



Title	NITOBE INAZO AND KOREA
Author(s)	TANAKA, SHIN'ICHI
Citation	HOKUDAI ECONOMIC PAPERS, 10, 50-67
Issue Date	1980
Doc URL	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/2115/30691">http://hdl.handle.net/2115/30691</a>
Type	bulletin (article)
File Information	10_P50-67.pdf



[Instructions for use](#)

## NITOBE INAZO AND KOREA

TANAKA SHIN'ICHI

Associate Professor

Faculty of Economics and Business Administration  
Hokkaido University

In looking back on the development of the study of colonialism, which deserves special mention in the history of social science in Modern Japan, especially when attention is turned to the origin of this study, it is predecessors of Hokkaido University and Nitobe Inazo that comes to the fore first, from matters relevant to which come about various related matters derivatively. Nitobe graduated from Sapporo Agricultural College (the Imperial Agricultural College of Sapporo), which developed into the Agricultural College of Tohoku Imperial University, then Hokkaido Imperial University, and finally the present Hokkaido University. The foregoing background was expressed almost precisely in a public academic lecture of Takaoka Kumao, the person concerned with this study in every sense, made in commemoration of the semicentennial in 1926 of the founding of Hokkaido Imperial University as follows :

«It is in Sapporo Agricultural College that a scientific study was initiated concerning a colonial problem in highest educational institutions of this country. Namely, the revision of College regulations in 1887 included the starting of the study of colonization as a new subject. Afterwards, in 1907, it became a branch of Tohoku Imperial University, whereupon this study became a part of the chair of Agrarpolitik. This is the first chair on a colonial study in universities of this country. When a chair of colonialism was opened in Tokyo Imperial University in 1909 for the first time, the professor in charge of the chair was Nitobe, alumnus of Sapporo Agricultural College. Thus our university is closely connected with the scientific study of a colonial problem.»<sup>1)</sup>

Further factual information is provided sufficiently for the present by no more than two books, *the Fiftieth Anniversary Chronicle of the Founding of Hokkaido Imperial University* (Sapporo, 1926) and the last volume of *the History of the Fifty Years of Tokyo Imperial University* (Tokyo, 1932). The reason why the author dared to quote Takaoka's lecture, historical as it is now, is to point out inaccuracies in much exaggerated descriptions such as : «Nitobe was in charge of starting a new course of colonialism in 1903 ; he made a remarkable achievement in the special study of colo-

nialism》<sup>2)</sup>, and 《the inauguration of Nitobe as Professor of a colonialism chair newly established in the Law College of Kyoto Imperial University in 1903, marked the first step of the academic study of colonialism in this country》<sup>3)</sup>. Indeed, in such divergent views, often raised as if they were common opinions, we can find the decisive influence of the recollection of Oda Man, President of the Law College then<sup>4)</sup>.

Meantime, important as it may be to argue as to who the originator of the chair of the study of colonialism was, at least to keeping of systematically strict authentic records of the university, it is otherwise nothing more. So, the author would rather confirm the following significant point. Namely, to compare it to space geometry, though not a suitable metaphor, Nitobe is looked on as having constituted the top vertex of a trigonal pyramid and Hokkaido Imperial University, Kyoto Imperial University and Tokyo Imperial University having formed its base triangle. Nitobe is, indeed, 《the founder and the pioneer of the study of colonialism as well as one of the constructors of agricultural economics in this country》<sup>5)</sup>.

In an effort to look into the details there of, the author examined some of chronological records of Nitobe. As a result, the author found a line, 《He was dispatched to Korea on October 9, 1906》<sup>6)</sup>, which attracted the author's attention, because little mention has been made of Nitobe's relation with Korea, as compared with Formosa. So, the author tried to investigate Nitobe from the point of view of his relation with Korea. The best literature that covers his writing activity and that his societal concern shown therein in the middle of the decade starting 1900 is a series of essays written between 1903 and 1907 for an English-language periodical, *the English Student* and its renamed periodical, *the Student*. Extracted articles from them were later published into a book entitled *Thoughts and Essays* (Tokyo, 1909), in original English reedited by Nitobe.

In October of 1903, Nitobe, inaugurated as Professor of Kyoto Imperial University, stated in "Prepare in Peace for War and in War for Peace"<sup>7)</sup> written in April of 1904 as follows:

《Far more difficult is it to keep in mind peace in the crisis of war than to remember war in times of peace. Peace is a normal condition of existence, and war is but a temporary device to make that condition sure. Youth, however, is prone to forget, in the momentary excitement of war, the more permanent interests of peace.

Think of the thousand issues which one victory involves! Of its price calculated in yen and sen, I will not speak. Of the dead, however and of what their death entails upon those left behind, we must not be unmindful. What our ultimate triumph (of which we feel so sure) will bring in its train, economically and morally, who can prognosticate?

Who can predict the full measure of the responsibilities which will devolve upon the coming generation? These are by far the greatest issues of the war, of which every young man must feel the weight and for which he must equip himself.

I appeal to the youth of our land! All the while remember that the enemies, whom you will have to combat, will be more formidable than the Russians, though their weapons may not consist of rifles and torpedoes. Reserve your overflowing energy for a more glorious warfare than that of the present. Store your mind with strategics for the coming contest.»

As mentioned above, at first sight, he treats the Russo-Japanese War, but he never discusses the war itself. Rather he warns against being bitten with a war fever, calling attention to an inherent relation between war and peace, which tends to be forgotten in wartime. Rather than the process of war itself he points out a calamity which war brings on people and assumes and dwells on, so to speak, nonmilitary war coming about as a result of war. Nitobe, watching the development of this war from such a point of view, states in "Self-Mastery"<sup>8</sup> written in November of 1904 as follows:

«A brilliant victory crowned our war with China: we are beating Russia to the amazement of the West. But the greatest victory is yet to be. Can we conquer ourselves? This last conquest is what would make our nation truly great. The bloodless warfare is the hottest and hardest, and the sublimest victory won by a spiritual weapon against an invisible enemy entitles the conqueror to a boundless dominion of universal respect and power.»

He emphasizes a victory of a nonmilitary war that the people should fight after the Russo-Japanese War. Still taking up a negative attitude toward a military war, he thinks much about the bereaved families of the war dead and continues to show a positive reaction to the home front rather than to the war front, as stated in "Bereaved Families"<sup>9</sup> written in April of 1905:

«Empires are tottering; empires are rising. Dramas on the most gigantic scale are being played in the world's history. For us who, for one reason or another, do not join the army at the front, it is well to remember what unseen battles are won. There are voices near us sadder than the groans on the battle-field; there are heats in stricken homes that are more heroic than those beating under a soldier's uniform.

Hark! even now I hear the deep sighs of a grief-stricken mother.

Dimly burns the andon wick, but dimmer still are the eyes of the

widow — so frail and worn she looks.

The wick is near its end. The light flickers for the last time. The woman, the child, the sword, the andon itself, are all blurred. In the darkness is seen a halo, radiant round the mother's head.

My eye is fixed on that light, while my ears forget to heed the crash of a falling and the shout of a rising empire.》

Thus, Nitobe seems as if he fell into a dilemma of mania and depression in the wartime situation, exalting idealism on one hand and growing war-weary on the other hand, namely expressing himself dually as an inspirer of a national spirit and as a soother of war victims. About the time a move to settle this war became more and more conspicuous and the arrival of peace drew near, he made an extremely noticeable proposal in "Post-Bellum Work"<sup>10</sup> written in June of 1905 as follows :

《Post-bellum work will can for the best intellect of our race and its highest exertions. How shall we pay back the money we have borrowed to carry on the war? What must we do for the thousands of families left fatherless and widowed? In what ways ought we to prepare for new conflict with new enemies? The post-bellum battles of Peace will involve our fifty millions of men, women and children. The post-bellum leaders must control all sorts and conditions of men, and these, men who cannot be ordered about in military fashion.

When I think of the mighty task which remains for us after the war, the deafening sound of banzai dies in the distance and the glaring torches pale away.

A few points must ever be kept before us as we study in our closets in these times of great excitement.

*First.*—The care of the bereaved families. The Government itself has a gigantic task in the distribution of awards and pensions.

*Secondly.*—The settlement of Korea must be given special attention. A poor effeminate people, with no political instinct, with no economic "gumption", with no intellectual ambition, is become the Brown Japanese Man's burden. Something must be done to resurrect a dead nation. Statesmen alone cannot do it. Teachers and agriculturists, preachers and engineers, can work more wonders than diplomats and generals.

*Thirdly.*—The money we borrowed must be returned with interest. We need, besides, money for new works of divers kinds. Foreign loans may be more fatal to the independence of a nation than an invading army. No debt of ours can be paid with anything else than the products of our own soil, agricultural and mineral wealth or manufactured

articles. The development of our physical resources is a question of national life or death.

*Fourthly.*—As our industries advance, so must our trade with the rest of the world argument. As our commerce grows, so must we increase our merchant marine. As navigation of our coasts and rivers improves, land communication must keep pace with it.

*Fifthly.*—Our political relations with foreign countries will become closer in every way. The whole of Asia, which has looked upon us with suspicion and condemned us as traitors to Asiatic tradition, will follow us as their guide.

*Sixthly.*—The closer touch with Europe and America, through diplomacy or commerce, necessitates better acquaintance with the languages of the West and especially with English, the most common medium of international mercantile dealings.

*Seventhly.*—The more intimate our communication with the West, the freer must be the interchange of our ideas.

I might go on enumerating demands that will be made upon us in the near future; but this cursory glance will give an idea of what the rest may be. Success in war is but a small beginning of the greater task of economic prosperity, which in turn is but a means to a closer bond of nations, the last being itself only a step towards the realization of the Golden Age, when men shall no longer regard their brothermen as enemies on the field of battle or in the marts of commerce.))

The foregoing counts for much in that the postwar administration of the nation is recognized as an inevitably forthcoming one as well as being grasped and formulated clearly as an urgent and indispensable one; this proposal set forth concretely and succinctly by Nitobe is worthy of attention especially in its antecedence, prescience and comprehensibility. It preceded "Yamagata Aritomo's written opinion of the postwar administration" (August, 1905), which is said to have been proposed by him, sooner than others, concerning the idea of how to govern the nation in the postwar period. Nitobe's proposal basically preempted the framework in its entirety concerning this matter, which *Meiji Taisho Financial History* edited by the Ministry of Finance tried to explain in detail in Sec. 4, Chap. 1, Vol. 1. Moreover, his theory, sprouting in advance, clearly and suggestively gave a direction of approaching to the whole image of fact-finding of the postwar administration, which has been explained by the recent study of modern Japanese history, germinant as it is in its priority. Thus, his theory constitutes a starting point, where a little bit abstract spirit, ideally blockaded in wartime, concretely bloomed with an acute sensibility and a high knowledge.

At the end of the War, his view of it was expressed. For instance,

in "Japan's New Duties and Responsibilities"<sup>11</sup> written in October of 1905, he mentioned as follows :

«Japan has made a record in the history of the world — a record that is record-breaking. It is well that a record disgracefully kept in letters of blood — that Europe may take any liberty with the life and land of Asiatics — should be broken. Mankind has now opened a new page in the story-book of European aggression in Asia, hitherto full of infamy and injustice. Let now the sleeping millions of Asia's children awake from their slumber of ages and assert the birthright which God has given them. Let them show themselves men and not slaves. But before their birthright is claimed, let them first see to it that it is deserved and that they will not abuse it. The dazzle of Japan's success should not blind their eyes and incite their vanity. In soberness let them study the cause of her rise and her victories. If our suzerainty over Korea fails to alleviate her suffering, we have no right to claim any supremacy over her. It is poor statesmanship and an ignoble policy to exercise power over a weaker nation in a way inimical to humanity. If Korea should lose her political independence, her people should at least be paid for it by better treatment from their new masters ; but if instead they receive kicks and blows, it is indeed sad proof that we are unworthy the name and place of an expanding nation. Whether our coming record on the continent will contribute to the progress of justice and liberty, the sense of law and order, or whether it will end in worse forms of despotism than Europe or native tyrants would place upon it, let coming history judge.»

Thus, in general, in the past and future relations of Japan with Asia and Europe, the Russo-Japanese War in world history means the beginning of a new age brought about by Japan, and also the release of Asia from Europe. Only Japan can give a good example of a release from a European control over Asian countries and Nitobe explains future international duties on a victorious country, Japan, simultaneously encouraging self-control. And he states in "New Duties of the New Year"<sup>12</sup> in January of 1906 as follows :

«The work of the coming year and of the years to follow will be largely of an economic and moral character. The War has left many a wound on our body politic, and it will gape and smart worse if not duly attended to.

Let us have heroes of manufacture, of commerce and of farming, — captains of industry and knights of labor. Let us now beat the bloodstained swords into plowshares and engines. Our next fight is

not with gun and cannon, but with abacus and ledger: it is not in Manchuria, but in the markets of the world, not with Russians, but with all the nations of the earth. Let the best youths, the picked brains, join in the contest of a great and invincible industrial army.

This, then, is a duty that is newly laid upon us — that we develop our natural and economic resources. Failing in this, our victories over two Empires come to nought.》

So far, he appeals strongly for the necessity of economic activities for recovering from tremendous war damage and maintaining and improving the acquired international position.

Nitobe paid much attention to a new relation between Korea and Japan, as it was shown that the colonial administration in the aforementioned "Post-Bellum Work" (his theory of the administration after the Russo-Japanese War) was concerned with "the settlement of Korea" (the second point of his theory), and that Asian colonization by Japan in the aforementioned "Japan's New Duties and Responsibilities" was concerned with the control of Korea. And he soon had a chance to visit Korea; namely, Nitobe, who retired from Kyoto Imperial University in September of 1906, took positions of both President of Daiichi High School and Professor of Agricultural College of Tokyo Imperial University on September 28, 1906; in the next month, October, he visited Korea. The following two travel essays, expressing his impression of Korea in a unique style, described Korean scenes of those days.

He stated in "A Decaying Nation"<sup>13)</sup> written at Suweon (Gyeong-gi Do) in October of 1906 as follows:

《Not a sign remains of the myriad flowers which once made the hills gay. The stone walls and the pavements of the water-gate are crumbling to pieces — an easy prey to frost and heat. The mountains are bare; the forests devastated, exposing the rocks they once covered with verdure. The exhausted fields no longer make a generous response to the turning of the plowshare or the sickle of the reapers.

Worst of all, the energy of the people is sapped to the utmost. Gone is all the spring of endeavor. There is no incentive to exertion. Men sit in their white robes, smoking their long pipes, dreaming of the past, heedless of the present, hopeless of the future. Only when spurred by hunger do they bestir themselves just enough to earn a scanty meal. Women — poor women, on whom the hardships of life fall heaviest everywhere — are forever engaged in pounding or washing the white clothing of the family, while boys of tender age, with faces fair as those of girls, are loaded with burdens sufficient to crush an adult



worker.

As I must among the willows to-night, a feeling of sadness steals over me. It is the same sensation I remember to have had in Granada, Cordova and Valladolid.

Certainly the fault is not in the air or the soil, neither do I find it altogether in the people, who are so worn that they can do but little harm. Where, oh where, then, lies the root of the evil? Who or what is it, that has led or rather misled this pitiable band of ten million souls into this slough of despond? Is it this man or that woman? Or is it a nondescript amorphous mass of forked radishes, which we dignify by the term of a people or a nation? Or is it that certain uncertainty that man in dire despair calls fate? Let history judge the guilty, as she has been wont to do and will do with increasing certainty.»

Korea, whose prosperity had faded, changed into the exhausted society of such hopeless people as the old, overburdened women, and the youth. The prosperity and decline were so severe that I could not help remembering ruins of an ancient city in the Iberian Peninsula. It is due to neither the weather nor the people but the adjustment of history, but he states in "Primitive Life and Presiding Death in Korea"<sup>14</sup> written at Jeonju (Jeon-ra Bug Do) in November of the next year as follows :

«Neither its climate nor its soil is to be held responsible for the decay of Korea.

I am riding through the fields of Zenshu. This is one of the largest plains of the peninsula. The early rice is harvested and the paths are thickly covered with sheaves laid there to dry. The swains, all in white raiment, are cutting the late crop, singing as the sickles move. As groups in the village yard beat the sheaves on logs of wood, to thresh, they keep time with hilarious songs. Tiny mud huts, thatched with straw, compose the hamlets and villages. Now and then, through broken fences, I catch glimpses of women busy with pestles, pounding the grain in wooden mortars, while their little ones, in red coats and white trousers, peep out at the Japanese passers-by, their eyes opening wide with wonderment and fear.

Life is Arcadian. I feel as though I were living three thousand years back, in the age of our *Kami*. Many a face do I see that I should have taken for the likeness of a *Kami* — so sedate, so dignified, so finely chiseled, and yet so devoid of expression. The very physiognomy and living of this people are so bland, unsophisticated and primitive that they belong not to the twentieth or the tenth — nor indeed to the first century. They belong to a prehistoric age.

Nowhere else, I believe, do the living walk and work so near the dead as in this land. The hills and fields are literally strewn with graves. Where I am riding even now the road is lined with mounds, and with straw coffins awaiting burial.

Only the rudest peasants saunter, labor and rest under the constant reminder of the dead and of the past — so constant that they not only heed it no longer; they grow callous to their message.

A people so closely related to death are themselves more than half-dead.

The Arcadian simplicity of the folk gives no promise of primitive energy; their habits do not remind us of the untamed vigor of Homeric songs, nor of Tacitus' description of early Germans, nor indeed of the fresh chronicles of the *Kojiki*.

The Korean habits of life are the habits of death. They are closing the lease of their ethnic life. The national course of their existence is well-nigh run. Death presides over the peninsula.》

He, keeping a pessimistic tone with the sense of uncertainty at the bottom, but admitting the pastoral, simple, and vivid working life of Korean peasants in the harvest time, emphasizes that decay was mainly due to the decadent nature of Korean people. Consequently, he comes to form unmistakably a view of looking on the society of Korea as being in the state of ultrastagnancy.

By the way, Nitobe's visit to Korea seems a cheerful one, but what was the true purpose of it? Nitobe's reminiscence<sup>15)</sup> of an interview with Ito Hirobumi furnish reasonable date to give a clue as to the purpose and his behavior while in Korea, for we find in them: "I used to investigate the agriculture and the colonial problem of Korea; The first thing I did after arrival in Korea was to call at the mansion of the Resident-General in Namsan of Seoul to see Duke Ito, whom he met at Ohiso in 1902; afterward I returned to Seoul upon completion of a inspection trip in Korea and had the third chance to see Duke Ito and gave him an account of the inspection". Let me quote a part of the interview:

Nitobe: In my opinion based on the inspection of every place, labor power here is not enough to achieve necessary agricultural improvement, and so the first thing to do is to bring in foreign laborers.

Ito: It is not true; the necessary thing for Korea today is not labor power but capital.

Nitobe: The pressing need of the hour is to increase labor power; the most urgent thing is to immigrate Japanese into Korea.

Ito: A shortage of population results from misgovernment for many

years and incomplete sanitary facilities ; the population is going to increase.

Nitobe : It will increase in future, but twenty years for the increased population to supply necessary labor power.

Two previously introduced travel books being though as by-products of the inspection, Nitobe concludes in the report of the inspection as follows : "I drew an instance from the inner colonization of Germany and persuaded him to agree of Japanese colonization into Korea. Then, he asked me to submit a report of the German inner colonization, which I promised. But due to the lack of statistical data and a prospect of settlement of the issue under the project of *Toyo Takushoku Kaisha* (*Totaku Company* in short and Oriental Colonization Company in English), I, after all, could not fulfil the promise with him". Concerning the German inner colonization and *Totaku Company* mentioned here, he pointed to the latter, which is particularly important, elsewhere as follows : "Duke Ito was then the Resident-General of Korea and Kiuchi Jushiro was an officer there. Duke Ito, as well known to the public, objected to emigration of Japanese to Korea by the principle 'Korea for the Koreans', while Kiuchi disagreed with Duke Ito. In spite of Kiuchi's strong suggestion, a Japanese emigration plan was not likely, therefore, to be adopted by him. In the home-land, however, Katsura Taro agreed eagerly to this kind of emigration plan and pushed forward earnestly the establishment of *Totaku Company* in Korea. As I joined in its discussion previously, I visited Korea at Kiuchi's suggestion"<sup>16</sup>. "My first meeting with Duke Katsura was at the establishment of *Totaku Company*. Duke Katsura would often have consulted on the establishment of *Totaku Company* with Hirata, Komatsubara, and Ohkura ; I was, as an offerer of information in this field, invited to take part in their discussion as many as four times"<sup>17</sup>. Namely, Nitobe's visit to Korea was due greatly to his intimate friend, Kiuchi, the Secretary-General of the Agriculture, Commerce, and Construction Section at the Residency-General. Nitobe availed himself of this opportunity to find new materials for colony researches just as "I said that the collection of research data was the purpose of my visit"<sup>18</sup>. Also, from his visit to Korea for researches and participation in the *Totaku* establishment project it can be said that Nitobe came mobilized into the pursuit of Japanese policy of colonizing Korea. Meantime, it has been little known to the public that the book, *My Respected Persons* by Yanaihara Tadao, which the author has read to extend the knowledge of Nitobe Inazo, has three different editions as mentioned later, which has a rather important meaning. So, let this point be mentioned first.

Currently accessible is *the Red Edition of Iwanami New Book*. According to the colophon of *the New Book* at hand, the date of the first

printing is May 30, 1940 and that of the thirty-ninth printing is July 10, 1977, "the preface" being dated 'March 30, 1940'. From this, we can see that the first printing was repeated continuously, which has no further meaning. The fourth section in the final chapter is entitled "Dr. Nitobe", in which we notice something not smooth. For instance, the flow of descriptions is not normal; it seems to be broken off abruptly in the middle. Though the reason is not clear, this section does not sit right after reading, which alone does not provide any clue to this question. To tell the truth, it is a natural consequence that we have a curious sense of disorder akin to doubt.

By diverting our attention to others — for instance, by looking into "The Postscript by the Edition", the twenty-fourth volume of *the Complete Works of Yanaihara Tadao* — all our doubts are dispelled as follows: In prewar days, *the Red Edition of Iwanami New Book* was published up to the fourth printing (1942), whereas in postwar days it was published from the fifth printing (1948) up to the present printing. In publishing the postwar edition, Yanaihara made no mention of a difference between the prewar and the postwar edition. But in the last chapter entitled, "Dr. Nitobe", a difference is noted between the two editions as a result of deletion and addition of sentences, which 'is conjectured to have come about on account of the printing circumstances under the occupation of Japan by the U. S. armed force in the postwar days'<sup>19</sup>. This is a sort of excuse made by an editing committee of *the Complete Works*, which implies a fair amount of implications. For, first the reason why Yanaihara could not add "the postwar preface" newly would be that he obeyed the publishing control, consisting of a part of the so-called G. H. Q.'s democratization (antimilitarism) under the occupation; secondly the reason why Yanaihara left it as in the former state (the fifth printing edition) even afterwards when the publishing control was dissolved, would be that he thought it more convenient to the postwar democratic Japan (considering mainly the honor of Nitobe); thirdly, the reason why he gave no explanation of the difference between the prewar and the postwar edition even when he was favored with a good opportunity to mention it afterwards, as if there had been no difference between the two, is supposed due to a sort of deep psychology which discouraged him from touching on his, namely, the author's involvement, pregnant with deep implications, in the change of editions, which did not defame him or Nitobe luckily, so to speak<sup>20</sup>.

Thus, if we examine only the postwar edition, we are far from perceiving any difference between it and the prewar edition; but it is natural that we should refer to the prewar edition as its original text; at the same time a comparison between both as to the degree of difference will be most

interesting. As for the twenty-fourth volume of *the Complete Works*, which contains this book, it uses the postwar edition as the original text, stating 'deleted portions have been restored and a difference from the prewar edition has been clarified individually'<sup>21</sup>. Besides it has become difficult to have access to the first printing or the prewar edition; so, the volume is by for the present most convenient. In short, this book has three different editions, the first (the prewar edition), the present edition (the postwar edition), and the modified book (in *the Complete Works*), each of which has its own characteristic not merely reducible to a difference in form.

Well, in the posthumous collection of Yanaihara's works, there is a notebook with an autographic manuscript written from left to right in Indian ink, and entitled "Professor Nitobe", which begins with the speech of Prof. Nitobe at the entrance ceremony on September 13, 1940<sup>22</sup>. This autographic manuscript is 'the note of writing down the speech of Prof. Nitobe at the entrance ceremony'<sup>23</sup>, which corresponds to "Dr. Nitobe" in the fourth item of the book, *My Respected Persons*. 'The Note' is contained in the twenty-fourth volume as follows (the italic portions represent those found in the prewar edition, but not in the postwar edition):

«September 13, An Entrance Ceremony, Rainy.

President's Speech.

[Omission]

This August is a very unforgettable month. One of the unforgettable things is flood in every place of the country, and they say flood damages will amount to about thirty million yen or so. [Omission]

*Another unforgettable thing is Korean annexation. This is literally a one-in-a-million chance. Japan comes to be a country overnight with a larger area than that of Germany, France, and Spain. Also, the sphere in which you can communicate thoughts by either speeches or sentences spreads out abruptly to as many as ten million people. If a circle is drawn with a radius of about 195.6 miles and with its center at a cape in the northernmost tip of the Noto Peninsula, Hokkaido, Kyushu, and Korea are contained in the circle and the Yalu River is just on the border line. In addition, transferring the center to about the place located at latitude 40° North and longitude 135° East and drawing a circle with a radius of about 782.4 miles, the Liaotung Peninsula and South Manchuria are contained in the circle and Saghalien, also contained up to latitude 50° North. Diverting the center a little and drawing a circle with a radius of about 929.1 miles, North Manchuria, and Tsitsihar as well as Harbin are contained in the circle. We have no intention of invading foreign land, but there is no denying the fact. The first circle has been already*

*realized. Anyway, this country has become a larger nation than any of European countries. This country has grown up rapidly. Japan has been quite different from what Japan was a month before. Now that Japan has become such a large country, the so-called traditional insularism should be abandoned. You should abandon such fussy and trifling insularism as doubting, being jealous, and envying; you should be generous.}}*<sup>24)</sup>

In this book, immediately after Nitobe's speech, Yanaihara made comments on Nitobe's speech, and the next part is eliminated mostly in the postwar edition :

«Concerning talks beginning with the annexation of Korea and further extending to an expansion into the continent, he was misunderstood as if he had asserted an imperialistic invasion, and in actual fact, they say some of Chinese students studying in Japan made a protest. Dr. Nitobe neither insisted on nor approved the invasion as his own opinion, but he only anticipated the historical inevitability and direction of expansion objectively, which is proved clearly in his speech. What Dr. Nitobe tried to teach us is that we should become increasingly generous with expanding sphere of people's activity.

[Omission.]

This is his teaching of the so-called 'sociality'. His teaching of 'international mind' is to apply this same thought to people in other countries. In the relation of other peoples and other nations, he teaches to keep company with other countries generously, admitting the values of existence and merits of other parties, without doubting, envying, and despising them. This mind is directly opposite to chauvinism. His teachings were, however, misunderstood as chauvinism. Dr. Nitobe was a person prone to be misunderstood.

*Afterwards, the regional expansion was realized up to 'not only Harbin but also Tsitsihar' in the North Manchuria just as Dr. Nitobe expected. Meanwhile, how about Japanese people's generosity in their mind? Have Japanese people really deserved the respect and reliance of other races and other peoples, living together, and having close contacts with them?}}*<sup>25)</sup>

In this quotation, only the italic parts are found in the postwar edition; these italic fractions, when combined, surely constitute an entity of sentences as a whole in an excellent manner, incredible as it may be. The following should be emphasized, however tolerant we may be of such circumstances in which its adept ability is worth admiring, its technique

comes from an uncontrollable motive to reform the prewar edition, and the fact that the postwar edition results in a viciously revised edition must be concealed. Namely, what should be emphasized is the expression that the first edition is equal to the present edition causes thoughtful readers to have a doubt akin to embarrassment as well as calling for a need to uncover it by the evident fact, especially because 'this book has the largest readership among books authored by Yanaihara'.<sup>20)</sup>

Well, what matters are not these facts, though it may be significant in themselves, but the following two quotations after all. It is about the thirty years after Nitobe made a speech that Yanaihara expressed his opinion about it. Thus, about seventy and forty years have passed since Nitobe's speech and Yanaihara's opinion were presented, respectively, their times differing in nature from the present time.

Namely, even if Yanaihara's opinion expresses well a special form of a feature of the prewar day as well as a teacher-student relation between both, we are called on to criticize Nitobe's speech once more with Yanaihara's opinion as a premise, despite that we should confirm that his opinion is worth a criticism.

The reasons are: Nitobe's speech describes openly his view of the annexation of Korea, which is, indeed, not easily obtainable, if sought from the present time frame, as well as developing a variety of views therefrom; these various views are recollected, justified *à la* Yanaihara, and are subjected to reexaminations in the course of the times; they are looked on anyway as a literature which concretely expresses characteristics of the two colonial policy scholars.

If so, first of all, Nitobe's speech theorizes the overwhelming affirmation of Japan's annexation of Korea, which is 'unforgettable' and 'literally a one-in-a-million chance', as well as theorizing the advance of the Japanese race, the expansion of Japanese colonies and the development of Japan as a "large power" namely empire, which objectify and rationalize such an expansion namely invasion that originated and developed firmly from the Korean annexation according as 'facts develop by themselves'. Secondly, after all, Yanaihara's opinion, in vindication of Nitobe's opinion, positively affirms and confirms it *defacto*, which is largely due to the circumstances hidden behind concerning the restriction of the times in which under a Fascistic regime antiregime scholars were purged or oppressed, together with the private restriction under the delicate state of mind resulting from a strongly tied teacher-student relation. Thirdly, it comes to be evidenced that the two are ultimately colonial policy scholars, who avoided to criticize imperialism combatantly and fundamentally from the anti-Marxian point of view.

Now, concerning an article entitled "Our Country's Recent Loss and

Gain<sup>227)</sup>, which Nitobe contributed to *Chuokoron* on September 13, 1910, the same day as he gave the speech at the entrance ceremony of Daiichi High School, it follows from a comparison between the article and the speech that corresponding descriptions and statements perceived in both resemble each other so remarkably that the article looks as if it were a manuscript dictated from the speech. But almost all of propositions of the speech change themselves by skillful techniques. From this sense, we have to say that such statements as 'we have no idea of invading foreign land', and as 'we have never thought of plundering our next door nation's territory' result in contradiction after all. Nevertheless, his joyful appearance is perceived in words like 'playing with a compass', 'regarding a play with a compass as a geography class at an elementary school', and 'we can draw a very interesting circle with a compass'; they perhaps come from his unique wit and humor subjectively, but objectively they have so a demonic force sufficient to let us associate them with some foolish operation that we are almost dumbfounded.

As a result of examining a fairly limited literature, we have been able to prove how Nitobe responded to the historical event of the annexation of Korea. But as a matter of course, since Nitobe often mentions the Korean problem afterwards, let his statements concerning it be introduced and looked into.

Nitobe began to contribute his articles to the criticism column of *Tokyo Mainichi Newspaper*, in which his direct or indirect references to the colonized Korea are included during the very short period from the Korean annexation to next year, 1911, although the amount is very small, which does not necessarily disappoint us. Nitobe, the first Professor in charge of *Colonial Policy Chair* established in Law College of Tokyo Imperial University, took part in the planning of establishing a *Colonization Learned Society*, becoming its councilor and chief reporter. It was established in April, 1910, the first lecture meeting being open with 1500-odd audience in December of the same year, whereupon he made a speech entitled "the Meaning of Colonization Learned Society"<sup>228)</sup>.

In the speech, he points out a confusion in elucidating the colonial problem and insists on the mobilization of scholars to maintain the new territory, and on the necessity to make a scientific study of colonial problems, such as, 'advantages and disadvantages, the ruling method, economic management, and so on'. As a result, the task of colonization policy scholars is summarized in the order of 'the observation of the enterprise', 'the criticizing of the enterprise', and 'the expression of facts'. After the reaffirmation of the lack of Japanese scholars specializing in colonial policy in those days and the bad condition of the study of the colonial problem, he advocates



the enlightening widely especially of general people of Japan concerning the present state of affairs in the Japanese colony on the basis of 'observations' and 'criticisms'. Therefore, concluding his speech, he wants to fulfil his duty to observe and criticize the enterprise and to lead the nation to avoid the future mismanagement of the newly acquired territory. Since Nitobe, recognizing the duty of colonial policy scholars, has a view of the future, his concrete opinion at that time, emphasized not quantitatively but qualitatively, is worth investigating.

In this connection, we have his article entitled "Make A Good Use of Christianity"<sup>29)</sup> in the criticism column of *Tokyo Mainichi Newspaper* dated October, 1910. In the article he, indeed, criticizes the colony authority for having ostracized Christianity only because he fears that the reaction to the oppression may lead to disturbance of religious unity. Then, he asks himself, presenting, as an alternative, a pacification measure similar to a sort of money tactics on one hand, and on the other hand he states from his deep insight that Christianity provides the best spiritual comfort to people in the colony. Here can we find him having no sense of solidarity as a Christian at all. An effective use of Christianity is nothing but a very skillful religious policy toward the colony from the point of view that vicious religious policy brings about an unnecessary international dispute and the resulting resistance of the oppressed people of the colony.

Next, Nitobe explains the fundamental policy of colony control in an article entitled "Necessity of Composure"<sup>30)</sup> written in November, 1910.

In the article, he explains the reason why it is easy to reign Korea in light of its geographical speciality on the premise of the 'defects of people'. He also discusses the durability of control of the colony from the standpoint of the ruling country and the ruled colony, especially on the basis of running the colony as a 'villa'.

Namely, as the fundamental policy of colony control, he duells on 'sufficiency in funds' and 'sufficiency in ruling', representing namely both economic and the political aspect. Both should be understood as corresponding to his objection to using only military power in ruling the colony for the reason that in spite of the expansion of the territory to the north and the south over several times for the last fifteen years as a result of each war, it is difficult to wear a sword from beginning to end, referring to 'an immortal saying' that 'the territory acquired by the word can be robbed by the sword but nobody can rob the territory acquired by the plow' in the article entitled "Note to Remain the Militant Nation to the End"<sup>31)</sup> written in February, 1911.

Well, in an article entitled "The Economic Foundation of Territorial Expansion"<sup>32)</sup> written in February, 1911, the economic and the political

aspect are developed a little.

According to him, the only possible policy that allows Japan to pursue its colonial development is basically an economic one, despite its recourse to political means at the beginning, making Korea as the mainstay of Japan's colonial enterprises in light of the fact that 'special means', namely effective use of capital and economical use of human power, are called for in the colonial development of such Japan that is low in capital accumulation and underdeveloped, as compared with 'Western countries', which are advanced capitalistic countries.

Thus, Nitobe thinks of the construction of an economic foundation on which to control the colonized Korea, but his view toward Korea and his theory of colonial policy toward Korea seem not to have been published afterwards. Finally, Nitobe, who died in Canada in October, 1933, dramatic as it was, had an opportunity to visit Korea earlier about summer in the same year. A paragraph of his impression of the Korean inspection tour then is quoted to conclude the present paper :

«From my optimistic point of view, both Japanese and Korean, turning our thought to the actual life, just like the same relation as that of England and Scotland, both races exist peacefully, calmly, and harmoniously. Seeing moderate, kind, and civilian Governor-Generals, such as Saito and Ugaki, participate in the administration of Korea, we have been pleased. . . . . Korea, however, is indeed a poor country. Especially any statesman has to think of the state of the peasant life first. Since I saw the present Governor-General giving all his energy to this point, I was willing to leave Korea for Manchuria.»<sup>39</sup>

It would be an indication of Nitobe's ironical and keen confession that even for him the colonized Korea is Medusa's head refusing scientific criticism.

Note.

- (1) †Takaoka Kumao, "On Two Large Movements in the Colonial Society", in *the Collection of Lectures in Commemoration of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Foundation of Hokkaido Imperial University* (Sapporo, 1928), 3.

† is marked on the Japanese literatures whose titles are expediently translated into English by the author of this paper.

- (2) †*The History of Kyoto Imperial University* (Kyoto, 1943), p. 91.  
cf. *The History of the Seventy Years of Kyoto University* (Kyoto, 1967), p. 350.
- (3) †*The History of the Fifty Years of Economics Faculty of Tokyo University* (Tokyo, 1976), p. 458.
- (4) †cf. Maeta Tamon and Takagi Yasaka ed., *The Reminiscences for the Late Dr. Nitobe* (Tokyo, 1936), p. 150.
- (5) †*The Complete Works of Nitobe Inazo* (Tokyo, 1969-70), IV, p. 645.

- (6) †The Graduates' Association of Tokyo Women's College ed., *The Memorial Number for the Late Prof. Nitobe Inazo* (Tokyo, 1934), p. 8.
- (7) Nitobe Inazo, *Thoughts and Essays* (Tokyo, 1909) in *the Complete Works of Nitobe Inazo*, V, pp. 212-214.
- (8) *Ibid.*, p. 196.
- (9) *Ibid.*, pp. 248-250.
- (10) *Ibid.*, pp. 253-258.
- (11) *Ibid.*, pp. 269-271.
- (12) *Ibid.*, pp. 273-278.
- (13) *Ibid.*, pp. 324-326.
- (14) *Ibid.*, pp. 326-328.
- (15) Nitobe Inazo, "My Reminiscence of Duke Ito Whom I Had Met for Three Times", *Japan of Business*, XII, 24 (Tokyo, November 1909), 1-10.
- (16) †Nitobe Inazo, *Images of Great Men* (Tokyo, 1931) in *the Complete Works of Nitobe Inazo*, V, pp. 548-549.
- (17) *Ibid.*, p. 556.
- (18) *Ibid.*, p. 550.
- (19) †*The Complete Works of Yanaihara Tadao* (Tokyo, 1963-65), XXIV, p. 943.
- (20) cf. †Yanaihara Tadao, *The Path I Have Followed* (Tokyo, 1958) in *the Complete Works of Yanaihara Tadao*, XXVI, p. 18, 57, 59.
- (21) †*The Complete Works of Yanaihara Tadao*, XXIV, p. 943.
- (22) †*The Complete Works of Yanaihara Tadao*, XXIX, p. 842.
- (23) †Yanaihara Tadao, *My Respected Persons* (1st ed., Tokyo, 1940), p. 179.
- (24) *Ibid.*, pp. 180-183.
- (25) *Ibid.*, pp. 189-190.
- (26) †*The Complete Works of Yanaihara Tadao*, XXIV, p. 943.
- (27) †*Chuokoron*, XXV, 10 (October 1910), 41-44.
- (28) †*Shokumingakkaiho*, I (May 1911), 1-8.
- (29) †*Tokyo Mainichi Newspaper*, dated October 25, 1910.
- (30) †*Tokyo Mainichi Newspaper*, dated November 3 and 4, 1910.
- (31) †*Tokyo Mainichi Newspaper*, dated February 9, 1911.
- (32) †*Tokyo Mainichi Newspaper*, dated February 10 and 12, 1911.
- (33) †*Japan of Business*, XXXVI, 15 (August 1933), 28-30.