A Different Kind of Centering: Makiguchi Tsunesaburo's Deep Anthropocentrism

Andrew Gebert

In recent decades, a number of researchers have analyzed the writings of Makiguchi Tsunesburo[1] *in ways that work to align his thinking on the human-nature nexus with the ecological outlook and sensibilities of the late-20th-century developed world. While not entirely without textual support, such interpretations obscure what I consider to be among his most important potential contributions: a mode of anthropocentrism that is at once full-throated and stands outside the prevailing binary of anthropo- versus ecocentrism. I argue here that Makiguchi offers a mode of anthropocentrism that can be characterized by a number of adjectives — deep, embedded, perspectival, agentic among them. His version of anthropocentrism, I believe, can be useful in negotiating the unprecedented challenges of the Anthropocene.*

The title is a deliberate reference and counterpoint to Arne Naess' Deep Ecology[2] *(1973) and subsequent, related streams of ecological thinking that seek to decenter the human; here I seek to problematize both the practical possibility and desirability of such a decentering.*

Introduction: Different Modes of Anthropocentrism and Ecocentrism

EDUCATION for the happiness of children is the theme of this special feature, and there can be few more central imperatives to that end than securing a livable planet for present and future generations. Among other interests, this is a key imperative for the realization of intergenerational justice. Environmental degradation is a major threat, and climate change is central to that. Children globally are experiencing climate anxiety, often overwhelmed by feelings of helplessness, despair, and even guilt.[3]

What modes of environmental education are going to be most helpful to children and young people today? What modes will contribute to their happiness?

The primary focus of this article is not on specific curricular questions. Rather, it considers worldview-level assumptions that underlie and shape different modes of environmental education. Central to these is how human beings are seen in relation to nature.[4]

For purposes of simplicity, views of the human-nature relationship will be classed into two main approaches, those that center the human: anthropocentric worldview; and those that decenter the human: ecocentric worldview.[5]

These approaches can be placed on a spectrum of their 'hard' and 'soft' versions; a non-exhaustive sampling of markers of these views are given below:

Anthropocentric worldviews

Hard version: Ontological (ontotheological); the natural world was created for human use and benefit; humans rightfully exercise sovereignty over nature.

Soft version: Consequentialist or agentic; human interests and concerns are generally prioritized, but a recognition of the human capacity to bring about change in the natural world imposes restraints and obligations, in particular for the sake of future human generations.

Ecocentric worldviews

Hard version: Humans are a kind of invasive species, or destructive virus, that the natural world would be better off without.[6]

Soft version: The boundaries between the human and non-human life forms are porous; human and non-human life have essentially equivalent value that could be institutionally expressed by, for example, recognizing nature in its whole or parts as the bearer of specific legal rights.[7]

Between the respective hard versions there are obviously many gradations and variations, and the soft versions of both worldviews sketched here can best be thought of as placeholders.

These different approaches to the human-nature relationship will be considered in more detail below, specifically in terms of their logical coherence, their genealogy of thought, and their (actual or anticipated) real-world impacts on educational efforts.

This examination will be facilitated by comparing and contrasting these approaches with those put forward by the Japanese educational philosopher Makiguchi Tsunesaburo (1871–1944), in particular in his early work on human geography and his later writings on value.

As Goulah has pointed out,[8] the parameters of this debate have largely been set by the global West; non-Western views have not been adequately taken account of or incorporated. This can be understood as true for many currently prevailing strands of both anthropocentrism and ecocentrism. In fact, the latter can be most accurately understood as a reactive development to the former. As a result, prevailing Western-origin expressions of ecocentrism often include hidden anthropocentric assumptions. Many of these have a teleological inflection in which the natural world is thought to have an in-built directionality or in some sense to 'want' to be one way rather than another. Crucially, it is assumed that this directionality or intention is something that is both independent of human will and yet accessible to human knowing, either through scientific observation or by some form of aesthetic or spiritual intuition.

The parallels with the ontotheology of Abrahamic monotheism are evident and have long been noted.[9] The reification of nature as something that 'wants to be' a certain way is a secularized version of Creator God teleologies; it is the world seen 'objectively' through the eyes of God. Sophie Strand has critiqued this as a "sterile disembodied view of the Anthropocene",[10] which she contrasts with a life space of colliding, commingling subjectivities.

Predator-prey relations provide a concrete illustration: the wolf seeks to eat; the deer seeks to avoid being eaten. New realities arise from the conflicting impulses and imperatives of these living subjectivities. These interactions in turn generate an emergent logic of feedback loops and equilibria that can result in greater complexity and resilience. Such ecological conditions should best be understood as the outcome of the heightened probabilities of survival they give rise to rather than as the expressions of some directionality intrinsic to life. To the extent that they enhance systemic resilience and thus the likelihood of human survival, it is entirely justified for humans to posit them as desiderata. But the vectors of causality should be traced with care and not reversed. That is, there is nothing preordained or determined toward which the system is working. It is simply a question, as Stuart Kauffman memorably put it, of life invading the "adjacent possible".[11]

Such commonly used expressions as 'destroying' or 'harming' nature can be understood as un- or semiconscious expressions of such

teleological assumptions. As Murao Koichi[12] and others note, the reality is that humans are incapable of destroying nature; we can only modify natural systems in ways that will make them incompatible with our continued existence.

The language of environmental destruction can function as an intuitively accessible shorthand for this understanding and its associated imperatives. Such modes of expression are entirely justifiable in pragmatic, consequentialist terms, but coming to grips with the full implications of the Anthropocene requires a deeper analytical clarity. In this context, such expressions represent a counterproductive degree of geologic and evolutionary ahistoricity.

It is my contention that Makiguchi presents approaches to the human-nature relationship that embody a non-modern, non-Western worldview, and that operate outside the prevailing binaries. As such, they can expand the parameters of the discourse and provide vital guides for negotiating the Anthropocene. These potential contributions, however, have been obscured by a failure to adequately read Makiguchi in his context and on his own terms.

Representative Readings of Makiguchi on the Human-Nature Relationship

While no serious interpreter of Makiguchi has described him as taking the 'hard' anthropocentric position — that humans exercise unchallenged dominion over nature or that the natural world was created to serve human purposes — other positions, including what might be called an affective or aesthetic ecocentrism, have been ascribed to Makiguchi by a number of authors. These interpretations are often based on readings of Makiguchi's first major work, *Jinsei chirigaku* (*The Geography of Human Life*; hereafter *Geography*) (1903) and will be examined in detail below.

What seems to be common to many of these interpretations is a selectivity that presents Makiguchi so as to be more compatible with, and relevant to, today's environmental thinking and ethics, to 'update' him to better align with late-20th- and early-21st-century ecological approaches and sensibilities. Specifically, they often conflate his stress on the importance of studying human-nature relations with the idea that humans can learn directly from nature or be instructed by it.

Such readings are not without textual basis. There are lyrical passages in *Geography* in which he describes a state of sympathetic unity with nature and speaks of nature as our teacher and protector.[13] The stress

on such passages seems to be something undertaken with the goal of suggesting that we can step out of our human perspectives and concerns and see things "through nature's viewpoint".[14] They support an interpretation of Makiguchi's approach as non-anthropocentric. Amidst a text that is dense, complex, and deeply embedded in the context and concerns of its times, these passages stand out as accessible, prescient, and relevant to the current ecological dilemma. From this perspective alone, focusing on them is understandable.

Further, the impulse to describe Makiguchi's approach as non-anthropocentric can be appreciated in light of the degree to which anthropocentrism has come to be seen as antithetical to the goal of planetary ecological integrity. Criticism and rejection of anthropocentrism have become axiomatic, and the desire to obtain a fair hearing for Makiguchi's ideas has generated an emphasis on passages consonant with such non-anthropocentric interpretations.

A broader survey of Makiguchi's work, including analysis of the above passages and the manner in which they are cited, will clarify such readings do not fully represent Makiguchi's views and aims. Crucially, they function to divert analytic attention from the unique modalities of Makiguchi's anthropocentrism as well as the simple fact of it: centering of human interests and concerns is the anthropocentric pivot around which *Geography* and his later writings on value revolve.

The key assertion of this article is that Makiguchi's anthropocentrism is both full-throated and sits outside the Western binary of anthropo- versus ecocentrism. And it is here that the real value of his approach as a resource and framework for new thinking is to be found.

Here I will look at what I see as some of the issues common to readings of Makiguchi's writings undertaken from a present-day ecological perspective.

As translator, editor, and interpreter of Makiguchi's thought, Dayle Bethel has exerted a lasting influence in particular on Makiguchi's reception outside of Japan. As Inukai[15] has pointed out, even in Bethel's painstaking English rendering of Makiguchi's primary education-related work, *Soka kyoikugaku taikei*[16] (*The System of Value-Creating Pedagogy*; hereafter *Pedagogy*) (1930–34), under the title of *Education for Creative Living* (1989), there are problematic aspects of omission and addition:

> It is clear that Bethel has made many editorial choices without notifying the reader, such as putting more emphasis on philosophy than pedagogy, simplifying Makiguchi's arguments on the concept

> of value and cognition versus evaluation, and omitting Makiguchi's references to various scholars as well as inserting and revising portions based on his interpretation of Makiguchi's ideas.[17]
>
> Bethel also inserts text that does not exist in Makiguchi's original writings (what I call additive translation). In some cases, Bethel seems to have added examples to supplement Makiguchi's arguments.[18]

These tendencies are even more pronounced in Bethel's 2002 rendering of Makiguchi's major work on geography, published under the title *A Geography of Human Life*.[19]

While most of the issues with Bethel's rendering of Makiguchi's *Pedagogy* can be understood in light of the complexity of the text — its frequent citation of other authors, not-always apparent lines of argumentation, etc. — the English version of his *Geography* seems to embody the agenda, discussed above, of making Makiguchi's ideas more compatible with the ecological outlooks and sensibilities dominant in the developed world of the late 20th century. As Goulah points out, "Although Bethel portrays *The Geography* as an explicit response to 'ecological devastation' and a 'celebration of the natural world,' a close reading suggests this is not the case."[20]

Because of the far-reaching influence Bethel has exerted on the understanding of Makiguchi's ecological thinking, it is worth examining these passages in detail. Many of those quoted to support a non-anthropocentric reading of Makiguchi are taken from a section of Makiguchi's work in which he describes different modes of interaction between humans and their surroundings. This approach is derived from the idea of multifaceted interest (*vielseitige Interesse*) propounded by the philosopher and pedagogue Johann Friedrich Herbart (1776–1841). Makiguchi adopts and modifies this to make it one of the pivotal concepts of *Geography*.

Makiguchi first divides human interactions into two major categories, which Bethel renders as the physical and spiritual. In the original, the first term *nikutaiteki* (肉体的) indicates the physical body and could also be rendered 'corporeal' or 'physiological'. The second term, *seishinteki* (精神的), has a wide range of associations and as such points to virtually the entire gamut of non-corporeal human life. In addition to 'spiritual', it could be translated as 'mental', 'intellectual', 'psychical', or 'psychological'.

After describing our physical/ corporeal/ material interactions with the world, Makiguchi describes the mental/ intellectual/ psychical/

psychological/ spiritual interactions of humans in the following manner:

> On the other hand, the human mind/ spirit is aroused and awakened by the external world, stimulated and inspired by its surroundings; it may engage in intentional action on the surface of the earth, use objects external to it to bring these under the sway of its powers, thus working changes in the external world; such actions of course cannot be realized unless mediated through the physical body, and yet because it is the mind more than the body that exerts the prime, direct influences, we can refer to this as mental/ spiritual or psychological interaction, in contrast to the former [category of physical] interactions.[21]

In his rendering, Bethel condenses this passage as follows, in the process shedding the many other possible translations for *seishinteki* for 'spiritual', with all its attendant present-day associations: "But it is through our spiritual interaction with the earth that the characteristics which we think of as truly human are ignited and nurtured within us."[22] What this reading does — and it is something shared by other, similar readings of Makiguchi on nature — is to ignore the agentic centering of humans who, as the fuller translation makes clear, are first "aroused and awakened", "stimulated and inspired" by their surroundings, but then go on to act on and modify these in accord with their human intentions and exigencies. In fact, the second half of the sentence, which can only be understood as Bethel's summary interpolation of the ideas he sensed in the original, makes the "truly human" the outcome of interactions with nature where in fact, and as will be shown, Makiguchi was fully focused on the side of the equation constituted by the various modes of human subjectivity. Further, the terms "external world" and "surroundings" here refer not only to non-human nature, but also to nature as acted on and modified by humans, as well as the more distinctly human productions of culture, industry, and so forth.

The title of Chapter 3, from which this passage is taken, is rendered by Bethel as 'Interacting with the Earth', with an appended subtitle that does not correspond to any identifiable text in the Japanese: 'Interaction with the Earth in the Process of Becoming Human'.

A more literal translation of the chapter title would be: 'How Best to Observe the Surrounding Environment?' or 'How Should We Observe Our Surroundings?'.[23] (Regarding this second translation, while Japanese does not insist on the inclusion of grammatical subjects, and none is given here, a human subject is clearly implied and this rendering can be reasonably argued for on that basis.)

The question of how we, as humans, are to observe, engage, and interact with our surroundings provides the framing for this entire chapter, as different modes of interaction are classified, analyzed, and illustrated. Mental/ spiritual/ psychological interactions are then broken down into eight categories: 1) Cognitive, 2) Utilitarian, 3) Scientific, 4) Aesthetic, 5) Moral, 6) Sympathetic, 7) Public, and 8) Religious.

The following is another example of how Bethel elides the element of human subjectivity, this time in his English rendering of a passage that follows the description of the last-mentioned category of interaction, the religious. From its positioning, this passage can be read as a kind of summary coda to what has gone before. Here Makiguchi waxes lyrical, perhaps under the influence of the last forms of interaction just described, or possibly of the emerging genre of landscape literature adopted from English examples and practiced by *Geography*'s editor and commentator, Shiga Shigetaka (1863–1927).[24] This passage is regularly cited as indicative of Makiguchi's approach to nature.

> It is through interaction with this outside world that we can make healthy, balanced, personality growth. Therefore, I say that this outside world, especially the natural environment, can truly be our educator, our enlightener, our leader, our consoler. Our happiness in life is very much connected with nature; it depends on the closeness or depth of our relationship with nature.
>
> Shall we try to look at our interactions with the outside world through nature's viewpoint? Nothing is more generous or more fair than nature. Nature never, ever closes its door to anyone. Nature never judges us by our social status, never discriminates between rich and poor. Those who are lost or discouraged can find sympathy and compassion in nature, but nature is incapable of flattery. Nature will remain silent unless we come seeking a relationship sincerely and earnestly.[25]

This is a relatively complete translation that follows the original in its main ideas. There is, however, a decisive divergence between the Japanese original and Bethel's rendering in that there is nothing in the Japanese original that corresponds to looking at these interactions "through nature's viewpoint". In fact, this passage is prefaced by the following: "In other words, interactions between humans and the external world can be entirely ascribed to the subjective aspects of humans."[26] This framing recasts the language that follows as a description of how humans subjectively experience nature as opposed to

one of the workings of a natural world somehow infused with didactic intent or goodwill toward humans.

As will be discussed below, Makiguchi's view of nature can be characterized as devoid of anything that could be termed teleological or providential. For him, meaning — in his later language, value — arises solely through human engagement and interaction with the world's vast congeries of otherwise neutral facticity.

Heffron explicitly criticizes anthropocentrism, including its expression in modern human rights and sustainable development thinking.[27] He ascribes to Makiguchi a position of "deep ecology"[28] consonant with the views of Aldo Leopold and Arne Naess, and "a non-anthropocentric theory of human-environment relations".[29]

Seemingly conscious of the issues with Bethel's English version, Heffron uses the formula "Makiguchi 1903, cited in Bethel 2002" when quoting passages attributed to Makiguchi's work on human geography. Even with this precautionary stance, Heffron's reliance on Bethel's work results in a reproduction of the interpretative agenda embedded in the latter's translation and editorial choices.

Heffron also quotes the passage analyzed above that starts with the "additive translation":[30] "Shall we try to look at our interactions with the outside world through nature's viewpoint?".[31]

In 'Perspectives of Mahayana Buddhism on the Destruction of Nature: Evaluating the Value of Nature', Yamamoto and Kuwahara[32] analyze Makiguchi's writings on human-nature relations. They also posit lines of continuity between Makiguchi's perspective and that of Mahayana Buddhism — which they describe as "nature-centric"[33] — despite the fact that *Geography*, the prime source for their citations, was written in 1903, more than two decades before Makiguchi's conscious reception of Nichiren Buddhism.

While the authors cite Makiguchi's original Japanese, they exercise a selectivity similar to that of Bethel. Even as they note the significance of different modes of human interaction with the environment, they also focus almost exclusively on 'sympathetic' relations with nature. This form of interaction with nature appeals to our present-day sensibility and can certainly be enlisted to counteract the untrammeled objectification of nature that has characterized much modern scientific and technological practice. At the same time, however, a reading that stresses this form of interaction to the near exclusion of others cannot be considered a full and balanced representation of Makiguchi's view of the human-nature nexus.

Like Bethel and Heffron, Yamamoto and Kuwahara cite those

passages from Makiguchi, of a poetic tone, that describe personal, intimate interactions between geographic features and humans, in this case mountains:

> Further, [Makiguchi] gives concrete examples of "sympathetic relationships"; for example, regarding mountains, plants and animals, Makiguchi states, "Mountains are like heavenly masters because they calm human feelings and enlighten people's minds ... mountains that are different from the self become part of the world just as the self. And, the relationship becomes part of a sentient being.... As a result, I become one with the mountains, and I will share its pain. In addition, my mind experiences the destiny the mountain receives."[34]

As was the case with Bethel, the authors here have omitted the context in which Makiguchi describes human-nature interactions arising. In this case, it is a distinctly human, socio-political context, as a fuller translation makes clear:

> Mountains are in fact the boundaries of a country; along with being an obstacle to those with ambitions [of invasion], they are a protective barrier for the people of that country. The people, protected by mountains, feel secure and sustain their lives within their respective territories, and this becomes a font and source for [the development of] civilization. When the people look to those mountains, could they be limited to seeing them as the insentient material of experience, in the same manner as the external world in general? How much less would this be the case for mountains that are heavenly instructors, softening people's sentiments and enlightening their minds? National populations who are lovingly protected by mountains will look to mountains in the way that a child looks to its parent. How could there be anyone who doesn't love mountains? When we come to this point, the mountains that had until now confronted us as an other, different from ourselves, become, just like ourselves, a constituent member of the world, something with which we are engaged in mutual interchange. Here the mountain becomes an entirely sentient thing, the object of a sentient exchange and engagement. Here we are in unity with the mountains, sharing their joys and pain; and, alongside the feeling that arises that we share the destiny the mountain undergoes, this same emotion is eventually directed toward the whole society that is protected by the mountains. This indeed is the reason why intense feelings of patriotism occur in mountainous countries.[35]

The interleaving of different forms of human-nature interaction seen here in the full translation is typical of Makiguchi's approach. In terms of the overall balance of the text, Makiguchi dedicates an equivalent amount of analytic energy and language to each of the different modes of interaction, not giving visible priority to those, such as sympathetic and religious, that are more conducive to affective, poetic expression.

The kind of selectivity exercised here, and the resulting oversimplification, obscure what I consider to be the most important aspect of Makiguchi's approach: the theoretical and practical implications of taking into account the full spectrum of interests and interactions that can arise between human subjects and their natural and social environments.

The Deep Anthropocentrism of *The Geography of Human Life*

To call Makiguchi's first major work anthropocentric is, in a sense, to state the obvious. It is apparent from the book's title, *The Geography of Human Life*. In the introduction, Makiguchi explains that the expression *jinsei* (人生) in the title is used as an abbreviated stand-in for *ningen no seikatsu* (人間の生活),[36] which, in addition to 'human life', might equally be translated as 'the life activities of human beings'.

The historian of geographic studies, Keiichi Takeuchi, has described Makiguchi's approach in the following terms:

> Makiguchi emphasized the significance and meaning that human beings discover in and confer on nature, which varies from place to place and era to era, rather than the physical or material constraints and influences exerted by natural conditions on human activities. Makiguchi felt that this was the proper object of study for the science of geography.[37]

Human perspectives, interests, and experience are consistently centered; they constitute the parameters framing Makiguchi's exploration of the world. While Makiguchi's overall approach is human-centered, it is important to note that the humanity he posits is relational, one thoroughly embedded in its surroundings.

This is illustrated in the introduction to *Geography*, which opens with Makiguchi describing himself, as author, in his study. Despite his relative poverty, he is able to wear clothes of South American or Australian wool, woven by English labor using the steel and coal of that land; the lamp in his room burns oil extracted from the Caucasus region of Russia; the glasses he wears have lenses produced with skill

and precision by German craftsmen. Makiguchi reflects on the various processes by which these products were raised, extracted, gathered, manufactured, transported, and sold before they reached him, describing how this makes him keenly aware of how his way of life is made possible through the efforts of many people throughout the world: "In this way, I realize that our lives extend to and are supported by the entire world, the world is our home, and all nations are the field of our daily life."[38]

Geography goes on to describe the multiplicity of ways in which humans interact with the natural and geographical features of their surroundings, shifting in the final chapters to an analysis of human-human interactions undertaken on the social, economic, and political planes. It is significant and reflective of the centrality Makiguchi accords to human subjects that the book opens with a description of interdependence among human individuals and communities.

The goal of *Geography* was to explore the many dimensions of human interaction with the environment. These are neither static nor preordained. They are dynamic and evolving, consisting of cycles in which humans, confronting the constraints and possibilities of their surroundings, impact and transform that environment; are influenced by and conduct their life activities within that transformed environment; and then go on to further impact and transform their surroundings.

'Nature' for Makiguchi would seem principally to have indicated human-influenced and -inflected nature. Pristine nature, free from the marks of the human hand — what came to be idealized in the West as wilderness — was never an object of particular interest or analysis.[39] The landscape that most concerned him was the long and densely inhabited regions where the vast majority of his compatriots lived. The challenge of his time was that of national development, elevating the living conditions of the large segments of the population who remained impoverished. Makiguchi saw education that empowered people to engage, individually and collectively, with their surroundings in more effective, productive, and (to use to his later terminology) value-creative ways as the key to realizing this goal.

Even as he stressed such modes of human agency, there is no evidence that Makiguchi saw humans as having ontological precedence in the world. His work on geography is entirely free from the kind of teleology or providentialism, the idea that the world embodies some kind of inner-dwelling meaning, intent, or purpose, that was a salient feature of the work of 19th-century Euro-American geographers such as Arnold Guyot[40] or the Japanese Christian Uchimura Kanzo's geographic writings.[41]

Decades later, in *Pedagogy*, Makiguchi quotes the American sociologist Lester F. Ward on just this point:

> All applied science is necessarily anthropocentric. Sociology is especially so. The old anthropocentric theory which taught that the universe was specially planned in the interest of man is not only false but pernicious in discouraging human effort. But true, scientific anthropocentrism is highly progressive, since it teaches that the universe, although very imperfectly adapted to man's interests, can be so adapted by man himself. Applied sociology is chiefly concerned with enforcing this truth. Throughout the theological and metaphysical stages of human thought philosophy was absorbed in the contemplation of the alleged author of nature. Pure science produced the first change of front, viz., from God to nature. Applied science constitutes a second change of front, viz., from nature to man. Nature is seen to embody utilities and effort is directed to the practical realization of these.[42]

Likewise, Part 2 of *Geography*, 'Nature as the Medium for Mutual Interactions between Human Beings and the Land', concludes with Chapter 22 'Humankind'. The term translated here as 'humankind' is *jinrui* (人類), which at the time had quite strong biological overtones and could almost be translated as 'the human species'.

In introducing the topic, Makiguchi recalls that he struggled greatly with the question of where, in his classification of geographic phenomena, humankind should be placed:

> If I followed the conventional division natural and human geography, [humankind] should of course have been included in the following Part [3, 'The Phenomena of Humankind's Life Activities with Earth as Their Stage'], but I believed it was most appropriate to recognize that, in relation to the phenomena of human life that are the prime focus of this book, humankind is, along with other natural phenomena, a cause (and the most important one) giving rise to them.[43]

In the first section of this chapter, 'The Special Characteristics of Humankind', Makiguchi analyzes *banbutsu no reicho* (万物の霊長), a term that appears in *The Book of Documents* (*Shūjīng* 書經), considered one of the five classics of Chinese literature dating at least to the early second century BCE. This term, which might be given the direct

translation of the 'leading soul of all things' has been used to describe human beings and the things that distinguish humans from other forms of life. Noting that this concept has generally been understood to describe some inherent characteristic of humans, Makiguchi rebuts this from an evolutionary perspective, stating that if one went back to their earliest origins humans had once been "an extremely powerless and pitiable being" and that their present status was the result of developments over immense length of time.[44]

When Makiguchi focused on the unique characteristics of humans, these were always posited as something gained experientially and not as inherent or essential. This would also appear to be the reason why Makiguchi was, unlike some of his Western and Japanese contemporaries, resistant to attempts to directly apply the principles of biological competition and evolution to the human/ social realm (see Gebert[45] for a more detailed discussion). For Makiguchi, the key paths of human heritage were extrasomatic and social — in lessons learned through experience and passed on as cultural systems of knowledge and wisdom.

Even after his reception of Buddhism, Makiguchi expressed skepticism about whether animals had consciousness in the manner of humans. More precisely, he saw the lack of shared language as decisively impeding any effort to confirm this. This is a gesture of restraint characteristic of Makiguchi — important to his view of nature — by which he maintained clear lines demarcating the known from the unknown (and potentially unknowable).[46]

Makiguchi's appreciation for the scale and complexity of natural forces and processes thus did not direct his curiosity to their possible source in divine creation and the resultant embedding of providential intent, but to (what we would today recognize as) self-organizing principles unfolding into the present and future. And, as the above-cited examples would indicate, his appreciation for natural systems often flowed into an even more insistent appreciation for the social creations and creativity of humans.

Sources of Makiguchi's Anthropocentrism

A relational ontology is something many readers will quickly and not inaccurately associate with Buddhism. A number of writers[47] have discussed Makiguchi's approach to the human-environment relationship in the context of the subsequent development of environmental discourse in the Soka Gakkai Buddhist lay organization founded by

Makiguchi and his protégé Toda Josei (1900–58). This discourse has drawn on Nichiren Buddhist concepts, such as the inseparability of life and its environment *esho funi* (依正不二), that were not referenced by Makiguchi and it is thus important to avoid eliding the lines between these two bodies of thought, however deep their connections and continuities.

As noted, *Geography* was written decades before Makiguchi's reception of Nichiren Buddhism. Further, even after his embrace of Buddhism and the integration of a number of key Nichiren concepts — in particular what I have called the social theodicy by which he came to understand Japan's careening progress into international isolation and armed conflict[48] — he seems to have evinced little specific interest in Buddhist ontology or metaphysics as applicable to the human-nature relationship.

If the young Makiguchi was influenced by the Buddhist worldview, it was in the guise of a general cultural ethos. Matsuoka principally attributes Makiguchi's seemingly effortless grasp of interdependence — between humans and nature and among humans in their social relations — to an "Eastern monistic worldview" (*toyoteki ichigenron no sekaikan* 東洋的一元論の世界観).[49] This analysis is regrettably vague, but it is difficult to identify more specific sources for Makiguchi's approach than this.

Elsewhere[50] I have written about the hybrid nature of Makiguchi's positionality and his resultant ability to simultaneously hold Western/ modern and non-Western/ non-modern perspectives. This hybridity finds expression throughout *Geography*.

His original reception of a non-modern, non-Western worldview, with its assumptions of interrelation and interdependence, would appear to have been culturally osmotic. His retention of aspects of this worldview in the face of its wholesale displacement should be seen as some mix of the deliberate and the characterological, something expressive of his habit of mind of not discarding earlier or traditional ways of thinking that he found valid and useful.

Over the course of his life, Makiguchi carried key elements of this worldview forward, elaborating and developing them by incorporating the knowledge and methods of such modern Western disciplines as biology, sociology, psychology, and pedagogy.

Perspectival/ Agentic Anthropocentrism

In addition to the assumption of human embeddedness, one of the most important features of Makiguchi's analysis of human-nature interactions

is his stress on and adoption of multiple perspectives. While these perspectives may be diverse, or even divergent, they are always human. The centering of the human being as perceiver, agent, and subject of influences is the consistent stance of *Geography*.

In the book's concluding chapter, 'Effects to Be Anticipated from the Study of Geography', Makiguchi states that the ability to observe things in a multifaceted manner is the characteristic most conspicuously lacking in the Japanese people. He then goes on to declare that "The multifaceted interest that is the most essential objective of instruction can be cultivated through the use of easily overlooked teaching materials in the immediate surroundings."[51] As this suggests, Makiguchi regarded the development of interest, especially the capacity to become interested and engaged with one's surroundings in a multidimensional manner, as the proper goal of education.

As mentioned earlier, in Chapter 3 of *Geography*, 'How Should We Observe Our Surroundings?',[52] Makiguchi adopted and modified Herbart's ideas of multifaceted interest (*vielseitige Interesse*) as a key framework for the book and its pedagogical objectives.[53]

Herbart's ideas about the psychology of learning were systematized by his successors and introduced into Japan starting in the early 1890s. These systems typically broke interest into a total of six categories. In his 1892 work on new teaching methods, Yuhara Motoichi (1863–1931) listed these, in English, as follows: "Empirical interest, speculative interest, aesthetical interest, sympathetical interest, social interest, religious interest."[54]

For Herbart, the ultimate goal of cultivating this kind of multifaceted interest was the development of moral character. This is described by his follower, Hermann Kern (1823–91), in his *Grundriss der Pädagogik*, one of the works that Makiguchi referenced, in Japanese translation, in *Geography*:

> In a many-sided interest the pupil should find a moral support and protection against the servitude that springs from the rule of desire and passion. It should protect him from the errors that are the consequence of idleness; it should arm him against the fitful chances of fortune; it should make life again valuable and desirable even when a cruel fate has robbed it of its most cherished object; it should enable one to find a new calling when driven from the old; it should elevate him to a standpoint from which the goods and successes of earthly striving appear as accidental, by which his real self is not affected, and above which the moral character stands free and sublime.[55]

In adopting these categories, Makiguchi made several significant modifications. First, rather than the more passive and interior term 'interest', he used a Japanese phrase *kosho* (交涉), which could be translated as 'negotiation' or 'interaction', to indicate a more active condition of interchange between people and their environment. Further, to the standard six categories, Makiguchi added two others: utilitarian and moral interactions.[56]

Makiguchi illustrated the idea of empirical (or cognitive, to follow his Japanese more closely) interest with the examples of a child playing in a rural landscape, or an ordinary citizen finding refreshment from the stresses of daily life there. This level of interest requires little more than that we experience and are aware of our surroundings. He illustrates utilitarian interaction with the examples of a farmer concerned about the coming harvest, a businessman whose moods swing in anticipation of market fluctuations for the product of that harvest, and a military officer considering the tactical implications of a landscape. A geologist and a naturalist are enlisted to illustrate speculative (scientific) interaction; a poet's or painter's response to the beauty of the landscape demonstrates aesthetic interaction. Then Makiguchi cites a traveler who had been long separated from his native place and greets its mountains and rivers "with the intimacy of an old friend" and "a person concerned for the welfare of the world, conscious of and sympathetic with society, who may feel a sense of gratitude [toward the land] for the great benefits provided to the life of the local inhabitants"[57] as examples of sympathetic and public interactions, respectively. Finally, a person of religious faith is described as reverently discovering the limitless power of nature in the grasses and trees of the landscape.

In examining and presenting to readers different geographic and natural features, Makiguchi consistently adopts the methods of multifaceted interest. In the section on forests, for example, he first notes the role of forests as a source of building materials. He goes on to describe their role in regulating the water cycle, citing contemporary research on the function of tree leaves to absorb and respirate rainwater before it reaches the ground; for leaf cover to prevent damaging run-off; for trees and forests to retain and gradually release water into the water table, in this way preventing both flood and drought conditions with their corresponding impacts on agriculture. He then relates the role of forests in promoting the health of fishes and fisheries, both through these regulatory functions and as a source of edible plants and insects. Conversely, he describes the kinds of downstream outcomes, such as floods and landslides, that are the result of indiscriminate clearing of forests.

He further offers descriptions of important Japanese trees, such as red cedar, hinoki, hiba, pine, oak, and bamboo, noting their rates and places of growth, the qualities that mark their usefulness as materials for construction or manufacture, such as resistance to rot, fineness of grain, frequency of knots, and luster.

He also notes the role of forests, perhaps counterintuitive to present-day readers, in national defense. Forests, he notes, can provide concealing cover for artillery emplacements, railways, or other military assets located near sea coasts or rivers, rendering naval bombardment or attack more difficult. Should an enemy come ashore and occupy these forests, however, they could be converted into a form of fortification for them. Writing on the eve of the 1904–05 Russo-Japanese war, Makiguchi was describing a nature-human relationship that would have been of pressing relevance to his readers.[58]

In addition to the major division into material/ physiological and mental/ spiritual interactions noted above, Makiguchi further classifies the latter into two major groupings: *keiken* (経験) and *kosai* (交際), translations of the German terms *Erfahrung* and *Umgang* as they figure in Herbartian pedagogy and translated here as experience and encounter.[59] Makiguchi presents these in the following chart,[60] formatted in the original to suggest a strong correspondence, but not identity, between cognitive interaction and experience; sympathetic interaction and encounter.

Decades later, in Part 3 of *Pedagogy*, 'Theory of Value' (1931),[61] Makiguchi would return to his analysis of the different modes of interaction, this time using the language of cognition (*ninshiki* 認識) and evaluation (*hyoka* 評価). These terms serve as points of demarcation on a spectrum of human response to things and events in our environment that ranges from disinterested recognition of facticity to subjective, impactful, potentially transformative interactions. Makiguchi identifies this latter mode of interaction as the realm of value and, in a reversal of classical Western epistemology, posits it as productive of deeper and more certain forms of understanding — precisely because it incorporates the subjective experience of value.[62] While there is some sense of prioritization between these modes of interaction, they are seen as fundamentally complementary and mutually necessary.[63]

In these later writings on value, Makiguchi adopts a stance that, while compatible with key strains of Buddhist ontology and epistemology, would appear not to have been directly influenced by these. The textual evidence suggests that Makiguchi's thinking on the question of value had largely taken shape prior to his reception of Nichiren Buddhism

Mental/ spiritual/ psychological interactions	1) Cognitive	Experience
	2) Utilitarian	
	3) Scientific	
	4) Aesthetic	
	5) Moral	
	6) Sympathetic	Encounter
	7) Public	
	8) Religious	

in 1928.[64] In 'Theory of Value', Makiguchi describes value in entirely relational terms, as the interaction between an object and an evaluating subject. For something to constitute an experience of value, the relationship must be, as noted above, generative of more than the simple recognition of fact on the part of the subject; it must impinge on, move, and influence the life of the subject.[65]

At no point in his writings on value does Makiguchi suggest that this evaluating subject can be anything other than human. This should not be understood as Makiguchi conferring a status of inherent superiority on humans, but rather an acknowledgement of the embodied, corporeally and cognitively bounded nature of our experience. He seems to imply that, as with the question of consciousness in animals, if other life forms experience value, they do so in ways that are not directly accessible to us and that, if we are to surmise anything in this regard, we should do so with great caution.

It could be said that Makiguchi denied, with particular clarity in his later writings, the idea of nature as a locus of value. As humans, we can learn from our experiences and interactions with nature, but nature cannot directly teach us. This is a subtle but critical distinction and I believe it is the understanding to which a full reading of Makiguchi leads us. And it is the light in which the lyrical descriptions of sympathetic interaction with nature cited above can and should be read.

Final Reflections: Implications and Applications of Makiguchi's Anthropocentrism

Makiguchi's approach to human-nature interactions has considerable significance for negotiating the era that is coming to be recognized as the Anthropocene. Some preliminary thoughts on this are sketched below.

The first is what might be called *cognitive* or *epistemological forthrightness*. That is, we only experience the world as humans, from within the context of our specifically human sensory and cognitive parameters, as well as our distinctively human interests and concerns. Recognition of the specificity of the cognitive parameters of our human experience does not negate attempts to enter imaginatively into the experiences of other life forms, but it locates these in the realm of the actively transpositional rather than passively 'real'. This can act as a restraint on human hubris — both the hubris of ignoring our embeddedness in natural systems and that of thinking that we know what these systems 'want'.

There are writers and artists who seek to bring the poetic imagination into deep conversation with the corporeally human so as to integrate the fungal, the viral, etc.[66] While such efforts may eventually generate new cultural imaginaries in which the human and non-human mutually transgress, rendering porous borders long considered absolute, there is an important grounding to be realized through acknowledgement of the sensory and cognitive bounds of our human experience. Anyone who has walked with a dog, the form of non-human life with which we have perhaps the longest, richest history of interaction, must acknowledge that the sensory (e.g., olfactory) world inhabited by our companion is one essentially unknowable to us.

Related to this as a corollary is a particular mode of *ethical clarity*.

Although our experiences of value arise from and are inevitably rooted in our lives as humans, we can make the conscious decision to act *as if* non-human life forms have value intrinsically and outside their relation to humans. While we cannot directly know or experience this value, we can adopt such a stance as a way of implementing the precautionary principle. Doing so would put humans into a different, and I would argue more salutary, relation with all that we do not, and may never, know.

The push to grant positive legal rights to natural systems is predicated on the idea that nature wants to be a certain way, that we humans can know what this is, and further that we have an obligation to enforce this perceived desire — over the objections of our fellow humans and their interests if necessary.[67] Many of the goals sought by this approach could be realized through an anthropocentric approach of declaring and enforcing the right of humans — extended to future human generations — to a healthy environment. Such an approach is both more logically coherent and legally justiciable, as the recent case in Montana in the United States attests.[68]

Another concrete benefit of adopting Makiguchi's mode of anthropocentrism could take the form of *enhanced mental health and efficacy*.

Through the famous serenity prayer, people daily seek the courage to change what they can change, the serenity to accept what they cannot, and the wisdom to know the difference. The ability to accurately assess the shifting landscape of capacities and opportunities to ameliorate our global circumstances will be a key skill for individual and collective humankind in the Anthropocene. On a climate policy level, for example, it will aid the search for the optimal balance between mitigation and adaptation. On the individual level, it will help people find and expand the space between a hypostatized, often paralyzing, sense of responsibility and nihilistic resignation.

Makiguchi's approach can also contribute to the *pragmatics of survival*.

If we take the geological agency of humans posited by the Anthropocene seriously, the understanding that this agency is not only a source of problems — but of solutions — must be taken fully into account, encouraged, and enlisted. This de facto centering of the human should be embraced, not as a regrettable necessity, but as a positive resource.

On the macro-scale, the path to sustainable flourishing is recast as the question of how far collective human self-interest can be enlightened.

On the micro-scale of family or community, it becomes a question of inter-human equity: what accommodations, compromises, reasonable sacrifices can be negotiated among humans in ways that secure broad understanding and active engagement?

This last-cited process requires *enhanced dialogue*, something to which Makiguchi's approach can contribute. If environmental education is conducted in a way that develops learners' appreciation of the fact that they relate to their natural and social surroundings in multiple ways, this can foster appreciation of the multiplicity of interests held by other humans, facilitating the forms of dialogue conducive to the pursuit of sustainability. The importance of such an approach comes into clearer focus when we compare it to current practices that often take the form of clashes among single-issue constituencies.

If recognition of the diversity of human interests and relations with different elements and aspects of the environment were to be promoted through early-stage education carried out with the goal of fostering the multifaceted perspectives of learners, this could provide a foundation for later specialized study in which the risks of commitment to narrowly

siloed knowledge disciplines are reduced. This in turn could create space for the kinds of multidisciplinary, multidimensional human-to-human communication and negotiation that are crucial to sustainability.

Multifaceted interest can also help us move past class-rooted prioritization of aesthetic concerns and perspectives by those whose material security has already been realized.

Development and recognition of multifaceted interest in humans can be analogized to the complexity and diversity of biospheres. In the human case, active acknowledgement and embrace of the diversity of relations people have with their surroundings could enhance the adaptability, robustness, and sustainability of those relations and of the human-nature whole.

Notes

[1] Some of the names of Japanese thinkers and authors in this article are given according to country practice, surname first.

[2] Arne Naess, 'The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movement. A Summary*' *Inquiry* 16, no. 1–4 (January 1973): 95–100, https://doi.org/10.1080/00201747308601682; Arne Naess, 'The Deep Ecology Movement', in Steven Luper-Foy, ed., *Problems of International Justice*, 1st ed. (London: Routledge, 2019), 144–48, https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429303111-9.

[3] Caroline Hickman, et al., 'Climate Anxiety in Children and Young People and Their Beliefs about Government Responses to Climate Change: A Global Survey', *The Lancet Planetary Health* 5, no. 12 (2021): e863–73.

[4] More appropriate terminology might be something like human and non-human nature; this would also be more accurately reflective of Makiguchi's views, if not always his language. The contrasting binary of human and nature is used here for simplicity's sake and also to highlight the dominant framework of modern Western anthropocentrism in response to which (modern Western) ecocentrism has developed.

[5] Interestingly, the Anthropocene, which on its surface is a clear linguistic and conceptual centering of the human, has been the occasion for some of the energetic efforts at decentering.

[6] See, Adam Kirsch, *The Revolt Against Humanity: Imagining a Future Without Us* (New York: Columbia Global Reports, 2023), for an overview of current anti- and transhuman thinking. Among the works considered here are: David Benatar, *Better Never to Have Been: The Harm of Coming into Existence* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006) and Claire Colebrook, *Death of the PostHuman: Essays on Extinction*, vol. 1 (London: Open Humanities Press, 2015).

[7] Christopher D. Stone, 'Should Trees Have Standing?: Toward Legal Rights for Natural Objects', *Southern California Law Review* 45 (1972): 450–501, is a seminal text in this regard.

[8] Jason Goulah, 'Language Education into the Anthropocene: Possibilities and Perspectives from Soka Humanism at the Posthumanist Turn', *Professing Education* 17, nos. 1 & 2 (2019): 6–16.

[9] Lynn White, 'The Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis', *Science* 155, no. 3767 (1967): 1203–07; Ian L. McHarg, *Design with Nature* (Garden City, NY: Natural History Press, 1969).

[10] Sophie Strand, 'The Fairies Are Back & They're Even Smaller: The Meeting of Magic & the Microscopic World of "Smalls"', *Braided Way Magazine*, August 8, 2021, accessed November 1, 2023, https://braidedway.org/the-fairies-are-back-theyre-even-smaller-the-meeting-of-magic-the-microscopic-world-of-smalls/.

[11] Stuart A. Kauffman, *Reinventing the Sacred: A New View of Science, Reason, and Religion*, 1st edition (New York: Basic Books, 2008), Kindle location 1564.

[12] Murao Koichi 村尾行一, *Makiguchi Tsunesaburo no "Jinsei chirigaku" o yomu* 牧口の人生地理学を読む (Reading Makiguchi Tsunesaburo's *Geography of Human Life*) (Tokyo: Ushio Publishing, 1997).

[13] Makiguchi Tsunesaburo 牧口常三郎, *Makiguchi Tsunesaburo zenshu* 牧口常三郎全集 (The Complete Works of Makiguchi Tsunesaburo), 10 vols. (Tokyo: Daisan Bunmeisha, 1981–96), 1:37–38; 1:133–34.

[14] Dayle M. Bethel, ed., *A Geography of Human Life* (San Francisco, CA: Caddo Gap Press, 2002), 31.

[15] Nozomi Inukai, '*Soka Kyoikugaku Taikei* Versus *Education for Creative Living*: How Makiguchi Tsunesaburo's Educational Ideas Are Presented in English', *Journal of Language, Identity & Education* 12, no. 1 (2013): 40–49.

[16] English translations of Makiguchi's *Pedagogy* cited in this article are part of a project to develop a complete English version of the Japanese text being carried out under the auspices of DePaul University in collaboration with Jason Goulah and Nozomi Inukai.

[17] Inukai, '*Soka Kyoikugaku Taikei* Versus *Education for Creative Living*', 49.

[18] Ibid., 47.

[19] Japanese, especially in its briefer utterances, does not have features that would be clearly equivalent to definite and indefinite articles in English. It is my view, however, that the use of the indefinite article in the title fails to represent the full scale of Makiguchi's ambition for this work, which was to provide comprehensive guidance for the analysis of the interactions between humans and their natural and social environments. In this sense, I consider *The Geography of Human Life* to be a more appropriate translation of the book's title.

[20] Jason Goulah, 'TESOL into the Anthropocene: Climate Migration as Curriculum and Pedagogy in ESL', in Jason Goulah and John Katunich, eds., *TESOL and Sustainability: English Language Teaching in the Anthropocene Era* (London: Bloomsbury, 2020), 90.

[21] Makiguchi, *Makiguchi Tsunesaburo zenshu*, 1:29; author's translation (passim).

[22] Bethel, *A Geography of Human Life*, 25.

[23] Makiguchi, *Makiguchi Tsunesaburo zenshu*, 1:28.

[24] See, Shiga Shigetaka 志賀重昂, *Nihon fukei-ron* 日本風景論 (On the Japanese Landscape), Kondo Nobuyuki 近藤信行, ed. (Tokyo: Seikyosha, 1894).

[25] Bethel, *A Geography of Human Life*, 31.

[26] Makiguchi, *Makiguchi Tsunesaburo zenshu*, 1:37.

[27] John M. Heffron, 'Soka Education and the Land Ethic: Educational Leadership toward the "Creative Co-existence of Nature and Humanity"', *Environmental Education Research* 28, no. 3 (2022): 480.

[28] Ibid., 482.

[29] Ibid.
[30] Inukai, '*Soka Kyoikugaku Taikei* Versus *Education for Creative Living*', 47.
[31] Bethel, *A Geography of Human Life*, 31.
[32] Shuichi Yamamoto and Victor S. Kuwahara, 'Perspectives of Mahayana Buddhism on the Destruction of Nature: Evaluating the Value of Nature', *The Journal of Oriental Studies* 27 (2017): 192–202.
[33] Ibid., 201.
[34] Ibid., 197.
[35] Makiguchi, *Makiguchi Tsunesaburo zenshu*, 1:133–34.
[36] Ibid.: 4.
[37] Keiichi Takeuchi, 'The Significance of Makiguchi Tsunesaburo's *Jinsei chirigaku* (Geography of Human Life) in the Intellectual History of Geography in Japan: Commemorating the Centenary of Its Publication', *The Journal of Oriental Philosophy* 14 (2004): 121; See also, Keiichi Takeuchi, 'Landscape, Language and Nationalism in Meiji Japan', *Hitotsubashi Journal of Social Studies* 20, no. 1 (1988): 35–40. https://doi.org/10.15057/8428.
[38] Makiguchi, *Makiguchi Tsunesaburo zenshu*, 1:13.
[39] For an overview of this history in the US context, see Jedediah Purdy, *After Nature: A Politics for the Anthropocene* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2015).
[40] Arnold Guyot, *The Earth and Man: Lectures on Physical Geography in Its Relation to the History of Mankind*, C.C. Felton, trans. (Boston, MA: Gould and Lincoln, 1853).
[41] Uchimura Kanzo 内村鑑三, *Chijinron* 地人論 (On Humans and the Land) (Tokyo: Keiseisha, 1894).
[42] Lester Frank Ward, *Applied Sociology: A Treatise on the Conscious Improvement of Society by Society* (Boston, MA: Ginn & Company, 1906), 6–7, cited in Japanese translation by Makiguchi, *Makiguchi Tsunesaburo zenshu*, 5:59.
[43] Makiguchi, *Makiguchi Tsunesaburo zenshu*, 2:172.
[44] Ibid.:173.
[45] Andrew Gebert, 'Tsunesaburō Makiguchi's Recasting of Competition: Striving for Excellence in a Context of Interdependence', *Thresholds in Education* 46, no. 1 (2023): 266–88.
[46] "Eels or other fish caught and pulled out of the water and dumped along a riverbank do everything possible to escape back into the water and seem to resist people trying to grab them. When human beings see more complex animals clearly opposing them and other enemies in seeking to preserve life, they may presume, from their limited perspective, such action to be 'conscious,' but this is a human-centered, subjective judgment; viewed from the animals' perspective, it may very well be untrue. Because no language exists to communicate with them, the truth of the matter remains mutually unknowable." (Makiguchi, *Makiguchi Tsunesaburo zenshu*, 5:165).
[47] Yamamoto and Kuwahara, 'Perspectives of Mahayana Buddhism on the Destruction of Nature'; Heffron, 'Soka Education and the Land Ethic'; Goulah, 'Language Education into the Anthropocene'.
[48] Andrew Gebert, 'The Roots of Ambivalence: Makiguchi Tsunesaburō's Heterodox Discourse and Praxis of "Religion"', *Religions* 13, no. 3 (2022): 260.
[49] Matsuoka Mikio 松岡幹夫, *Nichiren bukkyo no shakaishisoteki tenkai — Kindai*

nihon no shukyoteki ideorogii 日蓮仏教の社会思想的展開——近代日本の宗教的イデオロギー (The Societal Development of Nichiren Buddhism: The Religious Ideology of Modern Japan) (Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 2005).

[50] Andrew Gebert, 'Uncommon Faiths John Dewey and Tsunesaburo Makiguchi's Recasting of "Religion"', in Jason Goulah, Gonzalo Obelleiro, and Jim Garrison, eds., *The Dewey-Soka Heritage and the Future of Education* (Peter Lang Series on Ikeda/ Soka Studies in Education) (New York: Peter Lang, forthcoming [2024]).

[51] Makiguchi, *Makiguchi Tsunesaburo zenshu*, 2:432.

[52] Ibid., 1:28.

[53] Saito Shoji 斎藤正二, *Makiguchi Tsunesaburo no shiso* 牧口常三郎の思想 (The Thought of Makiguchi Tsunesaburo) (Tokyo: Daisan Bunmeisha, 2010).

[54] Ibid., supplementary note 5; Makiguchi, *Makiguchi Tsunesaburo zenshu*, 1:386.

[55] Hermann Kern, *Grundriss der Pädagogik*, 5th edition (Frankfurt: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1893), 36, quoted in Charles DeGarmo, *Herbart and the Herbartians* (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1895), 59–60, http://archive.org/details/herbartherbartia00degarich. This passage bears the clear stamp of Kantian individualism. Makiguchi's later criticism of Kant focused on what he saw as Kant's inability, in an era before the discipline of sociology had developed, to take the social aspect of humans fully into account (1930–31). In this sense, we can say that Makiguchi did not fully resonate with the ideal of aloof transcendence with which this passage closes. But the biographical fact is that Makiguchi did continue to pursue his chosen goals even after cruel fate robbed his life of its most cherished object — the four children he lost to illness — and enabled him to find a new calling as a writer, organizer, and Buddhist activist after he was driven from his previous occupation as a public school teacher and principal.

[56] Saito, *Makiguchi Tsunesaburo no shiso*, supplementary note 6; Makiguchi, *Makiguchi Tsunesaburo zenshu*, 1:396.

[57] Makiguchi, *Makiguchi Tsunesaburo zenshu*, 1:30.

[58] Makiguchi, *Makiguchi Tsunesaburo zenshu*, 2:100–05; Koichi Miyata, 'Tsunesaburo Makiguchi's Theory of the State', in *Ideas and Influence of Tsunesaburo Makiguchi: Special Issue of the Journal of Oriental Studies* 10 (2000): 10–28. Miyata analyzes the conclusion reached by Makiguchi in *Geography* that war was not the best path for Japan to pursue.

[59] Bethel's translation of *kosai* as 'encounter' is adopted here with grateful acknowledgement.

[60] Makiguchi, *Makiguchi Tsunesaburo zenshu*, 1:31.

[61] Makiguchi, *Makiguchi Tsunesaburo zenshu*, vols. 5–6.

[62] Makiguchi, *Makiguchi Tsunesaburo zenshu*, 5:249.

[63] See Saito, *Makiguchi Tsunesaburo no shiso*; Andrew Gebert, 'The Roots of Ambivalence: Makiguchi Tsunesaburō's Heterodox Discourse and Praxis of "Religion"', 260.

[64] In his 1930 *Pedagogy*, Makiguchi makes repeated reference to having pondered, for decades and to the point of torment, the themes and ideas of the book. See Makiguchi, *Makiguchi Tsunesaburo zenshu*, 5:10, 5:12, passim.

[65] Makiguchi, *Makiguchi Tsunesaburo zenshu*, 5:241.

[66] See, for example, Sophie Strand, 'Make Me Good Soil | Sophie Strand | Substack', accessed October 20, 2023, https://sophiestrand.substack.com/.

[67] See, for example, Jens Benöhr and Patrick J. Lynch, 'Should Rivers Have Rights?

A Growing Movement Says It's About Time' (n.d.). *Yale E360*, accessed June 8, 2023, https://e360.yale.edu/features/should-rivers-have-rights-a-growing-movement-says-its-about-time; Paul Wyard, 'Branching Out: Could We Give Legal Rights to Trees?', *Legal Cheek* (blog), June 24, 2020, accessed November 1, 2023, https://www.legalcheek.com/lc-journal-posts/branching-out-could-we-give-legal-rights-to-trees/.

[68] Mike Baker, 'Judge Rules in Favor of Montana Youths in Landmark Climate Case', *The New York Times*, August 14, 2023, sec. U.S., accessed October 30, 2023, https://www.nytimes.com/2023/08/14/us/montana-youth-climate-ruling.html.

About the Author

Andrew Gebert is affiliated with the Ikeda Research Institute for Soka Education at Soka University, where he teaches courses on Soka Education and translation studies. He is also adjunct faculty in the Value-Creating Education for Global Citizenship program at DePaul University in the United States and commissioned research fellow of the Institute of Oriental Philosophy.