minister, at Harbin station in Northeast China, and this occasion marked the 100th year of his assassination. 26 March 2010 marks the

100th year of Ahn-Jung-geun's execution, and 2010 is the 100th year since the Japan-Korea Annexation Treaty was signed.

I think that most Japanese only know of Ahn Jung-geun as the person who "shot Itō Hirobumi to death." Actually Ahn Jung-geun wrote an article in prison titled "On Peace in Asia," which was never completed. In this article, Ahn Jung-geun insists that Japan, China, and Korea have a duty to be united and to create peace in East Asia. Despite this, Itō Hirobumi was trying to annex Korea to Japan even though he was talking about "peace of the Orient." Ahn Jung-geun held that the reason why he killed Itō is that his actions went against the intention of Emperor Meiji as well. This is how Ahn Jung-geun explains himself in this article.

Although he could have run away when he killed Itō at Harbin, he did not. He was clear in his position as a loyal retainer as it was a fight to carry out his philosophy. You notice when you visit Seoul that Ahn Jung-geun is called a "loyal retainer," and never an assassin. Of course, there are various views on this. We tend to forget the fact that a type of philosophy held by someone like Ahn Jung-geun did exist. The point here is that we also need to consider what exactly was done in the beautiful-sounding name of "peace of the Orient."

Uchimura Kanzō appealed, just as Nakae Chōmin did, that if Japan has the money for war, "it should used to construct railways and universities in the world." He also insisted that "abolition of war is never a fool's dream...the best victory of law lies in the abolition of war" (Christianity and Legal Issues, 1910). Thus, Uchimura stated that if there is a law that should be victorious in the end, it should be one which stipulates the abolition of war. Needless to say, I believe he had an idea that is similar to that stipulated in Article 9 of the current Constitution of Japan.

Uchimura further states, "often we use the expression of bad peace and good war but which is better, bad peace or good war?" He states, "even the worst type of peace is more desirable than the best war" (Achieving Peace, 1905). His idea was that no matter how much a war might be promoted as being good, its only purpose is to kill people. Governments send their citizens to battlefields saying that good wars make people live. However, have there been any wars in the history of humanity that truly to let people live? Uchimura held that this was never the case.

Gandhi as well as many others have pointed out that if you kill someone in ordinary life, this makes you a murderer. However, if you kill ten, one hundred, or ten thousand people on the battlefield, you become a

hero. In this manner, you enter a perverse world in war that is totally different to the ethics of everyday life. Uchimura is pointing out that this is the problem itself.

Many people at the time, however, did not think this way. Rather, people were proud that the Russo-Japanese War was the very war in which the Japanese beat Caucasians from the West. Needless to say, Japan did not win the Russo-Japanese War by overwhelming its opponent. Japan exhausted almost all their military resources and it was impossible for the country to continue the war any further.

The Japanese government, however, did not let the public know anything about this reality. What is more, the government only wrote in publications compiled after the war, such as *Nichiro Senshi* (The History of the Russo-Japanese War), that Japan was always superior and that the Japanese officers were excellent. As a result, the reality of war did not yield any lessons at all. If Japan had written facts such as what actually happened and how much the country was endangered, then perhaps the next war might not have occurred. However, this did not happen. Why? It is because of the promotion of soldiers and prizes. That is to say, the government wrote lies in order to give decorations and to boost their ranks. This is what actually happened.

“True Civilizations do not Devastate Mountains nor Kill Humans”

When contemplating war and peace Tanaka Shozō's non-war ideology often comes to mind. Tanaka is well known for his engagement in the Ashio Mining Pollution Incident and for his work toward the solution of the incident by participating in a protest led by women and farmers at the front.

He declared his non-war ideology by stating, “I believe in non-war, and my fervent prayer and wish is that all countries of the world totally abolish their armies and navies. However, humanity must be fighting the war for peace constantly. If you neglect this or drop your guard, it will end in a war to the death” (September 2009). In other words, Tanaka Shozō insisted that humans should fight not by military power but by words, which is a proof of their humanity. Why should we fight? It is to protect the correct path of humans. Otherwise humans would be driven by evil. However, our fight should always a “war for peace.” Tanaka believed that he was fighting not by force but by words. This is why he was able to continue such a severe, long, and strenuous fight.

Tanaka also stated that if this non-war ideology is put into action, then the abolition of all armaments is compulsory. I mentioned before that Tanaka led the protest march but when the women in farming vil-

lages went to Tokyo, it was the police and the military that oppressed them. Tanaka felt that the police or military exists to protect the authority of the nation and not to protect the citizens in the end. In this sense, the fight against mining pollution was also a fight against armaments. That is the reason why he would say things like “True civilization does not devastate mountains, nor rivers, nor villages; nor does it kill humans.”

In other words, according to Tanaka, the taking of life through the destruction of the natural environment as in the case of mining pollution, or by war is violence, not civilization. War is not the only toe of violence; the taking of human life through the destruction of the natural environment is also a type of violence and an unnatural death. I say it is an unnatural death because life that should be lived to the fullest until death by old age is taken away prematurely. The destruction of the environment is violence that threatens the peace of humanity. This is how he thought.

Tanaka Shozō's way of thinking is in a way related to the current principles behind the Nobel Peace Prize. As you know, a Kenyan woman, Wangari Muta Maathai, and Al Gore from the United States received this award in 2004 and 2007 respectively. The prize was given to them with the idea that promoting the afforestation movement and fighting global warming were in themselves the construction of peace. In fact, Tanaka Shozō was insisting this more than one hundred years ago.

3. Searching for a “Non-Violent Society”

In this sense I believe we should value the thought of Tanaka Shozō highly and learn from it. However, in relation to nature, the idea of *eshō-funi* (oneness of life and environment) elucidated by Makiguchi Tsunesaburō is noteworthy as a thought that is based on deeper contemplation.

In Tanaka's case, as represented in the phrase “[civilization] do not devastate mountains, nor rivers, nor villages,” the subjects are humans. This means that humans as subjects devastate or harm nature. However, in reality, humans should also be a part of nature. If this is the case, considering not only not destroying nature, but also the relationship between nature and humans as a part of nature lead more to non-violence.

Of course, in “the oneness of life and environment,” the subjects are humans and the object is environment. However, both aspects form

“oneness.” As any form is followed by its shadow, both aspects always coexist. Therefore, the premise is that the relationship between nature and humans exists as one. Of course, this is based on the idea that all living beings are connected to the entirety of the universe in Nichiren’s Buddhism.

As opposed to Tanaka, Makiguchi holds that nature is what connects humans and nature and connects humans together. When Makiguchi uses the word “geography,” I think he is referring to this. He is not referring to geography we study at school, such as knowing what is produced in Tokyo or remembering where mountains and rivers are. Makiguchi considers the relationship between nature and humans and various aspects of this relationship, which are generated in the difference of space. This, I would say, is Makiguchi’s geography. He thinks about differences in environments generated through the interaction between humans and society or humans and nature first. Then he thinks about how humans and society should coexist.

He thinks about how humans and society should be by first considering the difference in environments generated in the interaction between humans and society or between humans and nature.

Humanitarian Competition—Reform through Moral Influence

As you know, Makiguchi began his work by looking at Community Studies. Nature and culture exists in the very land where you grew up. This means that fighting over your homeland is violence. I think colonization is a typical example of this. People who had nothing to do with Africa or Asia went there and made the land theirs. Then they also took away the natural products generated from the land purely for their own benefit. Taking away someone’s homeland is clearly violence, and this type of violence destroys even the relationship between humans and the natural environment there.

Makiguchi refers to political competition as something to be overcome, and this also constitutes a criticism toward unreasonable occupation through colonization. He states that people should “naturally influence others by using intangible force in order to achieve the same thing through authority or military might” (“A Geography of Human Life”). This is exactly what I wanted to express with the previously mentioned term “moral influence.” It means to achieve what has been achieved by force through intangible force: to persuade the other person by words and thoughts. “Humanitarian competition,” which is beyond militaristic, political, or economic competition, refers exactly to this. Competition here does not mean that you alone win by pushing someone over.

Rather, I believe it is to advance in an equal relationship by running together.

Thinking in this manner, whether it is the philosophy of Gandhi or Nelson Mandela, their ideas are fundamentally about resisting some form of pressure. However, Makiguchi's philosophy is different. His philosophy is not "resistance" as in the case of civil disobedience, but it is a principle "to change the world through non-violence" by being the subject of practice yourself in the society where visible and physical violence does not seem to exist.

Non-violence in a general sense refers to how to respond when the other party puts pressure on you. Violence clearly exists, and you resist to it by non-violence. In the world we live in, however, pressure and violence, which are not necessarily visible, oppress us. In this case, how should we change the other party? I believe Makiguchi is teaching us that this is the very point that we need to consider.

Also, when we change it needs to be natural, just as in Makiguchi's statement "naturally influence others." Changes should never be forced. The Japanese view of "nature" sees it as something "spontaneous or natural." "Nature" becomes so naturally, and if some pressure is brought to bear, it ceases to become natural or morally influential. Ultimately we should change in a "natural direction" by words and thoughts, or by the power of our personalities.

When considering the views of nature or the universe by Tanaka and Makiguchi, the new civilization of future humanity should consider the theme of how to eradicate invisible violence, and not just eradicating violence towards nature. Although these are complex themes, this is what I am considering now.

Intoxicated through "Dependence on Force" after the Victory over Russia

After the Russo-Japanese War, Tokutomi Roka, a Japanese writer and philosopher, came to keenly feel the "sorrows of victory." He felt that the victory had the dangerous potential to lead to further hatred and war while the entire nation was intoxicated with its success. After the war, Roka went to see Tolstoy. According to "A Pilgrim's Travel Diary" (1906), he received a great welcome when he passed through Turkey and Bulgaria because people were pleased that the Japanese had beaten Russia, and because of this they gained the confidence to fight Russia themselves. Roka, however, was very much saddened by this. He wondered if the Japanese taught people to "admire force" and whether they pushed them in the direction of engaging in war and dying. He worried

that not only these people but also the Japanese were intoxicated by “dependence on force” by the victory in war, and that they had lost their humanity. This is what “sorrows of victory” means. Victory is not something to feel happy about. Roka thought that the victory is actually the path to destruction.

He visited Yasnaya Polyana where Tolstoy lived and came back to Japan after learning of Tolstoy’s way of life. Then he devoted himself to agriculture and writing in the place he named Kōshu-en, which is the Roka Kōshu-en Gardens located in Setagaya ward of Tokyo. The thought of returning to agriculture includes the idea that you create the least amount of sin because you do not have to kill animals in agriculture. Of course, you can argue that you are killing plants. However, fundamentally, vegetarianism in Hinduism, for instance, is also based on the idea of not killing living animals apart from its claims concerning health benefits.

Roka also wrote and expressed his ideals in a letter he sent from Jerusalem to the Paris Peace Conference of 1919, such as the realization of women’s suffrage and the renouncement of colonies.

Discrimination is Violence and Violence is Discrimination

Another figure is Saikō Mankichi, who drafted the Suiheisha (“Levelers”) Declaration. The famous declaration was presented at the National Levelers Association Assembly held at Okazaki public hall in Kyoto in March 1922: “We, who know just how cold human society can be, who know what it is to be pitied, do fervently seek and adore the warmth and light of human life from deep within our hearts. Thus is the Suisheisha born. Let there be warmth in human society, let there be light in all human beings.” (translated by the Buraku Liberation and Human Rights Research Institute)

Saikō thought that discrimination is violence itself and violence is that which generates discrimination. This came through his experience of being discriminated against as he was from a Buraku area (discriminated community). He considered that unless we have compassion for all forms of life, discrimination will never be eradicated and will generate more war. If I only mentioned this part of his life, Saikō Mankichi can be described as a pacifist who honored human rights. However, in terms of his thoughts, he led a life that covered wide range of ideas. At times he was an enthusiastic emperor worshiper and praised war. After the Second World War, he supported socialism for a period.

He also sympathized with Gandhi and Martin Luther King Junior and was influenced by them. For instance, there is an idea of Gandhi’s called

anti-Odia. This can be interpreted in the following manner: “security and happiness of the smallest in society is the precondition of the security and happiness of the whole society itself.” In other words, when we consider what happiness is, we should first consider the happiness and security of the most oppressed and the smallest in society. This is philosophy that aims to make society or the world as a whole happy.

This idea is also similar to *A Theory of Justice* by John Rawls, who holds an important position in the area of political philosophy. He argues that we should think about how the society should be by putting ourselves in the shoes of the least blessed. Saikō sympathized with this idea. In addition, Saikō quoted the words from *My Non-Violence* by Gandhi: “If those, who were at one time strong in armed might, change their mind, they will be better able to demonstrate their non-violence to the world and, therefore, also to their opponents” (May, 1946). In other words, if the wars Japan engaged in as a military power were cruel and miserable and if Japan mended its ways and created peace as an unarmed nation, then this would constitute a much stronger appeal to its opponents.

Saikō believed that it was not effective to merely say this in words and he appealed for the establishment of a “Ministry of Peace,” which was proposed when the San Francisco Peace Treaty was signed in 1951. In addition to this, in 1966 he also proposed the creation of the “Wa-ei-tai” unit (literally, “the unit promoting harmony and prosperity”), which would construct peace. He designed the concept of a service unit for scientific technology to be used for international peace and joint prosperity.

As I have been saying, figures such as Nakae Chōmin and Uchimura Kanzō stated that peace in Japan will be achieved if it becomes a highly cultured country and contributes to the world through culture. At times during the postwar period Japan has been criticized for promoting one-nation pacifism and has faced questions such as “is it enough that Japan only secure peace for itself?” On the other hand, Saikō said that “Japan should not aim for its own peace but should take the lead in world peace by creating a Ministry of Peace.” Furthermore, this should not be a peace brought about through military might but through dispatching the “Wa-ei-tai” unit that would serve to help the people of the world through scientific technology.

Reject the Draft by Saying “Killing is Evil”

The last figure I will introduce is Kitamikado Jirō. He passed away in 2004 at the age of 91. When he was in high school Kitamikado read Tolstoy’s “What Men Live By” and was so impressed that he went to

Harbin to study Russian in order to be able to read Tolstoy after entering the University of Tokyo as an English literature major. He sympathized so much with Tolstoy's philosophy of absolute non-violence that he ended up rejecting the draft in 1938. Having said that, it could be that the officials in charge of the military induction unit may have gotten into trouble if it was discovered that one of the inductees refused military service, and this may have been why he was judged "unfit for military service" for reasons of insanity. Kitamikado later quit the University of Tokyo and lived in Mizukami village in Kumamoto prefecture, his hometown, working in the fields on fine days and reading books on wet days. He led the kind of life that Tolstoy expressed of those who "beat their guns into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks"—Tokutomi Roka lived the same life. Kitamikado had interaction with famous economist Kawakami Hajime, as well as Takigawa Yukitoki, then chancellor of Kyoto University who is famous for the Takigawa Incident. He put into action Tolstoy's words, "agriculture is the least sinful life."

He decided to pursue two lessons from Tolstoy, "absolute non-violence" and "heaven does not create one man above another man, nor does it create one man below another man," for the rest of his life and that led him to continue to translate his works. He worked in the field during the day, and at night he translated under a light. He stated that in terms of language study his translations were not necessarily excellent. He realized that if there was some significance in his translations, it was to extract Tolstoy's heart: his translations are a "translation of the heart." He wanted others to know that he was trying to translate Tolstoy by first knowing his heart and mind.

Furthermore, Kitamikado sympathized strongly with the non-violent philosophy of Martin Luther King Junior. In the famous words of King, "Nonviolence is a powerful and just weapon. It is a weapon unique in history, which cuts without wounding and ennobles the man who wields it. It is a sword that heals" (*Why We Can't Wait*, Signet Classics; Writing in Book edition, 2000, p. 12.). This is to say that non-violence not only does not harm others but "by not harming" you can make yourself noble.

If you respond to evil by perpetrating evil, you are equating yourself with your opponent. On the other hand, if you respond with non-violence, even if the other party was malicious and committed violence with arms, you will have more a precious weapon mentally than those who oppress you.

Kitamikado also thought in this manner and continued to spread the

philosophy of Tolstoy to young people by giving talks at Uji High School in Kumamoto prefecture and making woodblock prints of “Ivan the Fool” with students.

Tolstoy’s philosophy influenced many aspects of Japan. I wrote about this in my work titled *Nichiro Senso no Seiki* (The Century of the Russo-Japanese War, Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2005) as well. Kitamikado Jirō should be called the last Tolstoyan in Japan.

Kitamikado always said. “People ask me this question: why do you say non-violence is the only path to take?” To this, he responded, “Violence is evil. Murder is evil. It is evil because it is evil. I cannot say anything more than that.” Maybe this does not constitute an answer. However, Kitamikado was able to support himself by answering in this manner. He believed that murder and violence are evil and absolute evil must be eradicated. He believed that this thinking lived in Tolstoy, and he pursued this consistently to the end of his life at 91 years old. This leads us to ponder over where a man’s endurance comes from, and I think it is necessary to consider what the fundamental source is that supports humans.

4. Non-violent Philosophy in the Constitution of Japan

We are running out of time but I’d like to cut to the chase here and ask ourselves “What does it mean to live truly peacefully?” and “how should we pursue this?”

All People Possess “The Right to Live in Peace”

The Constitution of Japan includes the notion of “the right to live in peace.” There are various ways of interpreting this and it is quoted in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the United Nations. The Preface of the Constitution of Japan was the first in the world to stipulate this.

Article 9 of the Constitution forms the second chapter of the Constitution and this Article is the only part of the chapter. Although constitutional chapters are usually comprised of a number of articles, Article 9 of the Constitution of Japan is the only one of this second chapter. Why is this so? Actually, it was because part of a chapter on renouncing war was moved to the Preface during the drafting process. Therefore, although Article 9 is the only article in the chapter, it closely conforms to the Preface. The Preface clarifies the purpose of the Article 9 and provides a standard through which to interpret it.

Regarding what it is “to live peace,” the Preface includes the fol-

lowing sentence: "We desire to occupy an honored place in an international society striving for the preservation of peace, and the banishment of tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance for all time from the earth." This is to say, "peace" in the Constitution of Japan does not simply refer to a state whereby there is no war. It says that "peace" means to eradicate issues such as autocracy, slavery, oppression, or discrimination based on narrow thinking from this earth permanently. This is the important point.

The Preface also includes the phrase, "We recognize that all peoples of the world have the right to live in peace, free from fear and want." This right to "live in peace" was expressed clearly in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights after the Constitution of Japan was promulgated.

Although I just read the Japanese translation, which refers to "nations of the entire world" actually this phrase was a mistake in translation, or an intentional replacement of the translation. This is because the original text uses the term "all peoples" and does not use "nations." The original states "all peoples of the world" regardless of nationality. Of course, a constitution is something that is for the citizens of a nation. However, what is expressed in the Constitution of Japan originally is not only for the citizens of Japan. It is telling all the people of the world to act in this manner and to make efforts toward this goal. This is the difference.

At the same time, however, I can also understand the sense of incongruity because I used to work in the Legislative Bureau at the House of Representatives. That is to say, if we change this sentence to exactly what the original text reads, "All peoples of the world," then the Japanese government needs to take responsibility for this. I would assume this is why it was translated in that way because there would be trouble if the Japanese government had to take responsibility for people who do not have Japanese nationality.

"The Fighting Instinct" Develops Socially

This idea of "the right to live in peace" leads to the development of "nonviolent" thought that we are discussing now. When we discuss this, the following opposing argument is invariably raised: "Humans have a fighting instinct. Therefore, war will never be eradicated." Can it really be true? This point is included in the Seville Statement on Violence, which was adopted in the General Conference of UNESCO in 1989. Twenty scientists in various fields from psychiatry to behavioral genetics gathered together in 1986 at an international conference held in Seville, Spain in order to think about the causes of war. They concluded

that it was scientifically incorrect to say that war or any other violent behavior is genetically programmed into human nature. They rejected the idea that "war exists in humanity." In other words, they concluded that it is not instincts that drive humans to fight or to engage in war, but it is societies that create systems that drive men to compete and to fight. Of course, some would oppose to this stance but this was the statement they produced.

In this way, if we assume that fighting is developed socially, then it can also be changed socially. And this leads to the philosophy of Makiguchi Tsunesaburō. In "A Geography of Human Life" Makiguchi discusses "the way to benefit yourselves while doing something for others and providing them with benefit." He was thinking about the possibilities through such means. This way of thinking is called reciprocity or mutuality, and it is clearly and impressively stated at the beginning of this work. For example, the clothes and shoes we wear are made of materials from various countries and from people's hard work. Humans cannot live alone. We live through the benefits of the people of the world. Even your baby is receiving such benefits every time he or she drinks milk. Also, you receive benefits even if you are not born into a privileged class. The same applies even if you are poor and in a lower class. Humans live in a global linkage called the world. If this is the case, then as a matter of course people in the world need to help one another. This idea of "social compatriots" was Makiguchi's motivation to write "A Geography of Human Life."

Of course, since Makiguchi was influenced by the then mainstream theory of social evolution, his thought included the notion of "survival of the fittest." He takes in account the instinct to struggle for survival. At the same time, there is an idea of "mutual aid," which developed from the theory of social evolution represented by Prince Peter Alexeyevich Kropotkin. In other words, both mutual aid and competition are human instincts. This leads to the question of how these two instincts can be resolved.

Of course we do not have an answer for this as yet. However Makiguchi presents the idea of "humanitarian competition."

Denial of Structural and Cultural Violence

The idea of "structural violence" has become increasingly important in Peace Studies. Johan Galtung, a scholar of Peace Studies from northern Europe, states that there are two types of violence. One is "direct violence" committed by military force or by individuals, and the condition without it is "negative peace." The other is "indirect violence," which is

a type of structural violence, such as inequality and poverty, that hinders one from demonstrating one's potential ability. The state without this is called "positive peace." This is to say, a social structure which prevents a person from demonstrating his or her ability is also considered to be violence. Furthermore, laying blame on someone who is not in the position of responsibility is violence.

For instance, the Grameen Bank has been developed in countries such as Bangladesh. This bank lends small amounts of money to women in poverty. The bank does not simply provide money but guides them so that they can use their own abilities by taking joint responsibility and working together. In this manner, discovering the abilities of individuals who had once been suppressed and using them through mutual support is, in fact, "peace" and "non-violence." This way of thinking also exists.

This indicates that violence is not simply a physical issue. The challenge we face today is how we can acknowledge invisible social violence and how we change it.

It can be said that eliminating conditions such as poverty, starvation, oppression, discrimination, or isolation that derive from social structures leads to the establishment of a society of "structural non-violence" in which structural violence does not exist.

Looking at this type of non-violence adopted in the Constitution of Japan, Article 9 refers to the abolition of war. Also the Preface of the Constitution states that we will be free from "tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance" and free from "fear and want." In addition, Article 25 of the Constitution states that "all people shall have the right to maintain the minimum standard of wholesome and cultured living." This means that we cannot say we are at "peace" unless we have such a life. This does not simply refer to social security but signifies that leading "wholesome and cultured" life needs to be guaranteed as the right of human beings. A society that guarantees this is a "society of non-violence."

Further, Article 24 of the Constitution talks about equality between men and women. This states that oppression of women by men or vice versa is an act of violence. Naturally, the idea of abolition of domestic violence or in a relationship between men and women is contained in Article 24.

As for the denial of cultural violence which justifies violence through thoughts and culture, Article 13 contains various rights, such as "the right to pursue happiness."

The concept of "human security" proposed by the United Nations is an indication of the greater trends toward this type of non-violence. Peo-

ple such as Amartya Sen, the Indian economist who received Nobel Prize in Economics, as well as people like Ogata Sadako from Japan, former UN High Commissioner for Refugees, advocate this. The late former Prime Minister of Japan, Obuchi Keizō, once made a speech on this at the United Nations.

This is to say that the center of security is no longer the “security of a nation.” Each and every human being seeks security beyond national borders. A clear example of this is the terrorism issue. Terrorism threatens our security even if wars do not occur between nations. Also, opium and AIDS are threats to human security and thus constitute violence. The concept of “human security” addresses these as issues to be dealt with, as they include violence to humans both physically and mentally. Thus, we have already stepped away from national security toward human security.

What should we do under such circumstances? Starvation, poverty, and economic inequality—today, in the midst of economic globalization, the disparity between rich and poor is widening drastically. This is, in fact, violence. We are also faced with various questions: how can we improve the deterioration of the natural and social environment? How can we deal with the problems concerning the production and trade of drugs? How can we aim for freedom from fear and want? Furthermore, how can we create a communal society of no-war in Asia by spreading such movements?

The Realization of the Article 9 Requires Something “Sacred”

In conclusion, as I have been saying, if we assume that non-violence needs to be considered from various aspects and is not merely resistance toward oppression or authority, then we need to think about how we will establish such a “society of non-violence.”

Naturally speaking, on the other hand it is important to establish systems such as social and national securities, or to achieve the rights stipulated in the Constitution in reality and to guarantee them legally. Contemplating this, however, we are faced with the truth that such a society has not yet been realized. Why? This is because we have not had the power to pursue the philosophy of non-violence continuously.

Today I talked about the “sources of philosophies” that contributed to Article 9 of the Constitution of Japan but unfortunately these did not actually form a connection to Article 9. There were various ideas proposed by some people at different times, but these did not end up forming one great current or movement. Nor were the Japanese able to create such a Constitution by ourselves. Needless to say, it is a fact that people

of postwar Japan followed the United States in lifestyles and the sense of values, including the current Constitution. We cannot deny this.

Considering such changes and pressures that were brought to bear externally, the question that comes to my mind is exactly what is the power to continue and maintain an unwavering philosophy? The answer, I think, probably lies in being faithful to principles. Although I only mentioned the example of Kitamikado Jirō, I think the realization of a “society of non-violence” depends on whether or not we are able to maintain such faithfulness to principles. Unless we do not internalize these philosophies themselves and carry them out with a strong will, these ideals cannot be realized. Otherwise, the sources of philosophies will die out no matter how many excellent people emerge.

Hannah Arendt is a Jewish woman who is an excellent scholar of politics. She often used the words “love of the world,” which originates in the Latin *Amore Mundi*. “The love of the world” does not simply mean that “humanity should love one another.” Arendt used this word with the intention that no matter what can possibly happen to the world it is also a personal issue because you are a member of the humanity even if you are just one in six billion. She meant that we should maintain the attitude that we never forget how we relate to the changes in the world.

The various ideas I have presented today may not be realized in ten or perhaps even one hundred years time. However, we are living right now, in this time. Without living through this time now, there will be no future. Thus, we should do what we must do now. The world can only continue by our own actions.

One well known phrase is “The opposite of love is not hate, it is indifference.” It signifies that we should maintain our interest in others and move them as much as possible although we possess only the power of one in six billion.

At the end of my book *Kenpō 9 jō no Shisō-Suimyaku* I wrote that realization of the philosophy of no-war as described in Article 9 is as if it were “the action of opening up an iron door that weighs many tons with one little finger.”

When Article 9 was established, Nambara Shigeru, who was then chancellor of University of Tokyo and a famous political philosopher stated, “the success or failure of the establishment of a pacifist Japan, and therefore the success or failure of the new Constitution, depend primarily on elevating the quality of its citizens. It does not depend on elevating intelligence and morality alone. It will be impossible to achieve this without the new discovery of ‘something sacred’ by the Japanese citizens” (statement made on the occasion of the promulgation of the

Constitution of Japan, November 3rd, 1946). Perhaps Article 9 is too heavy a burden for Japanese citizens. We can never be sure if they can really maintain it. This is why I am keenly aware of the necessity of elevating intelligence and morality amongst Japanese and acquiring “something sacred,” something like faithfulness to principles, as I have just mentioned.

With this in mind, I would like all of you to understand that Article 9 is not merely about renouncing war or banning the engagement of war through military force. It is a philosophy of non-violence. The entire Constitution of Japan clearly addresses the elimination of various types of violence. Although the Constitution concerns legal issues and may not be familiar to you, I sincerely recommend to you that you try to read it one time from this perspective.