

Meiji Japan's Encounter with Modernization

Hisao FURUKAWA *

I The Modern Age

The periodization of history is probably just as important a task for the historian as the establishment of areal divisions is for the researcher in area study. How history is divided, and how the world is divided into areas, express in their demarcations the condensation of a comprehensive view of world history and of a view of the relationship between nature and man. During my two trips to China in 1990 and 1991, I had the pleasure of reading Ichisada Miyazaki's two-volume *History of China* [Miyazaki 1977], which convinced me that the division of time into four periods—ancient times, the middle ages, pre-modern times, and most-modern times (the modern age)—in a centralized society such as China was appropriate. This four-period system is extended to the whole of world history, and the following reason is given for dividing Europe's modern age from pre-modern times.

Silver ingots mined and smelted in the New World by slaves were brought to Europe, which profited from unheard-of prosperity. . . . The European world came to create an industrial revolutionary culture that practically regarded preceding cultures as worthless. This began in the latter half of the eighteenth century, and the history of Europe at this stage suddenly entered a new phase. So, I divide this phase from the earlier pre-modern times as the modern age. . . . [Yet] the modern age is not the antithesis of pre-modern times; it refers to the fact that pre-modern trends advanced all the more strongly. [*ibid.*, Vol. 1: 82-83]

Thus, although the modern age is a new phase, its continuity with pre-modern times cannot be denied. Likewise, I believe that this great scholar is asserting that even though divisions exist between pre-modern times and the middle ages, and between the middle ages and ancient times, continuity exists between these ages both in Europe and in China, each in its own way. This point is an important turning point in thinking. A totally different

* 古川久雄, Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Kyoto University

angle appears, for example, in the round-table discussions on "The Conquest of Modernity" held in 1942. The chairman, Tetsutaro Kawakami, stated: "My view is that our best approach is to begin by analyzing nineteenth-century Europe, since ultimately we have been educated by European civilization" [Kawakami *et al.* 1942: 175]. And Hideo Kobayashi opined that "The 'Conquest of Modernity' means the conquest of Western modernity. There's absolutely no question of the conquest of Japan's modernity" [*ibid.*: 247]. Such views reveal a kind of cultural emasculation that is premised on the discontinuity of Japan's pre-modern and modern times. Even in his criticism of "The Conquest of Modernity," Wataru Hiromatsu evinces a similar cultural emasculation when he writes: "As far as the criticism of capitalism is concerned, socialist thinking is sufficient for the task" [Hiromatsu 1989:244].

Let us return to continuity within history. With Miyazaki's view of history, continuity is not something that is purely cultivated in just one area alone. The timing by which we shift from ancient times to the middle ages, and from the middle ages to pre-modern times arrived the earliest in Western Asia, followed by the East and then Europe several hundred years later. If this is the case, just as water flows down from high places, the various elements of Western Asia's pre-modern civilization traveled to the East, giving rise to the commercial culture of Sung and the Renaissance in Western Europe. Europe which was the last to welcome in its pre-modern age was able to garner the collective results of the pre-modern civilizations of the East and Western Asia. An example of this was Columbus, who unveiled the curtain of the great age of seafaring. Columbus was a Jew who found the new land of Diaspora in his quest for new lands at the very moment that the Reconquest ended and Queen Isabella attempted to banish Jews from the country. Vasco da Gama's trans-Indian Ocean route was not even his own discovery; it was already well known among Arab seamen from Africa's East Coast all the way to India. Thanks to plundered silver and the armed domination of new sea routes, Europe enjoyed a new prosperity, and pushed forward with its industrial revolution, fulfilling its role as the curtain-opener to the pre-modern civilization. The effect of this reached the East and Western Asia.

Looked at in this light, world history is without doubt an unbroken fabric to which new weft is ingeniously and continuously woven into the ever-extending warp. What, then, is the difference between pre-modern times and the modern age?

Loosely stated, pre-modern society was probably a visually bright patchwork. I imagine it as a multi-colored patchwork woven of traditional and exotic materials in unique designs that reflected the customs and esthetics of their respective areas. This situation remains colorfully alive in non-centralized societies such as the Malay archipelago and Oceania.

Yet, in Europe, signs of the natural sciences were appearing, and when modern sciences became established, a new, different epistemology began to spread to other areas. The following statement by Torataro Shimomura in the discussion of "The Conquest of

Modernity" aptly describes the nature of modern science.

The epistemology of modern science is not the intuitive perception of the essence or form of things, as in ancient times It is a technical, formative epistemology . . . that views things , and that tortures so-called nature to force nature itself to answer. . . . To be connected with the spirit of experimental methodology is not to simply observe nature as it is in a purely objective manner; it is to make things that do not exist in nature real through human intervention. [Kawakami *et al.* 1942: 188]

Those who grasped the spirit of modern science became the slave masters, and the person who stays in the conventional patchwork literally becomes the material for proving the destiny of existence trapped in the cogs of dynamic torture.

The industrial revolution that started in the latter half of the eighteenth century involved many elements: the reform of the cotton industry with the British creating a triangular system of trade involving cotton from the West Indies, slaves from West Africa and cotton textiles in Manchester; improvements in the drainage of mine water by steam engines; the technical reform of the steel industry; and the reform of transportation by steam locomotives, the provision of roads and a network of canals. Farmers who had lost their land after being driven off their farms in the wool manufacturing age were brought together as factory workers, and the modern age in which structural poverty, unemployment, crime and corruption existed alongside the elegance of the bourgeoisie —the age of selective will in which choice lay with the individual—had begun. Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, published in 1776, symbolized the quality of the age along with research into the revolution in energy using fossil fuels. However, from the point of view of continuity in history, Adam Smith's theory of the value of work may have also been a rehash of Ibn Khaldun, the Arab historian from the fourteenth century. Ibn Khaldun pointed out clearly that it was production that was the source of true wealth beyond that of commerce [Morimoto 1980, Vol.2: 767-773]. The Diaspora of the Sephardim may also have led to the chance encounter of the forefathers of Arabian science and modern economics.

Though I cannot comprehend the theory of how modern capitalism and incipient capitalism differ, according to my own experience, I would say that the differences between the domestic industries seen in the souk (market-places) of Fez (Morocco) or Istanbul and the large complexes of factories in Rotterdam, for example, are overwhelming. Without having recourse to examples overseas, the ironmongers of East Osaka and the industrial estates along the coast of Osaka Harbor are as different in size as a flea and an elephant. With a large capital investment, land, machines and materials can be bought, turned into products by workers, and sold on the market to generate profit. This was the logical conclusion of this system—in the textbook explanation of capitalism. With regards to the purpose of manufacturing, the products of the Fez tanneries, so foul-smelling as to numb the senses, or the Istanbul ironmongeries, so noisy as to almost deafen, are linked to a

visible demand within the scope of eye-to-eye contact between buyer and seller; whereas, the products of modern factories are directed toward profit that is removed from human measure. With modern capitalism, a monstrous profit exists between work and products. Profit that was originally a talisman-like thing has gradually become an enormous monster. All kinds of things are turned into commercial products, and are manufactured in order to create profit on the commercial market. Such is the structure of modern capitalism.

Viewed at the individual level, I have no choice but to consider that the only reason why we cannot give up mass production, mass consumption and mass disposal that can only be termed fruitless, is that profit has become the absolute criterion of worth. Profit has now all but devoured not only man but also nature. In John Steinbeck's *Grapes of Wrath*, the words of the landowners' spokesman who has come to drive out the tenants are impressive. "If a bank or a finance company owned the land, the owner man said, The Bank—or the Company—needs—wants—insists—must have—as though the Bank or the Company were a monster, with thought and feeling, which has ensnared them. These last would take no responsibility for the banks or the companies because they were men and slaves, while the banks were machines and masters all at the same time. . . . They breathe profits; they eat the interest on money. If they don't get it, they die the way you die without air, without side meat. It is a sad thing, but it is so. It is just so" [Steinbeck 1939: 32-33]. The tractors destroyed everything, mowing down the woods and trees, baring the brown earth, which was blown about and scattered by the dry wind—together with the tenants.

Once Britain had achieved industrial reform, it immediately pushed on with building up its military strength. The Battle of Trafalgar (1805), in which it defeated the combined fleets of Napoleon and Spain, both established Britain as a maritime empire and was a signal that modern European capitalism had been established.

Modern European capitalism made inroads into East Asia in search of new markets. A dramatic sign of this was the Opium War. Britain sent its first envoy McCartney to the Ch'ing dynasty in 1792 in an attempt to settle the trade deficit in silk, tea and porcelain imports. The Imperial Letter handed to this envoy by Emperor Qian Long was truly commanding, and fully demonstrated China's confidence in the tributes brought to China. The gist of this Imperial letter was as follows. "The produce of the Imperial Court are rich and plentiful, and are limitless. They are not made available by the cargo of foreign barbarians. However, as tea, porcelain, silk thread, etc. produced by the Imperial Court are the necessities of Western countries and of your country, in compassion of your circumstances, the opening of a hong and trading shall be permitted in Macao, where you shall be supplied daily necessities and be benefited with the blessings of the Imperial Court." Britain's wish to establish a trading post in Peking, from which to break into China's immense market, was nipped in the bud [Yano 1990: 59]. Though subsequent envoys were to be dispatched, Amherst in 1816, and Napier in 1834, their efforts ended in failure.

Indeed, as Emperor Qian Long's letter states, trade with the Chinese Empire, with its varied environments—from grasslands and deserts to the loess plain of the north, the alluvial plains and wetlands along the Yangtze, the sub-tropical mountain districts of Lingnan, and the taiga forests in Daixinganling—and its large, diligent population producing masses of fine-quality goods, would become unfavorably imbalanced unless considerable steps were taken. In Japan, the Tokugawa shogunate also racked its brains over how to stem the endless outflow of silver and gold. What it thought up around the time of Hakuseki Arai were three types of goods packed in straw bags—trepangs, dried abalone and shark's fin.

The volume of Chinese tea consumed in Britain and the European continent from 1772 to 1780, for example, has been estimated at roughly 20 million pounds and 5.5 million pounds, respectively, and increased gradually from then on. In contrast, the products that Britain sold to China, such as raxa, blankets and furs, were unnecessary in sub-tropical Macao: Britain had nothing to sell. One of the products that the British East India Company consequently tried to sell was opium, and this attempt proved successful. The company had a monopoly over opium production in India and rapidly expanded its exports. A report presented to the throne in the 18th year of Dao Guang, in which Emperor Dao Guang laid down the opium prohibition policy, stated that in Canton alone "Although the yearly outflow of silver from before the 3rd year of Dao Guang was no more than several million *ryo*, the outflow of silver reached 17 million *ryo* from the 3rd to the 11th year of Dao Guang, 20 million *ryo* from the 11th to the 14th year, and increased to 30 million *ryo* from the 14th to the 18th year." Besides Canton, the amount of silver flowing out of Fuchien, Chechiang, Shantung and Tientsin also rose to several tens of millions of *ryo* [*ibid.*: 138].

The Ch'ing government negotiated for an end to opium smuggling with the British supervisor of trade in Canton. However, opium provided the funds for purchasing tea, and tea imports generated an enormous income in tea tax. So, the British had not the slightest intention of controlling smuggling. Lin Zexu, the governor of Hunan and Canton provinces, proposed the most thorough measures for the opium issue and was appointed as a special minister. On arrival in Canton, he confiscated 20,283 boxes of opium owned by the British, which he burned in the Humen straits in 1839. In response, the two major trading firms involved in opium smuggling, Dent and Matheson, made strong demands to British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, as a result of which, in 1840, the British parliament decided by a small majority to dispatch troops.

Compared with McCartney's time, Britain's military power had increased considerably. The British had pursued a policy of maintaining its naval strength at than twice the combined level of any two other countries. And in the past 50 years, steam-powered warships had made their appearance. Britain committed 48 warships, including steam-driven vessels, to the Opium War and crushed the Ch'ing navy of junks. Though the Chinese defeat is ascribed basically to the reduced fighting power and disorganized

leadership arising from the distrust between the Ch'ing dynasty and Han race, the one-sided defeat of the Ch'ing dynasty was also caused by such disadvantageous developments as the closures of Ningpo and the Yangtze river, the occupation of the Zhoushan Islands, and defeats at Kowloon and Jianshazui, which led to Lin Zexu's recall.

By the Treaty of Nanking, the British were to be paid six million yuan in nickel silver as compensation for the burning of the opium. However, in order to avoid unfair criticism in future, this was stipulated to be reparation for the deaths of British soldiers. In addition, the British received large sums for repair of Canton castle and three million yuan in reparation to British trading firms. Moreover, the British took Hong Kong, forced open the ports of Kuangchou, Shamen, Fuchou, Ningpo and Shanghai to foreign trade, and built foreign settlements in which "Chinese and dogs" were not allowed to enter. They had in effect captured extraterritorial rights by their gunboats.

Oddly enough, the Treaty of Nanking did not contain any clauses relating to the trading in opium, the cause of the Opium War. The British argument was to say, just like a thief caught in the act and defending his actions, "If the Chinese do not give up their habit of smoking opium, it is certain that they would import enough opium to smoke from somewhere else even if we did not sell it to them" [*ibid.*: 12]. The bluntest reason given for the British attitude was given by John Quincy Adams, the then American Secretary of State, who asserted that opium was not the direct reason for the conflict between Britain and China but rather the assertion of the rights for international fair traffic" [*ibid.*: 11]. This was shameless logic-chopping. Jinichi Yano rightly pointed out that "in forcing upon China, in contravention of that country's laws, substances so poisonous of moral hygiene that their sale is banned in their own country, and in turning their back on their destruction of the moral hygiene of the Chinese, [the British] revealed a mentality common to Caucasians, who disregard anything relating to Asian people as a crime." To force an unfair treaty upon the Chinese and call it a fair commercial treaty was incomprehensible.

The fact that the British themselves regarded the imbibing of opium as despicable was clear in Raffles' declaration of Singapore as a free port 20 years before the Opium War. "Excluding rules to be provided for prohibiting the consumption of opium and strong drink, and the vices of gambling . . . I have the freedom to sell to whom I wish" [Shinobu 1968: 346]. In a separate letter, he wrote to a friend, "I have had everything to new-mould from first to last; to introduce a system of energy, purity and encouragement. . . . We cannot do better than apply the general principles of British law to all, equally and alike, without distinction of tribe or nation" [Winstedt 1935: 202].

Four years later, in 1824, Britain and Holland exchanged Malacca and Bencoulén, and the spheres of interest in the lands around Singapore were agreed upon. It was like the division of plunder between thieves. The discontinuity between the crudity of the act of plunder and the subtlety of the theory with which it was embellished was the tragic essence of old Europe, and assumed more actual form in the early years of the modern age.

Both parties to a conflict or war have their own reasons, unavoidable circumstances

also arise. It is difficult to say that one side or the other is absolutely good or bad. Yet, Europe's claim was that it was always in the right, and that the other party was always unfair, wicked and provocative. This statement was possible only by those who had lived by the law of the jungle.

This situation reflected the ecological and historical environment in which European civilization was fostered. And Japan, while fostered in a totally different environment, absorbed this attitude to a considerable extent in the course of modernization. And now, Japan is suffering a bitter experience, since it cannot unilaterally blame the West. Nevertheless, the differences in environment between Europe and Japan should be emphasized. As an antidote to cultural emasculation, I would like to quote an observation made by a Japanese who was not thus poisoned. This passage is from Tenshin Okakura's "The Awakening of the East."

The glory of Europe is the humiliation of Asia! The march of history is a record of the steps that lead the West into an inevitable antagonism to ourselves. From their very outset, the restless maritime instincts of the Mediterranean and the Baltic, born of chase and war, of piracy and pillage, stood in strong contrast to the continental contentment of agricultural Asia. Freedom, the sacred word of all humanity, was to them the projection of individual enjoyment, not the harmony of an interrelated life. The strength of their community always lay in their power of combining to strike a common prey. Their grandeur consisted in forcing the weak to minister to their pleasures. Their pride was built of contempt for the helpless who were yoked to their wagons of luxuries. Even the Greeks, with all their vaunts of liberty, were tyrants to the Helots,—Roman voluptuousness swam on the sweat of Ethiopia and the blood of Gaul. In spite of the boasted equality of the West, their aristocracy still bestrides the back of the masses; wealth never ceases to trample on poverty; and the eternal Jew today is hounded worse than ever. [Okakura 1938 = 1984: 136].

The criticism is often raised that Japan, now a world power, is trampling underfoot poor people around the globe. Coming from the South, this contains a considerable element of truth; but from the North, to which Japan belongs, it often serves ulterior motives. This probably needs dissecting. Let us take a look at the materials for this dissection in a cross-section of Japan's modernization.

II Japan's Dilemma in the Closing Days of the Tokugawa Shogunate

In examining the crisis that Japan faced in the closing days of the Tokugawa shogunate, it is necessary to recall several points.

Seeing Britain's taking of Hong Kong and its conclusion of an unfair treaty that involved the opening of five ports to foreign trade and the establishment of

extraterritoriality, France and America realized that they were falling behind in the control of the Chinese market. Taking advantage of the War of the HMS Arrow of 1856, the Second Opium War, a combined fleet of British, French and American ships attacked the Kuangchow region. The combined forces of Britain, America, France and Russia occupied Kuangchow and agreed upon the Tientsin Treaty. Then, in 1860, combined British and French forces invaded northern China, occupied Tientsin, razed the Enmeien Palace, and took Peking under the Tientsin Treaty. This treaty included the opening of Tientsin port to foreign trade and the partial cession of Jiulong. On the other hand, Russia pushed its army into the northeast provinces, took the land north of the Ussuri river by the Treaty of Aigun in 1858 and the land east of the Ussuri by the Treaty of Peking. In Xinjiang, they extracted agreement to the establishment of a consulate at Ili. In the latter half of the nineteenth century, Britain, America, France and Russia tried in concert rapidly to break up Chinese territories for their own imperialist ends.

News of this invasion of Asia by various European countries soon reached the Tokugawa shogunate via the Dutch and Chinese on Deshima island; and the Kyushu clans, who were engaged in maritime smuggling, also knew of it. These events also reached directly into the seas around Japan. In 1844, French warships visited Okinawa requesting trade, followed by British warships in 1845 and British and French warships in 1846. In 1846, two American warships under Commodore Biddle appeared off the coast of Uraga, and expressed their wish to trade. In 1849, American warships called at Nagasaki port, and British warships surveyed the channels at Uraga. In 1853, the situation suddenly changed. Commodore Perry of the American East India Fleet called at Uraga after stopping at Naha and Ogasawara with four steam-powered warships. Bearing a letter to the Shogun from President Fillmore, he requested friendship, trade, coal and the provision of food. Masahiro Abe, a member of the Shogun's Council of Elders asked the daimyo (feudal lords) for their opinions regarding these credentials. This brought them face to face with the difficult problem of whether Japan should exclude foreigners or open its doors to foreign trade. China's wretched plight was no longer something to be nonchalant about; the decision of which option to take was now a pressing issue. Though ostensibly seeking friendship and trade, "Perry's warships were iron-plated steamships, one armed with 30 or 40 cannon, another with 12, and the remaining two with 20 cannon between them, all capable of advancing and retreating freely, and using neither oars nor paddles, turning around rapidly. . . . They were castles that moved freely on water" [Konishi 1974: 37]. This was indeed gunboat diplomacy.

Bowing to gunboat diplomacy, the Tokugawa shogunate was compelled to open up the ports of Shimoda, Hakodate and Nagasaki to foreign trade under the Kanagawa treaty of 1854 with America, Britain, Russia and Holland. Further, in 1858, under a five-nation treaty that now included France, Japan was obliged to accept an unfair agreement that included opening up additional ports in Niigata and Hyogo to foreign trade, permitting foreign settlements in the opened markets and ports of Edo and Osaka, free trade with the

Japanese people, consular jurisdiction (that is, extraterritoriality), and unilateral most-favored nation treatment. The situation from then on developed in complicated ways with various new policies being advanced—reverence of the Emperor and expulsion of the barbarians, overthrow of the Tokugawa shogunate and expulsion of the barbarians, union of the Imperial Court and Shogunate, “stormy seas and high waves”—that led eventually to the Meiji Restoration.

Looking at the foreign settlement in Yokohama, “Both the British and French armies stationed troops under the pretext of protecting their ‘settlements,’ built a barracks complete with a powder magazine and hospital in addition to a ‘Governor-General’s’ official residence having a floor space of 4,600 *tsubo* [15,180 m²] on a site of 20,000 *tsubo* [66,000 m²] with a total of 53,000 *ryo* borne by Japan. The number of British troops stationed there including the navy was about 1,500. France took the same action, too. Permission to lease land was obtained automatically once it was approved by the consul, and, moreover, the leasehold was perpetual, allowing them to freely buy, sell and turn land over to others. The Yokohama foreign settlement gradually expanded, with roads being built, street lamps erected, sewage drains laid, and a church, park, race course, cemetery and abattoir built. A self-governing organization run by foreigners was established in the settlement, and the police and defense was almost entirely under the charge of foreign countries” [*ibid.*: 450-454]. Stationing of foreign troops continued to the 8th year of the Meiji period (1875).

As I look back at this age of violent upheaval, I feel keenly that Japan did well not to become a Western colony, even though this semi-colonial situation continuing through to the 27th year of the Meiji period (1894). Though this has already been studied in detail by specialists, I should like to add my own observations.

First, the immense land of China acted as a breakwater for Japan. It took the combined fleet of the British and French 70 years to occupy Peking from the time when McCartney was forced to kneel in subservience and eventually leave Macao empty-handed. During these 70 years, Japan was given sufficient time to learn the technical innovations of Europe. Also, the fact that the Taiping Rebellion greatly diminished the counteroffensive power of the Ch’ing dynasty added considerable weight to the argument for union of the Imperial Court and Shogunate.

Second, Japan was also greatly indebted to Southeast Asia for delaying the arrival of the Europeans. The European countries that had gained a foothold in Southeast Asia, where various tropical agricultural products, forestry products and spices were produced, embarked upon a course of colonial management. Spain started the forced cultivation of tobacco in Kagayan Valley in the Philippines in 1782. Holland followed suit in 1830 with the forced cultivation of coffee, sugar, indigo, pepper, etc. in Java. France started managing Vietnam and Laos, and Britain tried its hand at teak lumbering, and rubber and sugar cultivation in Burma and Malay Peninsula. In this way, despite their intentions to reach the Far East, greed delayed their arrival in Japan.

Third, under its seclusionist policy, Japan had achieved a balance among its disparate types of leadership—the Imperial Court, the nobility and the shogun. Under the shogunate-clan system of shared government, which rested on a rice stipend system, the clans functioned rather like a hundred or more self-supporting companies competing economically with each other. A controlling organization of shogunate, daimyo and clan executives, samurai, village headmen, and *nago* (servant peasants) ran a complicated and subtle administrative organization. Not only commercial capital but also industrial capital was sufficiently available. In education, too, the Chinese classics, the doctrines of Chu-tzu and Wang Yang-ming, were studied hard in shogunate learning centers and clan schools; the study of Japanese classical literature evolved; and Western learning was being absorbed and digested via the study of Western sciences in the Dutch language. Furthermore, the traditions of natural history were being related in books such as the *Wakan Honzo Komoku*, a treatise on herbal medicines in Japan and China, and the *Wakan Sansai Zue*, an illustrated encyclopedia, and the study of natural sciences was developing in the hands of talented scholars such as Choei Takano, Takakazu Seki, Gennai Hiraga and Tadataka Ino. Education was not limited to the elite; against the background of a high literacy rate afforded by private elementary schools, the national literature of Chikamatsu, Saikaku and others flourished, and Yamato-e and *ukiyo-e* paintings were created. Arts such as *kabuki*, *bunraku* (puppet theater), *noh* and *kyogen* (comic farces), tea gatherings, *tanka* poetry meetings, and *ikebana* were all part of mass culture. Distinctive arts, festivals and customs were being maintained in each community by villagers and townspeople. Trips such as the Ise-mairi and Kumano-mairi visits to the Ise and Kumano shrines, respectively, were opportunities for contact with the culture of different areas, and the occasional transfers of daimyo and their retainers brought about the large-scale dissemination of culture, industry and customs from a different clan.

It is difficult simply to assign Japan's pre-modern culture as being superior or inferior to that of modern Europe. Unlike Europe, pre-modern Japan had no colonies. And unlike Europe, through its espousal of Buddhism, Japan was trained to accept suffering as fate; in its tradition of belief in the spirits of ancestors and nature, it had nurtured a deep modesty; and these attitudes were not limited to Buddhist monks and Shinto priests but were part of the mass culture. Though these two features of pre-modern Japan may appear disparate, they share the same roots. Japan had fostered a culture in which people treated others as fellow men whose feelings should be considered.

Ainu and Ryukyans might disagree with this, countering that they had been under colonial rule by the Japanese. This problem requires careful thought. Yet, several tens of millions of Amerinds in North and South America had lost their lives, freedom and dwelling places; several tens of millions of Africans suffered the same bitter pains; and Australian aborigines and Kanakas were forced into settlements barely fit for animals. Mass crimes such as these never occurred in pre-modern Japan.

The fourth reason that prevented Japan from being reduced to a colony was probably

the will to firmly hold onto its independence at all costs. It took full advantage of the above three factors in formulating a prompt response. The principle here, in a word, was "Japanese spirit with Western learning." This was typified by the actions of the Satsuma clan before and after the "Satsuma-British War," the bombardment of Kagoshima by a British naval squadron.

III The Satsuma Clan's Attempts to Increase Production and Promote Industrialization : A Phase in Japan's Modernization

Nariakira Shimazu, who became the twenty-eighth head of the Satsuma clan in 1851, grasped that the power of the small Western nation Britain lay in the power of its cannon and ships, and he determined to make these by his own efforts. The following passage is testament to his determination. "Now, Japan's situation should be called extremely dangerous, our moment of crisis. Such being the case, military preparation should come first, otherwise our national prestige shall suffer and we shall finally become the minions of foreign countries" [Kagoshima Prefectural History Center Reimeikan 1993(hereafter referred to as "Reimeikan material A"): 8]. At the same time, he adopted a policy to increase production through industrialization, and shaped plans for promoting internal and external trade.

First, Nariakira built a group of factories, mainly for the manufacture of weapons, at the northern outskirts of the city, and close to the Iso clan villa. These were collectively named the "Shuseikan" in 1857. Here, he set up a blast furnace for making pig iron from iron ore and iron sand, a reverberating furnace for melting and refining the pig iron, and a drilling platform for boring the barrels of cannon, thus finally succeeding in manufacturing steel-barreled cannon. The reverberating furnace was built based on a translation of a Dutch book obtained from the Saga clan, which had succeeded in making the first cannon of its kind in Japan in 1851. In this way, a fort cannon capable of firing a 90-kilogram ball could now be manufactured. This cannon was to demonstrate its might in the Satsuma-British War. Cannon for infantry whose direction of fire could be freely changed and percussion rifles were also manufactured [*ibid.*: 7].

Nariakira also engaged in building Western ships. In 1854, he completed a three-mast ship, the Iroha Maru, and on the pretext that the ships were only for traveling to and from Okinawa, he launched the Okinawa cannon ship carrying large cannon at Sakurajima Island. Though this was a wooden ship, the Shohei Maru was Japan's first Western-style warship. The Shohei Maru was 27 meters long and equipped with ten cannon, two mortar cannon, and four infantry cannon. Five Western warships were produced, three of which were handed over to the Tokugawa shogunate. He then succeeded in producing a steam engine based on a Dutch book, and building the Unkou Maru, Japan's first steamship. At 16 meters, it was a small wooden ship, but it was one example of how fast the Shuseikan's undertakings had advanced technically [*ibid.*: 7-8].

The Shuseikan tried its hands at various other technologies. For instance, Shozan Sakuma produced a telegraphic instrument based on a Dutch book in 1849. In 1855, the Satsuma clan succeeded in communicating with a Morse telegraph that it had produced, and succeeded in the same year in producing an electrically fired land and sea mines [Kagoshima Prefecture 1939: 57].

Production of the attractive glassware known as Satsuma Kiriko began in 1851 to supply the glass containers required in the pharmacy built by the previous head of the clan, Narioki [*ibid.*: 53].

Further, cotton spinning machines and cotton looms powered by waterwheels were put into operation, and 1,200 people were engaged in making porcelains such as Satsumaware, and producing crystal sugar, Japanese paper, oil and leather goods [*ibid.*:41-42, 58; Kagoshima Prefectural History Center Reimeikan 1986(hereafter referred to as "Reimeikan material B"): 52].

Though the Shuseikan was subsequently destroyed during the Satsuma-British War, it was restored by Nariakira's heir Hisamitsu, who took advantage of the despatching of students from Satsuma to Britain in 1865, and was established as Japan's first mechanized cotton mill in 1867 with equipment bought from Platt Brothers Co., Ltd. of Manchester by Tomoatsu Godai (who later established the Osaka Stock Exchange and made other contributions to the development of business in Osaka). The same company was also requested to design the mill where they installed steam engines made by a steamship company in Holland. A total of seven British engineers were invited to head six divisions—boiler, cotton blending, combing, slubbing, ring spindle spinning and oblique spindle spinning—and act as superintendents. The factory was run under their guidance. A total of 200 workers worked there ten hours per day weaving plain and striped cotton cloths [*Nihonshi Daijiten* 1967: 126].

Nariakira Shimazu died suddenly in 1858. However, he sent retainers to Okinawa immediately before his death, having made them promise to purchase a steam-driven warship from Britain. It was to be 40 to 60 *shaku* (12 to 18 meters) long, armed with 12 cannon and new type rifles, and its estimated cost was 185,000 *ryo*. They then purchased two more of these ships and five steam-driven warships before the Satsuma-British War at a cost of 510,000 dollars [Reimeikan material B: 9].

After Nariakira's death, a reaction against this path to modernization emerged. Increasing dissatisfaction with the conclusion of the unfair treaty between the Tokugawa shogunate and Harris strengthened anti-foreign sentiment throughout Japan. This was followed by a series of incidents driven by the sentiment of "revere the Emperor and expel the barbarian"—first with the Sakurada Gate Incident in 1860 and the Sakashita Gate Incident in 1861. In the same year, however, the Tokugawa shogunate's Kanrin Maru set sail for Europe carrying an inspection party: Japan was at the same time advancing toward opening of the country. It was still uncertain which trend would ultimately predominate.

This was also the time of the Namamugi Incident or the Richardson affair. "In August

of the 2nd year of Bunkyo (1862), as the procession of the daimyo Hisamitsu approached the village of Namamugi on the Tokaido highway (currently, Namamugi, Tsurumi-ku, Yokohama City), a group of four foreigners including a woman rode past the procession on horseback. This act was to incur the anger of the daimyo's samurai as it disturbed the procession. A sword master, Kizaemon Narahara of the Yakumaru Jigen Ryu school, cut down the leading British merchant, while other samurai attacked and wounded the two other men" [Reimeikan material A: 30]. Though this was an unfortunate incident, two of the four foreigners were inhabitants of the Yokohama settlement, so they should have observed propriety upon meeting a daimyo's procession. Although the British charge d'affaires, Neal, demanded compensation of 100,000 pounds from the Tokugawa shogunate, the American envoy stated in a report home that, "In view of the domestic situation in Japan and the sentiment of the Japanese people, there was sufficient reason to cut down the Englishman. As far as I am concerned, I feel it would be difficult for them to meet British demands" [Konishi 1974: 280].

The Tokugawa shogunate nevertheless met the demands for compensation. The Satsuma clan, however, rejected a demand for compensation of 25,000 pounds, and this led to the beginning of the Satsuma-British War. Let us take a brief look at this situation as described in the *Kagoshimakenshi* (History of Kagoshima Prefecture) [Kagoshima Prefecture 1939: 200-204].

On 27 June of the 3rd year of Bunkyo (1863), a squadron of seven British warships with combined crews of 1,185 men entered Kagoshima Bay, weighed anchor in the Kototsu estuary and undertook negotiations with the Satsuma clan. They were unable, however, to reach a conclusion. On 2 July, four of the British warships seized three of the Satsuma clan's steamships, the Tenyu Maru, Hakuho Maru and the Aotaka Maru, which had taken refuge near what is currently Shigetomi village of Kajiki town, and took them in tow to off the coast of Koike on Sakurajima Island. Takayasu Matsuki, the naval magistrate (later to become the Foreign Minister, Lord Munenori Terashima) and Tomoatsu Godai who had been on board were captured. At this point, the Satsuma clan's fortresses began to attack. The British command vessel immediately ordered the seized ships to be burned. Satsuma had fortresses at ten locations. The Tenpozan fortress was located at the mouth of the river Kototsu, and from there northwards in a protective line to the urban districts were located five forts, and to the side of Sakurajima Island were located fortresses at Yokoyama, Sakurajima Island (currently buried in the Taisho lava flow at the base of Sakurajima's volcano), Araide and Okino-kojima. Mines were laid between Okino-kojima and Moezaki on Sakurajima Island. These fortresses were equipped with 83 of the cannon cast at the Shuseikan. Though their regular shooting practice stood them in good stead, and the clan soldiers fought hard against heavy odds, the difference in fighting strength was evident.

Six of the British warships advanced deep into Kagoshima Bay, turned about, proceeded south from the shore, burned five of the Okinawan and other ships berthed

there, fired upon the Gionsu fort, then continued southwards destroying the clan's fortresses. The British fleet was equipped with 89 cannon, including the latest Armstrong cannon, whose might they demonstrated. The Satsuma clan's round cannon fired round balls up to one kilometer, whereas the British cannon had a range of four kilometers. Moreover, the British cannon fired pointed modern projectiles equipped with fuses which exploded upon impact, and exhibited much greater destructive power.

The battle lasted until 3 July, with the British fleet suffering 13 dead including the commander and vice-commander of the flagship and 50 wounded. On the Satsuma side, casualties were limited to 13 wounded, but the Shuseikan was destroyed, and rockets fired from the British warships burned the stretch of land to the east of Tsurumaru Castle and the tract of land from what is currently Nagato-cho to Uehommachi. On 4 July, the British fleet sailed out of Kagoshima Bay avoiding the mines, and returned to Yokohama to repair their ships and secure provisions.

Through this Satsuma-British War, the Satsuma clan learned the strength of the British navy and entered into a peace treaty, paying the compensation of 25,000 pounds with an advance from the Tokugawa shogunate. On the other hand, the British recognized the strength of the Satsuma clan and worked towards developing friendly relations with it.

Here, it is interesting to note what were the Satsuma clan's sources of funding for its military build-up. We can first mention the financial reforms of Tempo carried out by Nariakira's pre-predecessor Shigehide, and the chamberlain Shozaemon in place of his predecessor Narioki. Putting aside such tricky maneuvers as the shirking of repayment a loan of five million *ryo* from an Osaka merchant, and the production of fake gold at Hanakura to the north of the Iso villa, the Satsuma clan made efforts to develop an extremely wide range of produce. Briefly, these included tobacco, mushrooms, sulfur, alum, coal, salt, cotton textile, silk textile and Satsumaware. Moreover, able merchants were engaged in the development of these activities [Haraguchi 1966: 120].

The most important source of revenue was the increased production of muscavado, or unrefined black sugar, that was started on Amami Island in the seventeenth century. The first monopoly system begun in 1773 was apparently severe. All obstacles for developing farmland were swept away: if, for example, folk customs threatened to stand in the way, the island's leaders were urged to break with them and give their undivided attention to the production of muscavado. During this period, a disaster was to hit Tokunoshima Island. Famine caused 3,000 people to starve to death. With the Tempo Reforms in 1830, repression was eased slightly. However, the monopoly system continued without change, and efforts were made to establish new methods of exploiting the islanders and improving quality. In other words, a kind of forced cultivation system was implemented. Also, the rice-muscavado exchange rate was one-sided; for example, the price of muscavado was set at one-sixth that of the going rate in Osaka. In the ten years after the Tempo Reforms, earnings rose from 1,360,000 *ryo* to 2,350,000 *ryo* [*ibid.*: 123-128].

Another important source of revenue were the foreign goods that the clan brought

from the Ryukyus to sell on the Nagasaki Exchange. This included a huge sum from illicit trade in goods and along routes that were not officially sanctioned. This trade has been detailed by Kaneyoshi Uehara, whose work is the basis of the following summary [Uehara 1981].

Though the types of imported goods handled by the Satsuma clan gradually increased, the majority were medicinal materials. The main method of smuggling was for Satsuma clan's trading ships to go out directly to Niigata and Oshumatsumae, secretly buy kelp or the goods packed in straw bags, important commercial goods being traded with Ch'ing China under the control of the shogunate, and smuggle them to Ch'ing China via Okinawa. However, as this illicit trade naturally depressed trade at the Nagasaki Exchange, in 1851 the shogunate prohibited Satsuma from handling imported goods. Yet, after the Opium War, British and French warships frequently visited Okinawa, and eventually they requested trade. To maintain its links with Okinawa, in 1857 the Tokugawa shogunate again allowed Satsuma to handle imported goods [*ibid.*: 245-260].

In fact, the Satsuma clan had continued to sell and smuggle these goods during the prohibition period, in 1854 passing off imported goods as Okinawan produce [*ibid.*: 50]. Toyama medicine sellers played an intermediary role in this illicit trade, with the Satsuma clan adopting a system whereby they disposed of their own produced medicines via the Toyama medicine sellers' routes [*ibid.*: 273-282].

As sale of imported goods and illicit trade were important sources of revenue, it was reasonable for the Satsuma clan to protect and foster maritime trade. Ibusuki, Akune, Bonotsu, Yamakawa and Shibushi were bases of marine trade that had close links with the Satsuma clan. Chinese quarters still remain there even today. The coloring of Fuchien port cities is still very much in evidence in the hewn stone walls and stone-paved roads of Bonotsu and other port cities.

Placed in this situation, Shigehide, Narioki and Nariakira grasped the state of affairs in East Asia, and it was natural that they should desire to increase production just like the Choshu clan (in modern-day Yamaguchi Prefecture).

The fostering of talented personnel was also important in securing funds for increasing the clan's production. The samurai hierarchy of the Satsuma clan was distinctive as it also had "country samurai" who lived outside the castle quarter (in areas later known as *kyo*), as well as samurai who lived within the castle quarter, the seat of the daimyo's government. This was in effect the colonial militia system implemented by the Satsuma clan, whose territory was confined to the two countries of Satsuma and Osumi (modern-day Kagoshima prefecture), and part of the Hyuga country (modern-day Miyazaki prefecture) after their submission to the Tokugawa government. This system was implemented in order to raise the second largest stipend in Japan of 770,000 *koku* [1 *koku* = 5.1 bushels] of rice. By this system, troops and farmers lived together. Samurai hamlets called *fumoto*, or "bases," were set up in the center of the *kyo*, where the lord of the manor's villa served as government office of the *kyo*, the military and administrative center for the

several villages under its control. Country samurai normally supported themselves by farming, but in times of war they were mobilized as warriors. By this country samurai system, samurai warriors learned directly about the vicissitudes of the outside world, and whether they liked it or not were provided the opportunity to learn about world events.

Here, a special educational system operated in institutions called *kyoju* that turned the samurai of castle and country into the geniuses of Meiji Japan. *Kyoju* were located in each district (quadrant or sector) and were organized and run autonomously by *nise* and *chigo*, the sons of samurai living in the same quadrant. Here, they cultivated the skills to make them masters of both the pen and the sword. Ryotaro Shiba neatly captures the nature of the *kyoju* system as one that "absorbed the old southern custom of *wakashuyado* ['youth hostels'] and turned them into institutions for educating the descendants of samurai" [Shiba 1990: 228]. The *kyoju* system was probably a creative system whereby samurai also absorbed tradition and were prevented from escaping from the realities of their community.

The speed with which the Satsuma clan transformed itself after the painful damage it suffered in the Satsuma-British War was admirable. In 1865, two years later, the Satsuma clan despatched 17 students to the enemy country Britain with whom they had exchanged gunfire. The fundamental concept behind this is mentioned in a modernization plan that Nariakira had already devised in 1857. In actual fact, however, with the Satsuma clan paying their dues and learning the hard way in the Satsuma-British War, Nariakira's plan was revived with practical weight. Hiroyasu Matsuki (later to become the Foreign Minister, Lord Munenori Terashima) and Tomoatsu Godai, who were captured by the British during an earlier exchange, promoted the sending of students overseas. Let us now take a look at the course of this as described in Reimeikan materials A and Takaaki Inuzuka's *Satsumahan Eikokuryugakusei* (Students Sent to Britain by the Satsuma Clan) [Inuzuka 1974].

In 1857, Tomoatsu Godai was studying Dutch naval techniques in the Nagasaki Naval Institute. During his studies, in 1859, he stole a passage to Shanghai where he learned about world events. After his return to Japan, he became an assistant to the clan's naval magistrate, and was to be captured by the British fleet on the Tenyu Maru together with the magistrate Terashima.

Munenori Terashima was the clan's physician of Dutch medicine. He was eager to translate Dutch literature, and eventually became the effective promoter of the Shuseikan's undertakings. In 1861, he joined the Tokugawa shogunate's mission to Europe as interpreter-physician, and became one of the attendants to Yukichi Fukuzawa. The mission's duty was to survey the social systems of Britain, France, Holland and Russia. In a letter written by him on his travels, he stressed the view that the Japanese should lose no time in forsaking their narrow view of the world, and that the only way to save Japan from its predicament was to establish an unified state.

Tomoatsu Godai's written report was proposed against the background of his

experiences in the Satsuma-British War. His report suggested, firstly, that the sugar industry should be modernized by trade with Shanghai; secondly, that students should be sent to the West to learn in earnest about its culture and techniques; and, thirdly, that steam-driven warships, cannon, rifles, agricultural machinery, and spinning and weaving machinery should be purchased.

Hisamitsu of the Satsuma clan approved this written report, and students were chosen without delay. Tasks were distributed to a total of seventeen students in several groups. Nine students were put in charge of learning about military affairs, geography and customs; one student was put in charge of agricultural machinery; two students were put in charge of fortresses, fortifications, and the manufacture of cannon and rifles; one student each was put in charge of schools, hospitals, nurseries and asylums; three students were put in charge of drafting drawings of machine tools; and one student was put in charge of interpreting. In addition, Terashima and Godai went along as supervisors. The youngest of the group was 14 years old. As unauthorized travel overseas was, of course, strictly forbidden by the Tokugawa shogunate, everyone used aliases, and their pretext for leaving for was to protect the island of Oshima.

On 22 March 1865, they set sail from what is now Hashimaura, Kushikino City, on a small British steamship, HMS *Austrienne*. This ship was arranged for them by a British merchant, Thomas Glover, with whom Godai had become friends in Nagasaki. Here follow some extracts from the above-mentioned materials that describe their voyage.

- 22 March Set sail from Hashimaura. Hair to be cut on the 25th.
- 26 March Arrived Hong Kong. Donned Western clothes, hats and shoes. Viewed the town and docks.
- 5 April Set sail from Hong Kong on board a 2,000-ton passenger ship (90 meters long and 26 meters wide) of the Peninsular & Oriental Navigation Steamship Company of Britain.
- 11 April Arrived Singapore. Surprised at pineapples.
- 12 April Set sail. Surprised at the custom of a Dutch couple who kissed each other farewell as if not conscious of others' watching.
- 14 April Arrived Penang. Set sail immediately. Surprised at ice cream.
- 20 April Arrived Galle, Ceylon. Recorded that rice can be harvested twice a year and coffee grown, etc.
- 24 April Set sail.
- 28 April Arrived Bombay. Stared in wonder at the blocks of multi-storey buildings. Changed ship to the P&O Steamship Company's HMS *Benares*.
- 30 April Set sail.
- 7 May Arrived Aden. Took on coal.
- 8 May Set sail.
- 15 May Arrived Suez. Caught sight of camels. Amazed at ice factory and Suez

- canal excavation work.
- 16 May 0:30 a.m. Departed from Suez by steam train. Arrived Cairo 6 a.m. Departed from Cairo by steam train 7 a.m. Saw pyramids from train window. Arrived Alexandria 11 a.m. Set sail from Alexandria on board the large passenger ship Delhi.
- 19 May Arrived Malta 5 p.m. Took on fuel. Saw the medieval castle town of Valetta. Underwent a change of heart. "If the chief instigator of the principle of excluding foreigners from Japan were to actually experience how flourishing the developments and accomplishments of Europe were, even he would feel shame at the absurdity of the exclusionist ideas that he had been advocating and his grief would be unending." Set sail 10 a.m.
- 23 May Arrived Gibraltar 2 p.m. Set sail 4 p.m.
- 28 May Arrived Southampton 4:30 a.m. Departed Southampton 5:30 p.m. on a steam train. Arrived London's central station 8 p.m. Greeted by Thomas Glover's elder brother. Checked into hotel near Kensington Park.

The students then moved into lodgings, and practiced the English language under a private tutor. In July, they were then put up separately at London University faculty residences, and in mid-August they were admitted to the University College of London University. The youngest at 14 years old, was to be admitted to a grammar school in Aberdeen.

Different materials offer different descriptions of their stay in Britain and their observations of the European continent, and details are unclear [Kagoshima Prefecture 1939:215-218]. However that may be, Godai, Satsuma clan supervisor Shinno, interpreter Hori and the others busied themselves purchasing industrial machinery, and in March 1866 they returned to Satsuma.

Terashima tried various diplomatic maneuvers with the British government. In a meeting with Foreign Secretary Lord Clarendon, for example, he requested positive intervention by the British government in Japan's domestic reform [Inuzuka 1974:104]. Fortunately, however, this maneuvering did not lead to any significant results, and in July, 1866, Terashima and two others returned to Satsuma. A further five returned to Satsuma at around October 1866. As of summer 1866, six remained in London, one in Aberdeen and two in France, making a total of nine still studying abroad. In May of 1867, Machida, the school superintendent and head of Kaiseisho (later to become Tokyo University) started home from Marseilles.

The six remaining in Britain were influenced by Thomas Ray Harris, an active member of the esoteric universal redemption school of thought, and left for New York where the joint headquarters were located. The modernization of Europe itself was in a stage of upheaval. It was in the midst of changing from a classical capitalist society into an

imperialistic modern capitalist society. The three mainstays of this were protective tariffs, military build-up and colonial rule. Within this process, the strain of modernization was revealed in the spread of slums, the contrast between the harsh working conditions of the juvenile working class and the lifestyle of the extravagant bourgeois class, and wars between nations. The dualistic view of nature, naturally, arrived at the theory of mechanism; countless machines were produced, and the situation arose where the systems for operating these machines bound the Europeans themselves hand and foot. It was reasonable that thinking as represented by Harris, a reaction to a mechanistic culture, appeared.

After two years of study overseas, the six Satsuma samurai took notice of the contradictions of the West. Seriously troubled as to whether the salvation of Japan could be achieved by imitating this, they sent a written report to the Satsuma clan and accompanied Harris to America. The gist of the report was as follows.

Since our arrival in Britain, everything we have seen and heard has been completely new to us due to our ignorance. All we have been able to do is to sigh. At last, however, we now understand that unacceptable circumstances also exist. . . . We now understand that there are a few things that we should accept and many that we should avoid. To the inexperienced, the posture of the British government seems fair on the outside, but such is not the case. Merely, they are skillfully hiding unfair speech and behavior. . . . It is the nature of Europe and America to completely ignore justice for the sake of one's own profit, to pillage many lands, and to accept the strong and reject the weak. [*ibid.*:132].

On the other hand, Tomoatsu Godai viewed the situation in a completely different, penetrating manner. His view was along the following lines [*ibid.*:100].

The foundation of Europe is industry and commerce. Industry produces all kinds of things as one wishes using a variety of machinery, and turns them into the basis of the accumulation of wealth. Commerce is trading. By these two methods, national power is enhanced, and armaments are reinforced. Trading is the activity of merchants, and does not differ in essence with Japan. Though the various clans of Japan are actively engaged in finance, industry is still underdeveloped. Upon my visit to Europe and its various factories, I could only be amazed at how advanced their methods of production were.

In a nutshell, his argument was that even though there was no striking difference with Europe in trade, Japan's industry had fallen way behind.

IV Merits and Demerits of Modernization

Once Japan's modernization had been set in motion by the fear of colonization, its history followed the path suggested by Tomoatsu Godai. And in its pursuit of increasing production and building national prosperity and defense, Japan too would invite the criticism that it had assumed "the nature of Europe and America to completely ignore justice for the sake of one's own profit, to pillage many lands, and to accept the strong and reject the weak." Japan discarded as much of its outstanding pre-modern tradition as it could, to the extent that the awareness of cultural emasculation inherent in the claim that "we were educated by Europe" became ineradicable. Forgotten was the reflection by the six samurai who finally understood "that there are a few things that we should accept and many that we should avoid."

After the Second World War, Japan began rebuilding, carrying out its second modernization under the catchword of catching up with and overtaking Europe and America, and eventually becoming a major power both economically and culturally. For many countries around the world, in particular, countries such as Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia and China, Japan has provided a model. In Indonesia, for instance, Mr. Habibie, the Minister of State for research and technology, espoused the policy of national enrichment and military build-up, by promotion of strategic industries centering mainly on aircraft development. He is also an aeronautical engineer, once the vice-president and manager of technology applications at Messerschmidt Velco Brom GmbH of Germany [Shiraishi 1992:280]. In Thailand and Malaysia, similar policies of military expansion are steadily being pursued through weapons purchases.

In a manner of speaking, this situation is a re-enactment of the undertakings of the Shuseikan. Basically, direct blame lies with the sales of weapons by Europe's munitions industry. In this respect, we can state that Japan is blameless. Nevertheless, in its inability to define the direction of new developments that deny "the nature of Europe and America" readily to seek military supremacy, Japan is equally responsible. Newly industrializing nations are patterning themselves after Europe, America and Japan, embarking on the path towards increased production in the belief that economic development is the sole mode of progress.

Eventually the point was reached when danger signals began to be sent out about the Earth's environment. In 1972, the Club of Rome advanced the concept of zero growth [Meadows 1972]. This rang the alarm bell for the destruction of the Earth and called for the freezing of the status quo, which was all very well for the rich men's club, but not something the developing countries could agree to. In 1992, at the UN Conference on Environment and Development held in Rio de Janeiro, compromise between the so-called North and South was attempted by the leaders of the North under the slogan of "sustainable development." Though the action criteria adopted at the summit—Agenda 21—included various opinions, the basic line of thought was outlined in the third chapter

"Changing Consumption Patterns" in the first section "Social and Economic Dimensions" which went as follows. "All countries should strive to promote sustainable consumption patterns; industrialized countries should take the lead in reducing wasteful and inefficient consumption of energy and resources; developing countries should seek to avoid replicating wasteful and inefficient consumption patterns of industrialized countries in their development processes" [Robinson 1992:67]. In addition, declarations of principles such as the protection of the atmosphere, conservation of biological diversity and combatting Aeforestation have been adopted. Yet, America is opposing the Biological Diversity Treaty and treaty for preventing global warming as they alienate industrial activities and from the point of view of the advantages and disadvantages to the biotechnology industry. The South's argument in response to this is summarized in the speech made by Pakistan as representative of the developing nations. "The main cause behind the current economical and environmental crisis lies in the unfair international economic order that has brought about an immense imbalance between the North and the South." "There is no solution but to distribute resources more fairly and alter the modes of consumption and production of the advanced nations" [Asahi Shimbun 1992]. There are also intellectuals in the North who clearly state that reasons lie in the North's extravagance. For example, the Italian architect, Paulo Sorelli, says that the cause lies in the American Dream that, "Big houses, spacious gardens, two cars. If the whole of mankind wanted this ridiculous lifestyle, ten Earths wouldn't be enough." He says that we should scale-down our actions and we should abandon "the absurd building of cities that swallow up man's ambition" [Asahi Shimbun evening edition 1992]. The prime minister of India teaches us the words of Ghandi, "Though our world is made to meet the needs of each and every one, it cannot tolerate greed."

As I look at this argument, I am reminded of the discussions by American scholars in the 1960s. At a conference held in Hakone on "The Problems of Modernization in Japan," for example, criteria cited for judging how far modernization had been achieved included urban concentration of population, a high degree of use of inanimate energy, the spread of a secular orientation of the individual to his environment, the existence of large-scale social institutions such as government business and industry, and the increased unification of nations [Jansen 1965:19].

In other words, Western society is located in a centralized concept, its awareness is structured in such a way that modernization is evaluated by how asymptotic it is to this, and its supremacist attitude is clear. At the same time, in the short period of 30 years, the arguments have completely reversed. Though the expansion of production and consumption used to be good in the past, now the scaling down of production and consumption are being requested of developing countries as the best policy. In a sense, some aspects have not changed. This is Europe and America's resolve to maintain their supremacy in forming the world.

What is the goal of the new concept of development? I believe that it is the observance

of the principle of life, which I have discussed elsewhere in an article entitled "Shizen to Ningen no Kyoson" (Coexistence of Nature and Man) [Furukawa 1993:53-80]. We should recognize the historical life not only of living creatures besides man but also of inanimate things, and we should not torture nature, which is brimming with life. I feel that in pre-modern Japanese society, the principle of life was being observed. That tradition still envelopes us. I believe that it is still possible to rectify Western learning that has gone too far. To advocate the restoration of the principle of life without seeking supremacy over life—here lies Japan's potential for contributing to the creation of a new concept of development.

References

- Asahi Shimbun*, 14 June 1992.
Asahi Shimbun, evening edition 10 June 1992.
 Furukawa, Hisao. 1993. Shizen to Ningen no Kyoson [Coexistence of Nature and Man]. In *Chiiki Kenkyu no Furontia* [Frontiers of Area Study], edited by Toru Yano. Tokyo: Kobundo.
 Haraguchi, Torao. 1966. *Bakumatsu no Satsuma* [Satsuma at the End of the Tokugawa Shogunate]. Chuko Shinsho.
 Hiromatsu, Wataru. 1989. "*Kindai no Chokoku*" Ron [Discourse on "the Conquest of Modernity"]. Tokyo: Kodansha Gakujutsu Bunko.
 Inuzuka, Takaaki. 1974. *Satsumahan Eikokuryugakusei* [Students Sent to Britain by the Satsuma Clan]. Chuko Shinsho.
 Jansen, M.B., ed. 1965. *Changing Japanese Attitudes towards Modernization*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ. Press.
 Kagoshima Prefectural History Center Reimeikan. 1986. *General Guide*.
 ————. 1993. *Tomoatsu Godai, Munenori Terashima, Arinori Mori*.
 Kagoshima Prefecture. 1939. *Kagoshimakenshi* [History of Kagoshima Prefecture], Vol.3.
 Kawakami, Tetsutaro et al. 1942. *Kindai no Chokoku* [The Conquest of Modernity], reprint ed., 1979. Tokyo: Toyamabo.
 Konishi, Shiro. 1974. *Nihon no Rekishi* [The History of Japan], Vol.19. Chuko Bunko.
 Meadows, D.L. 1972. *The Limits to Growth*. New York: Universal Books.
 Miyazaki, Ichisada. 1977. *Chugokushi* [The History of China], 2 vols. Iwanami Zensho.
 Morimoto, Kinzei, trans. 1980. *Rekishi Josetsu* [Introduction to History], 2 vols. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
Nihonshi Daijiten [Encyclopedia of Japanese History], Vol.5. 1967. Tokyo: Kawade Shobo Shinsha.
 Okakura, Kakuzo. 1938. The Awakening of the East. (In *Okakura Kakuzo Collected English Writings*, Vol.1. Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1984)
 Robinson, N. A., ed. 1992. *Agenda 21 and the UNCED Proceedings*. New York: Oceana Publications, Inc.
 Shiba, Ryotaro. 1990. *Kono Kuni no Katachi* [The Shape of This Country], Vol.1. Tokyo: Bungei Shunjusha.
 Shinobu, Seizaburo. 1968. *Raffuruzu Den* [Biography of Raffles]. Toyo Bunko.
 Shiraishi, Takashi. 1992. *Indonesia: Kokka to Seiji* [Indonesia: State and Politics]. Tokyo: Libroport.
 Steinbeck, John. 1939. *The Grapes of Wrath*, reprint ed., 1980. New York: Penguin Books.
 Uehara, Kaneyoshi. 1981. *Sakoku to Hanboeki — Satsumahan no Ryukyu Mitsuboeki* [National Seclusion and Clan Trade: The Satsuma Clan's Illicit Trade with Okinawa]. Tokyo: Yaedake Shobo.
 Winsted, R.O. 1935. *A History of Malaya*, reprint ed., 1986. Kuala Lumpur: Marican & Sons.
 Yano, Jinichi. 1990. *Ahen Senso to Honkon* [The Opium War and Hong Kong]. Chuko Bunko.