

Distribution Agreement

In presenting this dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my dissertation in whole in all forms of media, now or hereafter known, including display on the World Wide Web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this dissertation. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the dissertation. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this dissertation.

Signature: _____

_____ Date

Approval Sheet

Examining the Life of Oyabe Zen'ichirō:
The New Formation of Modern Japanese Identity at the Turn of the Twentieth Century
By

Kazumi Hasegawa
Doctor of Philosophy
Graduate Institute of the Liberal Arts

Mark Ravina, Ph.D.
Advisor

Kimberly Wallace-Sanders, Ph.D.
Co-advisor

Regine Jackson, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Accepted:

Lisa A. Tedesco, Ph.D.
Dean of the Raney Graduate School

Date

Examining the Life of Oyabe Zen'ichirō:
The New Formation of Modern Japanese Identity at the Turn of the Twentieth Century

By
Kazumi Hasegawa
B.A., Meiji Gakuin University, 1999
M.A., The Ohio State University, 2001

Advisors: Mark Ravina, Ph.D., Kimberly Wallace-Sanders, Ph.D.

An abstract of
A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies of Emory University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in the Graduate Institute of the Liberal Arts
2013

Abstract

Examining the Life of Oyabe Zen'ichirō: The New Formation of Modern Japanese Identity at the Turn of the Twentieth Century

By Kazumi Hasegawa

My dissertation, entitled “Examining the Life of Oyabe Zen'ichirō: The New Formation of Modern Japanese Identity at the Turn of the Twentieth Century” reconstructs the life history of Oyabe Zen'ichirō (1867-1941) and examines the formation of his Japanese identity within international racial discourse of the time. His encounter with international racial discourse made him similar to and different from other Meiji intellectuals. Oyabe as a private citizen, decided to study in the United States. He studied in various educational institutions such as Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute, Howard University, and Yale University, which were the centers of American racial discourse in the late nineteenth century. His racial experience was not a singular relation with another race, but multiple and transnational, and included Anglo Americans, African Americans, and Native Americans in the United States as well as the Ainu and the Japanese in Japan.

Examining the experiences of other Japanese intellectuals during this period, it is clear that they shared similar experiences of being disheartened by the West because of their ethnicity. Oyabe studied in the United States between 1889 and 1898. After he returned to Japan, he educated the Ainu, by establishing an Ainu school called Abuta Gakuen in Hokkaido in 1905. In the 1920s, he became one of the strongest advocates for the legendary myth that Genghis Khan, a Mongolian hero of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, was identical to Minamoto no Yoshitsune, a Japanese warrior. Although it provoked a public controversy, the book was a best seller and gained popularity. He also published several books regarding the origins of the Japanese people as a lost tribe of Israel.

The common thread in Oyabe's various enterprises was the production of a Japanese racial identity that fit with broader, transnational racial discourse. The key question for the formation of Japanese identity was how to fit the Japanese people into late nineteenth century racial discourse. Put simply, were the Japanese “white,” or not quite? My dissertation connects Oyabe to these questions of Japanese ethnic identity and international relations between the United States and Japan at the turn of the twentieth century.

Examining the Life of Oyabe Zen'ichirō:
The New Formation of Modern Japanese Identity at the Turn of the Twentieth Century

By

Kazumi Hasegawa
B.A., Meiji Gakuin University, 1999
M.A., The Ohio State University, 2001

Advisors: Mark Ravina, Ph.D., Kimberly Wallace-Sanders, Ph.D.

A Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies of Emory University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Graduate Institute of the Liberal Arts
2013

Acknowledgments

Foremost, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the members of my dissertation committee. I am deeply indebted to Dr. Mark Ravina who has been my *sensei* since I arrived at Emory in 2006. He has constantly provided me with his expertise in Japanese history and sound advice during each step of the dissertation research and writing process. I had countless meetings with him to discuss my project and life in general. I am honored to have worked with him during my graduate years at Emory. Dr. Kimberly Wallace-Sanders as my co-advisor and Dr. Regine Jackson as my committee member have guided me throughout my time in this graduate program. Without their tremendous support, I simply could not have gotten through the program and finished my dissertation.

Many thanks also go to archivists, researchers, and staff at various institutions and archives in the United States and Japan, all of whom made my research possible. I first encountered Oyabe Zen'ichirō, whom I researched in this dissertation project, at the Moorland-Spingarn Research Center, Howard University. I am indebted to Donzella Maupin at the University Archives of Hampton University for sharing Oyabe's archives. Dr. Kristina Troost, Head of International Area Studies and Japanese Studies Librarian at Duke University, gave me a fellowship and the opportunity to use the library materials. Dr. Fukuju Shino at the Multi-media and Socio-information Studies Archive, The University of Tokyo Interfaculty Initiative in Information Studies Graduate School of Interdisciplinary Information Studies, shared the collections of Tsuboi Shōgorō. Dr. Deriha Kōji at the Historical Museum of Hokkaido and helped me find the related resources in the Ainu collections. Dr. Ogawa Masato at the Hokkaido Ainu Cultural Research Center shared his expertise in the history of Ainu education. Ms. Okamoto Michiyo at the Obihiro City Library allowed me to use an office in the library to read the writings of Yoshida Iwao. Mr. Okada Hideyuki at the town office of Tōyako showed me around the town and taught me the regional history of Tōya. Dr. Kikuchi Iwao at the Miyagi Gakuen Women's University sent me copies of resources about the Yoshitsune legends in the Tōhoku region because we had to cancel our meeting due to the earthquakes. I particularly appreciate the opportunities and support given to make my research possible in Japan, even in the middle of chaos after the Great Tōhoku Earthquakes occurred in March 2011. Today, on March 11, 2013, two years after the earthquakes, I am writing to express my gratitude to everyone who helped me in various ways to stay calm, focus, and keep researching during my stay in Hokkaido and Tokyo.

Finally, my family, friends, and *sensei* across the globe have been inspirations for completing this program. My family, Kiyoshi, Matsuko, and Naomi, always believe in me and await my graduation all the way from Japan. Many of my friends encouraged me to get through the program. Especially, Thomas Fabisiak and Lillian Waller read all of my chapters and patiently worked with me to improve my writing. Special thanks go to Dr. Ito Ruri. She was the first feminist

scholar I encountered in college, and she opened many doors for me in academia. She has led me in the journey since then. Thank you, all.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| Prologue | 1 |
| Chapter 1 The Civilized “Japanese?” Competing Narratives of Civilization at the Turn of the Twentieth Century | 29 |
| Chapter 2 The Philosophy of <i>Jitsugyō</i> : Oyabe, Hokkaido Kyūdojin Kyūikukai, and Ainu Education Praxis | 65 |
| Chapter 3 Minamoto no Yoshitsune Fever: Intellectual Debates over Historical Truth and Oyabe Zen’ichirō’s Interventions in Japanese Imagination in the 1920s | 108 |
| Chapter 4 Disheartened by the West: The New Formation of the Meiji Christian Intelligentsia | 143 |
| Epilogue | 194 |
| Bibliography | 199 |

Prologue

Oyabe Zen'ichirō (1867-1941) is less well known than Meiji intellectuals such as Fukuzawa Yukichi¹, Nishi Amane, and Natsume Sōseki. If I had not encountered his name in the university archives of the Moorland-Spangarn Research Center at Howard University when I visited a few years ago, I would not know about him either, nor could I ever have imagined researching his life. However, once I got interested in his life and publications, I started to notice his name and fragments of his life appearing scattered throughout Meiji history.

Oyabe was a Christian minister, writer, and a founder of the Abuta Gakuen (Abuta School), which provided elementary school education to the Ainu, who are now considered an “indigenous people” of Japan.² Oyabe also spent approximately nine years in the United States; from 1889 to 1898 he studied at places like Hampton Normal Agricultural Institute, Howard University, and Yale University. Oyabe was an eclectic thinker, and his writings include books on the legends of the survival hero Minamoto no Yoshitsune (1159-1189), the origins of the Japanese people as a lost tribe of Israel, and the Japanese origins of Genghis Khan. Because his publications were not academic, his books were regarded as *tondemo* books: totally divorced from scientific and academic legitimacy.³

Recently, there have been moves to shed light on Oyabe's life, particularly his published memoir, *A Japanese Robinson Crusoe*. In 2009, two scholars of Asian

¹ In my dissertation, Japanese names are written with the family name first followed by the given name.

² After various efforts made by Ainu activists, the Japanese Diet passed a resolution on June 6, 2008, that officially recognizes the Ainu as “indigenous to Japan.”

³ For example, Doi, *Yoshitsune densetsu wo tsukutta otoko*, 2005.

American Studies, Greg Robinson and Yujin Yaguchi reprinted Oyabe's memoir, which was originally published in June 1898 by Pilgrim Press. This time, they added an introduction discussing Oyabe's life. Their project rescues Oyabe from being entirely forgotten by history and renders a title to Oyabe in history, particularly in the history of Asian immigration to the United States. Along with this significant move, I also argue in this dissertation that Oyabe was one of the most important intellectuals in modern Japan, and his life experiences and publications invite critical academic research.

Robinson and Yaguchi attempted to frame Oyabe in the context of the history of Asian immigration and position his memoir as "a pioneering Asian-American memoir."⁴ They explain the historical significance of Oyabe's memoir, in which the author himself illustrates his experience in the United States: "Oyabe's is arguably the first full-length English-language memoir by an Asian about its author's life in the United States."⁵ Although they mention the role "race" played in Oyabe's life in Japan in relation to the Ainu, it is obvious that their effort is to position Oyabe in the context of Asian American Studies. Analyzing Oyabe's silence in his memoir about his Native American as well as African American schoolmates at Hampton Institute and Howard University, they argue that he identified with and performed "whiteness" in his life, which they also claim is similar to the writings of other "cosmopolitan" *issei* among Asian immigrants:

"...A *Japanese Robinson Crusoe* can best be understood as forerunner to the writings of the 'cosmopolitan Issei,' that is, members of the disparate group of Japanese immigrant intellectuals who arrived in North America (often as

⁴ Robinson and Yaguchi, "Introduction," *A Japanese Robinson Crusoe*, 2.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Notes 1, 24.

students) at the turn of the century, lived outside ethnic communities, and prided themselves on their connection to white Americans.”⁶ I do not disagree with their insights about Oyabe’s performativity and status as a forerunner in the history of Asian immigration to the United States. In order to understand his life experience, however, I believe that we need to use a more articulated transnational framework, including Japanese Studies, rather than rendering him exclusively in the space of American Studies. If Oyabe is situated in Japanese Studies and U.S.-Japan relations, there are more critical issues to be examined.

Oyabe’s life is intriguing at both the empirical and conceptual levels. In the United States, he spent one year (1889-1890) at Hampton Institute while it was providing “bi-racial” education to Native Americans and African Americans from 1868 to 1925. Oyabe also studied theology at Howard University from 1890 to 1894, the first historically black college in the North. He continued studying at Yale University and received a degree in divinity. In 1895, he was ordained in the First Congregational Church in Washington, D.C. with the attendance of President Jeremiah E. Rankin of Howard. He then worked as a missionary of the Hawaiian Evangelical Association and left for Hawaii on June 15, 1895. After two years of service, he returned to Yale in 1897 and continued his studies. As a Japanese man, Oyabe was exposed to multiple racial groups, including Native Americans, African Americans, and Asian Americans.

In 1898, after about nine years in the United States, Oyabe returned to Japan. For a short period of time he worked as a minister of Momijizaka Church in

⁶ Ibid., 20.

Yokohama, but he soon moved to Hokkaido to devote himself to educating the Ainu. He established an elementary school (Abuta School) for the Ainu in Abuta, Hokkaido. He also helped draft the Hokkaido Ainu Protection Law, which passed in 1899.

Oyabe came back to Shinagawa, Tokyo from Hokkaido in 1909 and became an instructor at Tokyo Kōten Kōkyūjo and Kokugakuin University. In 1920, he was hired as an interpreter by the Ministry of War of Japan and sent to Chita, Siberia (Russia) for two years. For a person with a strong interest in Minamoto Yoshitsune, it was an excellent opportunity to research the legend that Yoshitsune had survived his last battle and become Genghis Khan. After the two years of work, he was asked to teach at military college, but refused the offer in order to focus on his research and writing. As a result, he published a book in 1924, *Jingisukan wa Minamoto Yoshitsune nari (Genghis Khan is Minamoto Yoshitsune)*, claiming that Genghis Khan was actually Minamoto Yoshitsune. He became a strong advocate of the legend that Genghis Khan, a Mongolian hero of the twelfth century, was actually Minamoto no Yoshitsune, a Japanese general who fled from his rival, Yoritomo, his own older half-brother. Although it provoked a public controversy, the book was a best seller. Since many scholars disagreed with his argument, he published another book in 1925, *Jingisukan wa Minamoto Yoshitsune nari: chojutsu no dōki to sairon (A Revision of the Real Figure of Genghis Khan was Minamoto no Yoshitsune)* to reclaim the legitimacy of his research and argument. He spent the rest of his life as a writer. His publications include *Nihon oyobi nihon kokumin no kigen (The Origins of Japan and the Japanese)* in 1929, *Shizuka gozen no shogai (The Life of Shizukagozen)* in 1930,

Manshū to Minamoto Yoshitsune (Manchuria and Minamoto Kuro Yoshitsune) in 1933, *Jun nihon fujin no omokage (Remembrance/Shadow of the Authentic Japanese Women)* in 1938.

Oyabe participated in important intellectual discussions at the turn of the twentieth century. Centering on Oyabe's life experience, each chapter in this dissertation examines particular intellectual discussions at the turn of the twentieth century such as the discourse on civilization; international racial discourse, including the indigenous populations of Native Americans and the Ainu in Japan; the debates on modern methodology in historical research and the elimination of historical myths; and the question of Christianity and exteriority in Meiji Japan. Although he is not a well-known figure within any single issue, his life vividly illustrates the various intellectual discourses of which he was a part.

His life is particularly interesting because its central interests are race and Japanese identity. His encounter with international racial discourse made him both similar and dissimilar to other Meiji intellectuals. It was not uncommon for Meiji intellectuals to study and live in the West, in such countries as France, Germany, and the United States. Nonetheless, Oyabe as a *minkan* or private citizen decided to study in the United States and was placed in educational institutions such as Hampton Institute, Howard University, and Yale University, which together formed the epicenter of American racial discourse in the late nineteenth century. His racial experiences were not defined by a singular encounter with any one race; rather, they were multiple and transnational, including Anglo Americans, African Americans, and Native Americans in the United States, as well as the Ainu and the

Japanese in Japan. Similarly, if we were to examine the lives of other Japanese intellectuals of the time, we would see that they shared the experience of being disheartened by the West because of their Japanese heritage.

Oyabe's life merits closer examination because of the dilemma that stemmed from his contradictory position as both a member of the major Japanese (the dominant ethnicity) in Japan and as a racial Other in the United States. His responses to this psychological dilemma bear attention as well: how did he try to re-conceptualize Japanese ethnicity/race in Western racial discourse? How did his responses interact with the Ainu identity in Japan?

My dissertation primarily aims to produce a life history of Oyabe, centering on the question of racial identity in the United States and in Japan. Specifically, I will explore how Oyabe intervened in constructing Japanese "race" and identity in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries via multi-polar spaces in the United States and Japan. I will also ask how racial and national identities were constructed in his life, that is, the construction of the Japanese "race" and modern Japanese identity. My purpose is not to explore the history of Japanese nationalism, but to understand how and why modern Japanese identity was demarcated and constructed in a specific way in the international context, particularly in U.S.-Japan relations. The central issue on which I would like to focus is the role that Oyabe played in the construction of the ethnic Japanese based on his experiences in the United States as an ethnic Other along with other Meiji intelligentsia.

Theoretical Framework
Coeval Modernities of the United States and Japan: Race and Nation at the Turn of the Twentieth Century

The turn of the twentieth century was a significant era for both the United States and Japan. Both states were emerging as modern and imperial powers. They needed to reinterpret their genealogies of civilization⁷ as modern states, particularly in relation to “ethnic” Others (Native Americans and African Americans in particular in the United States and the Ainu and others in Japan). “Ethnic” Others in both nations started to appear in public domains in a way that both polities could not ignore. As a consequence, they were forced to reimagine their nationhoods and the concepts of Self.

In the United States, by the end of the nineteenth century, the African American population doubled in comparison to its size prior to the Civil War (four million ex-slaves and a half million free blacks). This number was significantly larger than the number of freed slaves living in other slave holders’ home nations in Europe.⁸ As a modern nation, the United States had to deal seriously with black freedmen and freedwomen because the population was “too large for either deportation or reservation to be a practical solution.”⁹ At the end of the nineteenth century, although African Americans expected to be treated as citizens of the nation,

⁷ David Howell explains that after the collapse of the Tokugawa in 1868, the periphery people of the old Tokugawa, including the Ainu, became Meiji imperial subjects through the policies of “ethnic” negation. Simultaneously, the “realm of civilization” was altered from the Sino-centric world view to the Western modernistic civilizational view. (Howell, *Geographies of Identity in Nineteenth-Century Japan*) For example, Stephan Tanaka examines the intellectual reinterpretation of genealogies of Japanese history in relation to *Tōyō*, which mainly refers to Chinese history (Tanaka, *Japan’s Orient*). Regarding the situation of the United States, Singh states: “By making ex-slaves into citizens and enfranchising black men, the Civil War and Reconstruction era established a new cultural and political trajectory. Of paramount import was the augmentation of a universalizing nationalist imperative in which the masses of black people—no longer located outside of the U.S. nation-state, its imagined community, public sphere, and political society—entered America’s shared, if fiercely contested symbolic, social, and political space” (Singh, *Black is a Country*, 23).

⁸ Logan, *The Betrayal of the Negro*, 3-4.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 3.

particularly during and after the Reconstruction era, the U.S. government continuously disenfranchised African Americans and facilitated the system of segregation in the South as symbolized by the U.S. Supreme Court decision of *Plessy v. Ferguson* in 1896.

The economic impetus of education did not work perfectly as planned. The psychoanalytic explanation of imperialism and identification suggests the problematic transformation of citizenry. On the one hand, the colonizers (for instance, white men) imposed the burden of identification on the colonized (Native Americans and African Americans); on the other hand, white men constrained the colonized with a contradictory law: “be like me, don’t be like me: be mimetically identical, be totally other.”¹⁰ While Native, African, and Asian Americans were expected to yearn for white civilization, they were constrained not to cross a border. They were expected to remain different as Other for white men in order to secure the psychology of white domination.

Meanwhile, after the collapse of the Tokugawa regime in 1868 in Japan, the outcasts (*eta* and *hinin*), periphery people in Tokugawa including the Ainu and ex-samurai, were all incorporated into the Meiji imperial order and became imperial subjects. The modern nation of Japan “entailed a redrawing of Japan’s political boundaries to incorporate into the core polity its autonomous yet subordinate peripheries.”¹¹ One of the significant Japanese paternalistic moves was represented in the act of the *Kyū dojin hogo hō* (The Ainu Protection Act) passed in 1899, which claimed to provide support and aid for the Ainu through the allotment of land,

¹⁰ Fuss, *Identification Paper*, 146.

¹¹ Howell, *Geographies of Identity in Nineteenth-Century Japan*, 8.

provision of medical and daily supplies, and an elementary level of education, including Japanese language education. Oyabe was one of the central players in promoting and passing this law.

The United States and Japan both were required to refigure a new modern nationhood that took account of their “ethnic” others not only domestically but also internationally. The United States expanded its imperialism internationally, symbolized by the territorial acquisition of the Philippines as a result of the Philippines-American War (1899-1901). Japan also attempted to represent itself as a western and colonial power to the international community through, for example, the victory of the Sino-Japanese War (1894-1895) and the Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905). Japan also took the path of expansion, colonizing other Asian nations such as Taiwan, Korea, and China (Manchuria).

The “coevalness” of both nations’ modernities and nationhoods tends to be dismissed in the nationalistic frameworks of area studies and history; on the contrary, some studies overemphasize the “unevenness” between societies and point to the temporal and spatial lags as evidence for proving the unique or “alternative” or “retroactive” processes of development of a particular nation.¹²

With regard to the “coeval” modernities of the United States and Japan, as

¹² Harootunian, *Overcome by Modernity*, Preface, x-xxxii. Harry Harootunian points out the problematic view by traditional researchers on modernity, such as the “uncoeval” understanding of modernity, particularly in the interwar period. He cautions that this kind of perspective presupposes the universal time-line of modernity and normalizes the experiences of the early-developed nations such as France and England. He states, “It is precisely this time lag that produces the scandal of imagining modernities that are not quite modern—usually a euphemism for being ‘not quite white’—and new, often outrageous classifications like ‘alternative modernities’ or retroactive modernities differentiated from the temporality of the modern West which, then, allow us to safely situate societies like Japan in a historical trajectory derived from another’s development” (xvi).

Harootinian argues, it is important to compare these two emerging imperial powers. At the same time, we need to be careful about power, specifically unbalanced and discursive power (neither temporal nor spatial relations) between the two nations that can be depicted in the framework of “the West” and “the Orient.” Analyzing this historical time within the international framework, it is crucial to examine how these two nations dealt with ethnic Others and what the relations among different ethnicities were. Rather than narrating the histories of the United States (the West) and Japan (the Orient) separately, Oyabe’s life story allows me not only to analyze the two nations in relation to each other but also to examine the power relations functioning between them.

Masculinity, Racialization, and Sexuality

In addition to research on race/ethnicity and nation, gender, masculinity (also hetero-normativity), in particular, merits special attention in order to understand the historical discourse in relation to civilization and the modern nation. Gail Bederman in *Manliness and Civilization* (1995) analyzes how manliness/manhood and the white race were intentionally combined in order to maintain white middle-class male dominance over the discourse of civilization in turn-of-the-twentieth-century America. For example, Theodore Roosevelt transformed his masculine image by deploying U.S. imperialism in domestic and international politics. Roosevelt maintained that the West was the place where the American race could progress toward its civilized perfection. In the West, he attempted to exercise his militaristic masculinity through fighting with Native Americans. As a part of international policy, he also strongly supported the masculine cause for the Spanish-American War and called his opponents “fossils”

and “old women.” Through these colonial and imperial projects, a particular militaristic maleness started to be associated with U.S. national politics, and people expressed their patriotism toward the nation in the military-defined masculine discourse.¹³

Roosevelt also had a special emotional obsession with Japan, specifically with the “old Japan.” Regularly associating with a connoisseur of Japanese culture like Dr. William Bigelow, Roosevelt was interested in absorbing Japanese culture. At the time, he was one of many Japanese cultural followers in New England who attempted to find solutions to social disorder in the Gilded Age in simplified Japanese aesthetics and philosophy such as *bushido* (the way of life), which appeared as a symbol of social hierarchy and stable society.¹⁴ What Roosevelt observed as “Japanese culture” was quite gendered and male-oriented. For example, he learned *Jujutsu* and even had a *judō* room in the White House; he also promised Bigelow that he and his son would read Nitobe’s *Bushido* and asked questions about the book. In the rapidly changing society of the late nineteenth century, many Northern political leaders and intellectuals tried to re-imagine American national identity through cultural representation of the “old Japan,”¹⁵ many of which were gendered.¹⁶

¹³ Hoganson, *Fighting for American Manhood*, quoted in Sinha, *Gender and Nation*, 24.

¹⁴ Benfey, *The Great Wave*. Roosevelt had particular cultural relations with Japan. These special ties with Japan through Japanese culture are depicted in Chapter entitled “The Judo Room.”

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ Yoshihara, *Embracing the East*. Yoshihara argues that at the turn of the twentieth century, white, middle-class women were able to imagine a new form of femininity by encountering the Oriental commodities—by “consuming” oriental objects and making “Asia as spectacle” (17) at home without necessarily breaking the gender norms of the time.

Race, masculinity, and sexuality have been mutually constitutive in American history. The construction of white masculinity has not been a lone and independent process but rather a relational process. It relied heavily on the racialization of other ethnic men. David Eng in *Racial Castration* (2001) shows that Asian American men were long prohibited from accessing normative white masculinity (heterosexuality) because of the miscegenation laws, limited citizenship, and immigration. Although Chinese men, for instance, participated in producing a modern nation as laborers who built the continental railroads, they were excluded as citizens and even from the national photographic archives.¹⁷ The prohibitions around race, masculinity, and sexuality function simultaneously to produce Asian American male subjectivities and make them “illegible” and “queer.” Queering Asian American men has persistently shaped, reshaped, and secured the heterosexual white man’s masculinity as normative and dominant. It is also important to note that this project of “making manhood” has tied manliness/manhood and masculinity exclusively to male bodies. As a consequence, female masculinity has been silenced as Judith Halberstam argues in *Female Masculinity* (1998)¹⁸. An attempt to access the dominant masculinity (read as white and heterosexual male masculinity) by other racialized and sexualized gender subjects has been prohibited.

The Creation of Modern Japanese National Identity

James Ketelaar discusses the history of Buddhism in the Meiji period, but he also extends his analysis to Meiji history itself, during which various domestic and international events “wove together” to create a new form of nation. He claims:

¹⁷ Eng, *Racial Castration*. See Chapter 1.

¹⁸ Halberstam, *Female Masculinity*.

The history of Japan, in other words, should not be read as merely a set of specific “responses” to the “impact” of the West. The dynamic interplay of historicist, Nativist, and economic concerns within Japan wove together many threads, domestic and international alike, in the creation of, finally, a new nation and, more specific to our concerns here, a new Buddhism.¹⁹ It is necessary for researchers of Meiji Japan to pay attention to differing forces both domestically and internationally. My primary concern in this dissertation on the construction of Japanese ethnicity and national identity requires examining domestic and international dynamics as well as the dialogues among them. Oyabe’s life inevitably interfaces with the multiple spaces and politics: the international, the domestic; Japanese and Christian identity.

Discussions of the meanings of “Japan” as a nation (discussions of what makes Japan “Japan”) became particularly active and popularized in the Meiji period, particularly in the late Meiji. Modern Japanese history has been shaped by interactions with the West. Therefore, examining the creation of modern Japanese identity is inevitably the project of analyzing how the Japanese understood the positionality of their ethnicity placed in the international discourse of race and its various responses to the fixed positionality or recreation of a new Japanese formation, to be recognized in international society. In order to understand these processes, it is also important to acknowledge the earlier attempts to create and extract the essence of Japanese-ness because these attempts show historical continuity as well as variations in crafting the meanings of Japan and its people.

In the Tokugawa period, particularly from the late eighteenth century, the intellectual movement of *kokugaku* (study of Japan), inspired by intellectuals like Motoori Norinaga, became influential in seeking “true” Japanese essences and core

¹⁹ Ketelaar, *Of Heretics and Martyrs in Meiji Japan*, 5.

meanings of the Japanese. The intellectuals defined the Japanese using the term “Japanese spirit” and removing “foreign” elements such as Buddhism. Hirata Atsuane, a central figure in this movement, attacked the *Shin* and *Nichiren* sects of Buddhism because he claimed that these carried a “foreign sensibility.” The supposed “Japanese” and “foreign” sensibilities were invented and defined against each other.²⁰

The practice of Christianity was strictly banned in the Tokugawa period. The ideology of anti-Buddhism due to the emergence of *Mito-gaku*, thereafter provided a reading “text” for the nativist movement. This nativist movement also led to the development of the ideology *sonnō jōi* (revere the emperor, expel the barbarian).²¹ This ideology was subsequently quite politicized by *sōshi* (people with determination, particularly from Chōshū and Satsuma, who overthrew the Tokugawa *bakufu* (the shogunate government) and restored political power to the emperor. These *sōshi* were ideologically inspired by *sonnō jōi*, and the victory over the *bakufu* owed much to imported modern rifle technology, which the Tokugawa *bakufu* did not particularly welcome.²² The nativist movement and the motive to seek a Japanese sensibility should be understood in relation to the international geopolitical conditions of the time.

This ideological move to define the essence of the Japanese was undertaken only within the communities of intellectuals and political leaders. In *Geographies of Identity in Nineteenth-Century Japan* (2005), Howell shows that the Japanese in

²⁰ Ibid., 20.

²¹ Koschmann, *The Mito Ideology*, 173.

²² Craig, *Chōshū in the Meiji Restoration*, quoted in Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 94. Tessa Morris-Suzuki, *Re-inventing Japan*.

general did not share the unified ethnic and national identity of the “Japanese.” Rather, they recognized “difference” and gained a sense of identity, not through ethnicity/race/nationality but through geography: various domain polities, particular social statuses, and the categories of “civilized” or “barbarous” subjects as defined by the spatial boundaries and political governance of the shogunate.

It is significant that Howell characterizes the recognition of difference as “geographies of identity.” By utilizing this conceptual framework of identity, Howell claims that Japanese identity or difference is constructed through the “long process of border drawing.”²³ His emphasis is drawn to the politics of spatiality and constant defining and redefining of spatial borders, of “us” and “them.” Tessa Morris-Suzuki also explains that “space” and “time” are crucial concepts for analyzing Japanese national identity and nationhood.²⁴

People in Meiji Japan experienced and participated in the definition and redefinition of “Japan,” the time when the question of the ontology and representation of the nation was prominent. Through the importation of Western political theories, on one hand, Japan started to employ hierarchal racial discourses. On the other hand, Japan had to reshape itself based on its own desire: the desire to be as powerful as other imperial nations like the United States. The unbalanced power and desire in international and domestic domains solidified a “new” modality of being Japan, claiming the embodiment of universality: being modern and imperial in the sphere of the imagined Orient. Oyabe’s attempt to reconstruct Japanese

²³ Howell, *Geographies of Identity*, 3.

²⁴ Morris-Suzuki, *Re-inventing Japan*, 86.

identity was the result of overcoming a sense of inferiority that he experienced in the United States.

Meiji's intellectuals and political thinkers avidly transmitted the Western political theory such as Samuel Smiles' *Self-Help*, John Stuart Mill's *On Liberty*, William and Robert Chambers' *Political Economy*, as well as more than thirty works of Herbert Spencer²⁵ into Japan through literary translations. Although Western racial discourse had been introduced long before Meiji through Dutch literature of geography, probably during the seventeen and eighteen centuries,²⁶ the most influential book in terms of its wide circulation was "Sekai kunizukushi" ("Account of the Counties of the World"), written by Fukuzawa Yuchiki. In this book, Western racial categories are explained with color-coded illustrations: "Europeans are white, Asians 'slightly yellow,' Africans black, the people of the Pacific Islands brown, and the inhabitants of 'the mountains of America' red."²⁷ After the literary imports were completed, Japanese intellectuals, however, did not simply receive these Western political theories. Rather, since the contents of Westernization did not fit in Japanese contexts, these Japanese intellectuals invented new terminologies to translate the Western concepts. Those debates appeared in journals like *Meiokusha*, resulting in a transformation of their own intellectual discourse and praxis.²⁸

Through the process of acquiring Western knowledge, Japanese intellectuals—including historians such as Yamaji Aizan, Naka Michiyo, Miyake

²⁵ Howland, "Society Reified: Herbert Spencer and Political Theory in Early Meiji Japan," 70.

²⁶ Morris Suzuki, *Re-inventing Japan*, 85.

²⁷ Fukuzawa, "Sekai kunizukushi" quoted in Morris-Suzuki, *Re-inventing Japan*, 85.

²⁸ Howland, "Society Reified," 7.

Yonekichi, and Shiratori Kurakichi²⁹ and anthropologists such as Tsuboi Shōgorō³⁰, accessed Western discourse regarding the Japanese racial position in the West. It explained that Japan was inferior to the West; Japan was objectified and constructed as the “Orient” of the West.³¹ However, the Japanese did not fit themselves into Western discourse. They experienced a dilemma and searched for “how to become ‘modern’ while simultaneously shedding the objective category of Oriental and yet not lose an identity.”³² Stephan Tanaka examines how the Japanese historians’ project of *Tōyōshi*³³ in Meiji re-configured the Japanese past in Asia against the “Occident” while highlighting difference and separation from China: “[T] *ōyō* was the source of Japan’s orientalism as well as of the narrative of Japan’s progress.”³⁴ Tanaka observes these Japanese historians’ project as a “reciprocal relation” or a “dialogic exchange” between the Occident and the Orient. On the one hand, the West “provides a powerful motivating force to ‘be like the West’ or to ‘modernize’”; on the other hand, “(o)ne does not merely extract from the object, for that object might

²⁹ Tanaka, *Japan’s Orient*, 17.

³⁰ Sakano, “Jinshu • Minzoku • Nihonjin,” 234.

³¹ Tanaka, *Japan’s Orient*, 17.

³² *Ibid.*, 3.

³³ Tanaka unpacks the history of *Tōyōshi*, which was created by the Meiji historians. The literal translation of *Tōyō* is “the Orient.” By establishing the history of the Orient (the main location of this history is “*shina*”—the objectified China), they framed Japan as a part of Asia (which allows Japan to be part of world civilization) but simultaneously objectified China and made it “Japan’s Orient.” In this study of history, they changed the references of China and Asia to *Shina* and *Tōyō* respectively. Tanaka argues that “[b]ecause the Orient was the origin for modern Western history, Japan, by turning to *Tōyō* for its own past, made Asia the common ground and locus of comparisons and contestation with regard to the West. In this way, the Japanese were using the West and Asian as other(s) to construct their own sense of a Japanese nation as modern and oriental” *Ibid.*, 18.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 22.

incorporate parts of the external discourse, or it might develop—or try to develop—a voice of its own.”³⁵

This Japanese dual identity of “becoming modern” and “being an Oriental” also resulted in inventing the concept of *minzoku* (ethnicity) in Japanese society. This concept of ethnicity applied not only to the ethnicity of the Japanese against the West but also to Japanese peripheral groups, especially the Ainu, by treating them as “primitives” in Japan. The concept of *minzoku* was popularized through the media of the 1880s, such as *Nihonjin* (journal) and *Nihon* (newspaper), both of which expressed a strong sense of nationalism.³⁶ In these media, the terminology of *minzoku* was created, referring to “a subject that carried tradition continuously and historically” or to the “people who criticized the ideology of Westernization and considered Japanese tradition, history, and culture as foundations for the national development.”³⁷

Tessa Morris-Suzuki argues that the key to understanding the construction of Japanese identity is the “shift in emphasis from the dimension of ‘space’ to the dimension of ‘time.’”³⁸ In the early Meiji period, regions such as Hokkaido and Okinawa, which were considered “different” and “foreign,” were spatially integrated into modern Japan. However, people who lived in those “foreign” places, including the Ainu, were examined by Japanese and Western anthropologists and were labeled as “ancient” in contrast to “modern” Japan.³⁹ The Ainu, who were made

³⁵ Ibid., 22.

³⁶ Sakano, “Jinshu • minzoku • nihonjin,” 235.

³⁷ Ibid., 235.

³⁸ Morris-Suzuki, *Re-inventing Japan*, 86.

³⁹ Ibid., 86.

Japan's "primitive," helped to define the modern nationhood. This time lag between the Japanese and the Ainu was translated as "barbarous" or "difference," and the Ainu along with other differences have been intentionally disregarded in Japanese nationhood. The academic as well as popular genre of *Nihonjinron* (the discourse of Japanese-ness) always defines Japan as "culturally exceptional." Subsequently, "homogeneity" among the Japanese has been used as convincing proof to support this theory.⁴⁰ As Befu and many others argue, *Nihonjiron* has been the core self-representation of the nation, and the myth of homogeneity has been creating a reality from which they can hardly escape.⁴¹ Oyabe also attempted to use the time lag between the Japanese and the Ainu, making the Ainu "savages" in Japan. As a Japanese educator, Oyabe committed himself to the mission of making the Ainu modern subjects—subjects who were nevertheless second class but who could fit into the notion of Japanese nationhood. The Ainu were assimilated into Japanese society, but simultaneously constructed as different in relation to Japanese identity.

Carol Gluck in *Japan's Modern Myths: Ideology in the Late Meiji Period* (1985) delineates the historical sensibilities of the late Meiji period, which falls roughly between 1890 and 1921. She characterizes this historical time as the time of "civic definition,"⁴² which came after the serious flood of Westernization due to the Meiji Restoration. Gluck pays special attention to "the people" (the *minkan*—"outside of the government"), who have been simply regarded as the "receptors" of the *tennō sei*

⁴⁰ Befu, *Hegemony of Homogeneity*, 2.

⁴¹ Many works on challenging Japan's homogeneity, particularly from the perspective of ethnicity, have been written recently. For example, Oguma, *Tanitsu minzokushiwa no kigen* and "*Nihonjin*" no *kyōkai*, Weiner, *Japan's Minorities*, Denoon, Hudson, McCormack, and Suzuki, eds, *Multicultural Japan*, and Lie, *Multiethnic Japan*.

⁴² Gluck, *Japan's Modern Myth*, 21.

ideology in previous literature and research. Gluck deconstructs the homogenous image of *tennōsei* ideology of the Meiji and the functioning of its ideology. The *tennōsei* ideology of the Meiji has been usually described by researchers as a top-down phenomenon; the ideology was disseminated through government bureaucracy to the common people. However, Gluck articulated the more complex interactions among the people, particularly the ideologically active *minkan*, who seriously debated the well-being of the nation and acted more like an autonomous agency. These *minkan* people along with governmental officials synchronically or discursively tried to cultivate “the sense of nation.” Thus, the people concentrated on creating the unity of the nation and made an “effort to draw all the people into the state, to have them thinking national thoughts, to make *kokumin* of them, the new Japanese for what was called ‘the new Japan.’”⁴³

The project of creating Japanese ethnicity was a collaborative work among various people and not necessarily practiced exclusively by Japanese government officials. Oyabe, I argue, was one of the important *minkan* figures in creating modern Japanese ethnicity and identity. His experiences with American racial discourse, establishing the school for the Ainu to promote their “autonomous” life in Japanese industrialization, his cultural nativist argument about the myths of a historical hero from the twelfth century, Minamoto no Yoshitsune (1159-1189), and his claim that the Japanese were a lost tribe of Israel, all illustrate the facets of civilization and modernity experienced at the turn of the twentieth century, which contributed to

⁴³ Ibid., 23.

reforming the Japanese identity via relations to the United States as well as domestic racial axes in Japan.

Japanese Christians and Christianity: Identity of “True Cosmopolitanism”⁴⁴ in Meiji

Various journalists, politicians, and intellectuals attempted to determine a new direction to modernity and Westernization in Meiji. In this process, what had been accused as “not-Japanese” or “foreignness” in the past was gradually re-appreciated; moreover, this non-Japaneseness or access to universality became one of the important characteristics in late Meiji Japan. In *Of Heretics and Martyrs in Meiji Japan* (1990), James Edward Ketelaar analyzes how Japanese Buddhism grew significantly in Meiji through the process of redefining “Buddhism” and what the “modern” meant to the religion. Ketelaar insightfully explains the “exteriority” of Buddhism, which had been accused of being “not-Japanese” in the past, became proof of being connected to the world. Access to the international community was strategically utilized in order to connect the Japanese past to the present, which also secured Japan’s location in the world system. The concept of universality enabled Buddhism to reclaim a new Japanese-ness and, therefore, through the novelty acquired by establishing itself as a “modern” religion. The “exteriority” of Buddhism also granted a new past in Japanese history, transforming the representation of the religion from “heretics” to “martyrs.” Ketelaar claims:

“...[T]here was also a careful preservation of Buddhism’s final exteriority to exclusively national historical formations. It is precisely this undeniable exteriority, found both within its doctrinal organization and the structuring of its past, which contributed to extensive attacks upon Buddhist

⁴⁴ Ketelaar, *Of Heretics and Martyrs in Meiji Japan*, 188. I should note that in the book, Ketelaar only refers this identity to newly defined modern Buddhism; however, I would like to argue that Christianity can also be analyzed in a way similar to the one Ketelaar describes.

institutions in the early years of Meiji. Here, however, this undeniable exteriority is gradually refashioned into its strategic opposite. No longer a burden to Buddhism, or at least not a burden in the same manner, this exteriority becomes the key element in the formulation of a newly defined Buddhism and its global conception. This ironic refiguration of its own exteriority ... allows Buddhism, in the name of national cultural revolution, to refigure its heretical past into a lamentable martyrdom.⁴⁵ “Exteriority” helped the Buddhist monks to redefine the “new” modern Japan and Japanese identity, which claimed a different sensibility from the one the nativists constructed. Ketelaar also names this new redefinition of being Japan as “true cosmopolitanism” that is actualized by gaining the two keys of “classical” and “modern.”⁴⁶

In a similar way, Christianity in general and Japanese Christians in particular were able to define themselves in relation to this new direction of “cosmopolitanism” in Japan. This “new” identity was certainly complex because different competing forces clashed in the process of embodiment (I will discuss more details in Chapter 4). In this regard, Christianity, as a significant “difference” like other ethnic minorities, played an important role in defining, redefining, and imagining Japanese national identity and nationhood.

Methodological Framework

The Politics of Experience

“Experience is ... not the origin of our explanation, but that which we want to explain”

Joan Scott⁴⁷

My research focuses on the life of Oyabe Zen'chirō and analyzes the processes of identification (including misidentification and dis-identification) of his race/ethnicity and gender at the turn of the twentieth century. By examining the life

⁴⁵ Ketelaar, *Of Heretics and Martyrs in Meiji Japan*, 197.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 188.

⁴⁷ Scott, “Experience” in *Feminists Theorize the Political*, 38.

of Oyabe, I argue that we can trace his individual-level process of identification as a Japanese man at the turn of the century as well as simultaneously analyze events, discourses, and institutions that produced his subjectivity. The concept of “experience” is important for my dissertation project because it enables me to explore the inseparable and intricate projects of discourse, institutional and historical analyses, and subject formation. The concept of experience as a theoretical tool enables me to examine the dynamic relations between discourse and self-formation.

In “Experience,” Joan Scott problematizes the common assumptions about experience and shifts the focus of feminist analysis to discourse and language in subject formation rather than treating women’s experience as the common ground of feminist politics. Although experience is usually understood as something that individuals possess, Scott argues that subjects are constituted through experience.⁴⁸ She questions the authority of experience and instead argues that experience constitutes a self:

Talking about experience in these ways leads us to take the existence of individuals for granted (experience as something people have) rather than to ask how conceptions of selves (of subjects and their identities) are produced. It operates within the ideological construction that not only makes individuals the starting point of knowledge, but also naturalizes categories such as man, woman, black, white, heterosexual, homosexual by treating them as given characteristics of individuals.⁴⁹

Therefore, examining one’s experience is not just describing, but requires an analysis of how the subject is produced in various discourses. We make sense of experience by explaining. Furthermore, Scott claims that experience is already a

⁴⁸ Ibid., 26.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 27.

product of interpretation, constructed through one's interpretation of society, relations, and the past. She eloquently explains: "Experience is at once always already an interpretation *and* something that needs to be interpreted. What counts as experience is neither self-evident nor straightforward; it is always contested, and always therefore political."⁵⁰ (Emphasis in original.)

In a similar sense, Judith Butler in *Gender Trouble* also gives critical thought to "experience" and the category of "women." She questions the naturally gendered "subject;" in other words, she questions the ontological categories of "women" and "men." She turns her analytical focus to the discursive subject formation in power and takes a genealogical approach that attempts to investigate "the political stakes in designating as an origin and cause those identity categories that are in fact the effects of institutions, practices, discourses with multiple and diffuse points of origin."⁵¹ This calls into question why certain categories and identities are produced in differing discourses and powers. In my project, Oyabe's claims and identifications with a certain view of masculinity and race/ethnicity were also produced and contested in multiple locations including educational institutions, events, and historical/political ideologies both in the United States and Japan. As a researcher in the twenty-first century, I analyze Oyabe's experience in a new light since he provides an interpretation of his life in his memoir.

Outline of Chapters

Chapter 1

The Civilized "Japanese?" Competing Narratives of Civilization at the Turn of the Twentieth Century

⁵⁰ Ibid., 37.

⁵¹ Butler, *Gender Trouble*, xxxi.

The racial and ethnic discourses and processes that shaped Oyabe's Japanese male identity were complex. Narratives around Oyabe are constructed along multiple axes. First, there was a representational gap and an identification issue between American racial discourse and his own representation of the self. The racial discourse of the United States positioned Oyabe as Asian or Japanese, which was considered "uncivilized" and "primitive," which, in general, meant inferior to the white race. For example, Oyabe chose the universities where he studied, particularly Hampton and Howard University, based on his intellectual and pedagogical interests and because he thought that these schools functioned as good prototypes for educating the Ainu in Japan after he returned. Nonetheless, Oyabe was not differentiated from other Native and African-American students in these institutions. In contrast to U.S. sociopolitical racial discourse, Oyabe's memoir frames his experience as one of the fellows of white philanthropy, and he represents himself as equal to a white man. Second, there were also competing representational narratives surrounding Oyabe and the Ainu. Oyabe as a member of the major "Japanese" (*yamato*) ethnicity constructed his ethnicity as superior and civilized while constructing the Ainu as a subjugated ethnicity. However, some European and U.S. anthropologists claimed that the Ainu were actually an "ancient" white race (the claimed discourse of "noble whites") and used those narratives to criticize Japanese colonial policy over the Ainu. Although Oyabe knew this Western anthropological knowledge, he argued against it and instead claimed the superiority of the Japanese.

Chapter 2 The Philosophy of *Jitsugyō*: Oyabe, Hokkaido Kyūdojin Kyūikukai, and Ainu Education Praxis

This chapter focuses Oyabe's involvement in Ainu "activism" and education after he came back from Hawaii in 1898. I explore his activities related to the Ainu through the association called *Hokkaidō Kyūdojin Kyūikukai*. I also analyze how his philosophy of *jitsugyō* (vocational education) toward the Ainu can be compared with other approaches of Ainu educators, such as Izumi Munehiro and Yoshida Iwao (1882-1963). He was also one of the important members of Hokkaido *Kyūdojin kyūikukai*, which proposed the Ainu Protection Law in Japan. I pay attention to his particular philosophy of *Jitsugyo* to examine Oyabe's approach to Ainu education.

Chapter 3

Minamoto no Yoshitsune Fever: Intellectual Debates over Historical Truth and Oyabe Zenichiro's Interventions in Japanese Imagination in the 1920s

In this chapter, I examine a particular dimension of Oyabe's life as a myth creator through his publications. In the 1920s, Oyabe was the most important producer of Minamoto no Yoshitsune's legends of survival. He argued that Genghis Khan, a Mongolian hero of the twelfth century, was actually Minamoto no Yoshitsune. Many intellectuals criticized Oyabe's research, and the legend of Yoshitsune's survival provoked public controversy. By the 1920s, Japanese intellectuals, particularly historians, had established modern and scientific research as their legitimate methodology. They did it by eliminating the historical myths that had persisted before.

Oyabe defended the legitimacy of his research and attempted to prove the legends of Yoshitsune. In his chapter, I examined the intellectual controversy of the Yoshitsune legends. It should be situated as part of a long intellectual debate between scientific and modernist intellectuals and mythic nativists who can be observed from the Meiji period. Oyabe attempted to reconnect Japanese history and

imagination to the great civilization of China and Mongolia. His research methodology spoke to his divergent approach of being mythical yet cosmopolitan; therefore, it was hardly conventional compared with other intellectuals. Oyabe legitimized oral tradition and ruins, which were regarded as mythical and pre-modern vis-à-vis dominant scientific methods. He visited domestic (the East Ōshū) as well as Siberian and Mongolian locales to collect evidence, which was made possible by modern mobility and his cosmopolitan sensibility. In other words, he made Japanese historical myths transnational and connected with greater civilization so that the Japanese past fit into the international context, which is equivalent to European civilization. By doing so, he intervened in the Japanese imagination, celebrating the Japanese qualities of being both retrospective and pre-modern yet simultaneously cosmopolitan. He attempted to seek a new way of being “the modern,” which was not solely defined by the Western models of civilization.

Chapter 4 **Being Disheartened by the West: The New Formation of Meiji Christian Intelligentsia**

This chapter analyzes the formation of the Meiji Christian intelligentsia by examining the autobiographies and essays of Japanese Christians at the turn of the twentieth century. These include Katayama Sen’s *Jiden* (1923), Uchimura Kanzō’s *Japan and the Japanese* (1894) or *Representative Men of Japan* and *How I Became A Christian* (1900), Nitobe’s *Bushido: The Soul of Japan* (1900) and Oyabe Zenichirō’s *A Japanese Robinson Crusoe* (1898). Situating Oyabe’s memoir among the Meiji intelligentsia, they all shared the similar experience of being disheartened by the West, although they became so close to Western subjects because they had mastered foreign languages, had faith in Christianity, and had spent extensive time

in the West. The Meiji intelligentsia tended to hide their experience in narratives. But, they showed different ways of overcoming their sense of inferiority caused by racial prejudice toward the Japanese. Through their experiences of being disheartened by the West, they reinvented their relations to Japan and the Japanese past and reformed Japanese identity.

Epilogue:

In the epilogue, I examine the current politics of Japanese national identity and nationhood, particularly in relation to the Ainu. *Kyūdojin hogohō* (the Ainu protection law), which Oyabe helped to pass in 1899, continued to exist in Japanese discourse for approximately one hundred years. In 1997, it was finally renamed as *Ainubunka no shinkō narabini Ainu no dentōtō ni kansuru chishiki no fukyū oyobi keihatsu ni kansuru hōritsu* (“Outline of the Act on the Promotion of Ainu Culture, and Dissemination and Enlightenment of Knowledge about Ainu Tradition”) with a nuance of multiculturalism. The Ainu have long aimed to be officially recognized as the “indigenous people” of Japan, and in 2008, their “indigenous” status was “recovered” in Japan as well as in the broader international community. However, the irony behind the Ainu movement is that the more they emphasize this “indigenous” status in Japan, the stronger they re-inscribe the counters to Japanese nationhood and nation-state. As a concluding chapter, I also critically examine the continuities and discontinuities of Japanese politics of self-identity and nationhood from the Meiji period.

Chapter 1

The Civilized “Japanese?”

Competing Narratives of Civilization at the Turn of the Twentieth Century

Like people and schools of criticism, ideas and theories travel—from person to person, from situation to situation, from one period to another...

What happens to it when, in different circumstances and for new reasons, it is used again and, in still more different circumstances, again?...

It is never enough for a critic taking the idea of criticism seriously simply to say that interpretation is misinterpretation or that borrowings inevitably involve misreadings. Quite the contrary: it seems to me perfectly possible to judge misreadings (as they occur) as part of a historical transfer of ideas and theories from one setting to another...

Edward W. Said “Traveling Theory”⁵²

Introduction

Discourses of civilization or categories of the civilized and primitive served to establish multi-layered racial relations both in the United States and Japan at the turn of the twentieth century.⁵³ The western hegemony/hierarchy of race could be challenged and appeared contradictory according to which axes of power were in play in specific places. These power relations were always mobile, being shaped in history, narrative, and representation, and shifting according to the economic and sociopolitical forces of the time. As Said’s quote above explains, certain theories or ideas travel from one location to another, producing a different historical and political consciousness, and those forms of consciousness are oftentimes contradictory and, thus, subject to “misreading” and alteration.

This chapter illustrates how Oyabe Zen’ichirō encountered the discourse of civilization pertaining to race. Oyabe spent approximately nine years, from 1889 to

⁵² Said, “Traveling Theory,” *The World, the Text and the Critic*. The quotes are on pages of 226, 230, and 236.

⁵³ For example, Bederman’s *Manliness & Civilization*.

1898, in America. He studied for one year between 1889 and 1890 at Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute in Virginia while it was providing a “bi-racial” education to Native Americans and African Americans from 1868 to 1925. Oyabe also studied theology from 1890 to 1894 at Howard University, the first historically black college in the North. After working as a minister in Hawaii, He came back to study at Yale University and received a degree in divinity. As resistance to the international discourse of race, Oyabe intentionally misread it and attempted to overcome the position determined by this discourse. As I will show in this chapter, however, the discourse of civilization was not set in stone because even Samuel Armstrong, a president of the Hampton Institute, tried to prove his authentic identity as civilized by overcoming the sense of difference that stemmed from growing up in Hawaii. At Hampton, Oyabe encountered this discourse of civilization and attempted to reproduce it in Japan in relation to the Ainu (see Chapter 2). By examining his American experience, I will also shed light on the relations between the particular consciousness produced by it and the construction of Japanese racial identity.

Discourse of Civilization: From the Old World to the New World

The discourse of the civilized and the primitive in relation to race did not start in the nineteenth century in the United States. It can be traced back to the colonial home country of England. The question was interconnected with the principle of American identity and the definition of a “citizen” in America.

Historians of race claim that the hierarchical idea of race emerged as a modern concept and developed along with the British colonial experience and the

refinement of global capitalism.⁵⁴ In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, England experienced tremendous social, religious, political, and economic changes. Audrey Smedley points out that the emergence of early capitalism, in particular, dramatically transformed the “worldview” of the British and the meaning of value, morality, and difference.⁵⁵ Capitalism shifted the governance system of feudalism to individualistic relations through labor and production. Under the system of merchant capitalism, the British were able to accumulate unrestrained wealth and private property, protected by the value of individualism and privatization. Changes in value, being able to translate everything to material and money, offered a new “worldview,” in which the haves were morally superior to the have-nots. These various transits in value and morality influenced the ways of understanding difference among people. The immediate racial example was the way in which the British viewed Ireland and the Irish as “lazy” and “uncivilized”⁵⁶ because of their different livelihoods. Smedley further explains that these values were transmitted through the immigration of Anglican, Puritan, and other English people into the New World, which would influence the ways in which they dealt with other non-English and non-European populations in the United States⁵⁷

However, the idea of the superiority of the Caucasian race, particularly the British and Anglo-Saxon-Teutonic, was not simply transmitted to the new world. It significantly evolved in America and became an important vector in understanding

⁵⁴ Hannaford, *Race*.

⁵⁵ Specifically, Chapter 3 is helpful to understand the travel of the idea of race from England to the New World.

⁵⁶ Smedley, *Race in North America*, 60.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 60.

American civilization. The success of Puritan settlers, the revolution against England, and material and territorial developments explained the superiority of the Anglo-Saxons' political and economic institutions and, consequently, their natural characters as a race.⁵⁸ Indeed, the act of moving toward the West, was believed to represent the processes of American civilization.

American "Western Route" in Racial Civilization

It seems to me that God, with infinite wisdom and skill, is training the Anglo-Saxon race for an hour sure to come in the world's future. Heretofore there has always been in the history of the world a comparatively unoccupied land westward, into which the crowded counties of the East have poured their surplus populations. But the widening waves of migration which millenniums ago rolled east and west from the valley of the Euphrates, meet today on our Pacific coast. There are no more new worlds. The unoccupied arable lands of the earth are limited, and will soon be taken. The time is coming when the pressure of population on the means of subsistence will be felt here as it is now felt in Europe and Asia. Then will the world enter upon a new stage of its history—the final competition of races, for which the Anglo-Saxon is being schooled.

Josiah Strong, an advocate of the "Home Mission" movement that promoted evangelical Protestantism in the nineteenth century, enunciates the importance of the barren land of the West for the entire development of the Anglo-Saxon race.⁵⁹ They required these lands to show their economic and theological success, and the results were considered proof of their civilized status.

After the end of the Civil War, the American militaristic and industrial move westward provided concrete evidence of Anglo-Saxons' superiority. This westward move unfolded within religious, militaristic, and economic contexts. The discourse

⁵⁸ Horsman, *Race and Manifest Destiny*, 5.

⁵⁹ Strong's *Our Country* is quoted in William's "Voices for Imperialism: Josiah Strong and The Protestant Clergy" *Journal of the Kentucky-Tennessee American Studies Association*, No.1, 1973. On-line. <http://spider.georgetowncollege.edu/htallant/border/bs1/berge.htm>

of progress and manifest destiny discursively bundled all the violent and colonial events together and produced a centripetal effect and convincing justification. The western experience became a cardinal principle for organizing American national identity in the discourse of civilization.⁶⁰

The West was imagined as “virgin” romantic and open space, waiting to be conquered.⁶¹ The inhabitants of this space, Native Americans, were regarded as “savages.” The spatiality of the West explained this mixed message of romanticism and savagery. The West was imagined within the worldview of Anglo-Saxons and their identity as the “civilized” race. It was considered a meeting point between savagery and civilization. It was a place where rebirth, transformation, and rehabilitation (reactivation) were all practiced and experienced for creating a masculine, strong, and unified identity. Furthermore, as Trachtenberg points out, the process did not stop there:

By the 1890s, then, the Indians had been incorporated into America no longer simply as ‘savage,’ a fantasy object of ambivalent romantic identification or racial hatred, but as ‘lowest order,’ outcast and pariah who represented the fate of all those who do not work, do not own, do not prefer the benefits of legal status within the hierarchies of modern institutions to the prerogatives of freedom and cultural autonomy.⁶²

After the massacre at Wounded Knee in 1890, the American West was imagined as much bigger and exceeded the boundary of the American Pacific Coast. Josiah Strong calls the Pacific Coast the new Mediterranean Sea in the twentieth century. By renaming the Pacific Coast in this way, he argued that the new racial

⁶⁰ Trachtenberg, *Incorporation of America*.

⁶¹ Turner, “The Significant of the Frontier in America” in *The Frontier in American History*, 1-38.

⁶² Trachtenberg, *Incorporation of America*, 34.

civilization would move from the American Pacific Coast through the western route to the rest of the world. This American western route would complete the final development for Anglo-Saxons. The United States expanded its territories internationally and incorporated Asia as a place to secure a selling market and cheap labor.⁶³ Between 1870 and 1920, the United States accepted some 26 million immigrants from abroad. However, these immigrants were never viewed as legitimate citizens, and Asians, especially, were treated as “unassimilated strangers” to American society. The idea of progressiveness was particularly promoted in educational areas where different races were encouraged to accept and participate in American society; however, the avenues for participation were limited.

Race and Education for Native and African Americans

In *The Incorporation of America* (2007), Trachtenberg illustrates the changes that occurred in the West and the South⁶⁴ due to the intrusion of “American

⁶³ Jacobson, *Barbarian Virtues*, Chap.1.

⁶⁴ While the political exclusion of African Americans continued, there were strong economic forces for progress and prosperity, starting with the expansion of the railroad industry. Supported by popular images of the West cultivated by various agencies, the railroad and the advancement of the telegraph (Trachtenberg, *Incorporation of America*, 20) transformed the vast space of West into the space of production. Other commercial industries also came in, following the railroad industry. The relations between agriculture and corporations changed, and the West was assimilated into a national and international system of “buying, selling, and shipping” (Ibid., 21). The West became a place that provided “raw materials” to larger corporations. The West was not only a region where national/international corporations become a part of the system. The South, especially the Delta (the Arkansas and Mississippi Delta) also attracted the Northeast and Midwest lumber industries and allowed them to continue reaping the forests in the Delta from the late nineteenth century to the early twentieth century. It started with the government intervention of opening up the region. During the 1880s, the federal government established the flood control of the Mississippi River and connected the Delta and the Eastern Seaboard through an east-west railroad. The Louisville, New Orleans, and Texas railroads were purchased by the Illinois Central Railroad, and the region was linked with Chicago and New Orleans (Woodruff, *American Congo*, 10). Due to the clearing of the forests by the expansion of the lumber

corporations.” He argues that the “Gilded Age” was the time of the emergence of a corporation system which not only expanded across the nation, but changed various relations of people; perceptions about society such as “culture,” “value,” “outlooks” and “the way of life,”; and, eventually, the nation of “America” itself.

The field of education was also dynamically influenced by the American corporation and the notion of American civilization. Education directly speaks to the future, to the question of what kind of people and society need to be imagined and produced. The article entitled “Rights and Duties of the Citizen VI. Education,” which appeared in *Southern Workman*, a school journal of Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute in 1878, shows Hampton’s educational vision and defines the meaning of education in relation to the state and productivity:

Education bears the same relation to citizenship that interest does to capital: an uneducated population is like the Talent, in the parable, that was buried in the earth. Education is a means, not an end; it is a tool, by the use of which, man can produce more with the same amount of exertion, than he can without it.⁶⁵

In this article, people, especially “uneducated people,” are considered natural resources (“Talent”) that are “buried in earth.” Through education, people maximize their potential/utility and become productive citizens. Eventually, these productive citizens are believed to serve the states’ economic “interests” in exchange for the state’s investment in establishing public schools. Under the rhetoric of economic progressivism, schools became like factories that transformed “raw materials” into productive workers that the state labeled “good citizens.”

industry, the lands of the Delta were transformed into a large scale “corporation plantation” (22) where black laborers were exploited through the system of sharecropping.

⁶⁵ Bryce, “Rights and Duties of Citizens. VI. Education” in *Southern Workman*, Vol. Vii, March 1878, 69.

Oyabe and Armstrong Meet at Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute: Two Figures of the American and Japanese Robinson Crusoe

Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute (hereafter Hampton Institute) was established by the initiative of the American Missionary Association (AMA) in 1868 to educate emancipated blacks, Native Americans, and Asians. Although Samuel Chapman Armstrong was not appointed by the AMA as their first choice, due to the resignation of E.B. Parsons,⁶⁶ Armstrong eventually became the first president of the Institute. Between the years 1868 and 1925, Hampton also provided industrial and agricultural education to Native Americans. Because of this history, Hampton Institute, particularly at the turn of the twentieth century, was characterized as a “bi-racial” educational institute. The fact that there were a few Asian students also studying there is little known. Oyabe studied at Hampton from 1889 to 1890 (Furukawa states that he studied there for two years⁶⁷) with two other Japanese students: Saitō Seizirō and Sakamoto Genta. He attended the agricultural department as well as the normal school. The experience at Hampton Institute was extremely critical for his later life in Japan. It enabled him to explore the discourses of race and gender of the time, for example, the racialized and gendered performance of a white philanthropist as “civilized,” as well as the industrial/practical idea of education to the “uncivilized” and the “primitive.”

⁶⁶ After serving as a brigadier general for white and black troops in Civil War, Armstrong was passionate about educating blacks in the South. He became a Freedmen’s Bureau superintendent in Virginia. He also was the one who convinced the AMA (Edward P. Smith, a secretary of the AMA) to purchase a former plantation land (Little Scotland or Wood’s Farm) for a new school that he envisioned (Eng, *Educating the Disfranchised and Disinherited* 73).

⁶⁷ Furukawa and Furukawa, “America no kokujin kōtō kyōikukikan to nihonjin,” 61-78.

Hampton Institute provided him with the epistemology and methodology for remaking himself and ultimately his Japanese identity.

Oyabe's experience at Hampton can be encapsulated in his relations with Samuel Chapman Armstrong. As the first president of the school, he established its philosophical foundation and organizational scheme.⁶⁸ Armstrong was born in January 1839 at his father's (Richard Armstrong) missionary station in Wailuku, on the eastern side of Maui. Richard, who was Irish Protestant, married Clarissa Chapman, of Puritan descent, after his graduation from Princeton Theological Seminary. In 1819, Richard and Clarissa were sent as members of the third party of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM) to Hawaii.⁶⁹

Samuel grew up in a missionary home where differences in race and class were clearly demarcated. It was quite obvious that in his childhood, he did not question the legitimacy of his father's missionary work; he affirmed the work, embraced the paternalistic ideas of education designed for the "uncivilized," and regarded it as his own mission as well.

Samuel's house in his childhood had been called "Stone House." It was made of lines of coral, and originally built as the residence of a British Admiral. By 1840, it was owned by the Kingdom of Hawaii and used as an official residence for the Armstrong family when Richard became the minister of public instruction.⁷⁰ On the one hand, Richard seemed more open to the local culture and people of Hawaii, inviting Hawaiians to this home, and letting his sons, including Samuel, learn the

⁶⁸ See Lindsey and Eng who both discuss the centrality of Armstrong to Hampton. Lindsey, *Indians at Hampton Institute* and Eng, *Educating the Disfranchised and Disinherited*.

⁶⁹ Lindsey, *Indians at Hampton Institute*, 1

⁷⁰ Engs, *Educating the Disfranchised and Disinherited*, 13

native language. On the other hand, Clarissa tried to minimize the exposure to the native culture because she feared that her children would become “too native.” She made sure that her stone house had “high walls around it” so that the Hawaiians could not easily access it.⁷¹ She did not like that Richard had native people as his guests at home: “When [Richard] is here, the room set apart for the natives is full from morning till night. Books, schools, medicine, must all be attended to. And the natives talk so loud that it is almost unendurable.”⁷²

Samuel was raised in an exclusive missionary school community although he could have had an opportunity to study with Hawaiian children. He first went to the Royal School in Honolulu, which provided education to the children of the Hawaiian nobility. Afterward, he advanced to Punahou School (later Oahu College) in 1854. This school was designed by his father to train leaders for establishing the “puritan common wealth in the tropics.”⁷³ Although both schools were originally designed for white settlers’ families, especially missionaries’ families, they ultimately accepted children of both races. It is worth noting, however, that these white settlers made a particular effort not to let their children “fraternize” with the Hawaiian children.⁷⁴

The experience of growing up in Hawaii made him an outsider to the New England orthodoxy. In 1860, at the age of 21, Armstrong came to America for the first time to transfer to Williams College in Massachusetts. There, other New England students noticed a certain difference in Armstrong, mentioning his fine

⁷¹ Lindsey, *Indians at Hampton Institute*, 1

⁷² Talbot, Samuel Chapman Armstrong 15-16; M.F. Armstrong “Richard Armstrong” WCWC (Armstrong Family Papers, Williamsiana Collection, Williams College, Williamstown, Massachusetts) quoted in Engs, *Educating the Disfranchised and Disinherited*, 14

⁷³ Lindsey *Indians at Hampton Institute*, 2

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 3

health and physical strength. For instance, John Denison, Armstrong's first roommate, described Armstrong's appearance in this way:

[I]nto my introspective life nature flung a sort of cataclysm of health named Sam Armstrong.... He was a striking illustration of that Robinson Crusoe like multiformity of function that grows up perforce under the necessities of a missionary station. New England energy, oceanic breeziness, missionary environment, disclosed themselves in him.... He was a trifle above middle height, broad-shouldered, with large well-poised head, forehead high and wide, deep-set flashing eyes, a long mane of light brown hair, his face very brown and sailor like. He bore his head high, and carried about an air of insolent good health.⁷⁵

Not only did Armstrong's peers notice his difference, describing him as "Robinson Crouse," but Armstrong himself sensed that he stood out from his New England classmates. This difference made him embrace an outsider identity, although he desired to be fully accepted by his schoolmates. In a letter sent to his brother in Hawaii while studying at Williams, Armstrong showed his frustration: "I can never be Yankeeified."⁷⁶ Robert Engs, a historian of education, describes Armstrong's outsider experience: "Most of all, Sam very much wanted to fit in, and he became increasingly aware of his 'provincial' background and relative poverty compared to some of his classmates. Writing home, he lamented about the need to stitch his well worn trousers, and asked his brother Baxter... to send him money for new suits."⁷⁷

The Fellows, many of them from New York City, are genteel, dress well and exhibit polite manners; their society I value a great deal for its reforming

⁷⁵ Denison, "Address in Memory" quoted in Engs, *Educating the Disfranchised and Disinherited*, 29.

⁷⁶ Samuel Chapman Armstrong (SCA) to Baxter Armstrong, 17 May 1861, in Helen Ludlow, ed., "Personal Memories and Letters of General Samuel Armstrong" 1898, unpublished manuscript in Hampton University Archives, Hampton, Virginia, 128 quoted in Engs, *Educating the Disfranchised and Disinherited*, 31.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 31.

influence; and I need it because my manners at the islands became very poor and rough by my never mingling at all in good society.⁷⁸

Armstrong recognized his different background and considered that his “manners” were “rough” and “poor,” as he saw other students who belonged to elite white society. Here, we can see that he tried to be accepted by white society, but he was positioned as an outsider within white New England society. He was not outside of his race, but his Hawaiian childhood certainly differentiated him from other white missionaries in New England. Engs also explains that Armstrong’s need to be accepted by “the upper echelons of northern society”⁷⁹ would “remain with him all his life....”⁸⁰ The Hampton Institute provided a space for Armstrong to prove himself in his own way as a white man who could educate “inferior” races like his father who committed him to the missionary work in Hawaii. By creating the Hampton Institute in the United States, Armstrong, performed white missionary maleness in order to assimilate. The Hampton Institute was the ideal place for Armstrong’s Americanization-- for his particular racialization and gender socialization.

Hampton Institute for “Colored Students”

The ideology of Hampton as home base for Americanization was promoted in various domains of Hampton’s life; indeed, such ideology organized students’ everyday school and social experiences. In 1969, Francis Greenwood Peabody characterized Hampton’s education as “education for life” by referring to the following comment from Armstrong: “The only hope for the future of the South is in

⁷⁸ SCA, “At Williams College” and SCA to Ellen Armstrong, 22 Sept. 1861, both in WCWC quoted in Engs, *Educating the Disfranchised and Disinherited*, 31.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 31.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 31.

a vigorous attempt to lift the colored race by a practical education that shall fit them for life.”⁸¹ The education at Hampton exceeded the regular academic training; it attempted to transform various aspects of the students’ lives, aiming for “character building” in order for the students to be recognized as “good” U.S. citizens. In this section, I examine how this home ideology of Hampton functioned in the students’ everyday lives. My analysis mainly covers the consciousness of the school as an organization; I need to note that it is a different matter whether students accepted and acted on the ideology although some students advocated Hampton’s ideology, such as Booker T. Washington in the case of Tuskegee Institute.

Curriculum/Work at Hampton

Although the Hampton Institute began as a school to educate blacks in 1868, it also accepted Native American students between 1878 and 1923.⁸² Under the Peace Policy initiated by President Grant in 1868, the state started to promote Native Americans’ assimilation into American society. Engs explains that in 1874, some 150 Kiowa, Comanche, and Arapaho, who had participated in an uprising in the Indian Territory of Oklahoma, were incarcerated at Fort Mason, Florida. Their warden, Lt. Richard Henry Pratt, who commanded black troops during the civil war, did not agree to this unfair treatment. He petitioned the Indian Commission in Washington to release these Native Americans who were innocent and asked for “provision,” an education for those who were incarcerated. Because of his petition, fifteen of them were sent to the Hampton Institute.⁸³ The school continued its Indian

⁸¹ Peabody, *Education for Life*, xiii

⁸² Not only African-American and Native-American students, Hampton accepted a small number of Asian students as well.

⁸³ Engs, *Educating the Disfranchised and Disinherited*, 117.

program until 1923. Unlike the recruitment system for black students who voluntarily came to Hampton to be interviewed for admission, Indian students were “recruited” from various territories by Hampton and military officials. By the time that the Indian program ended in 1923, 1,300 Indian students were enrolled from 65 tribal groups.⁸⁴

In 1890, for example, when multiethnic education began to be provided, there were 692 students in total.⁸⁵ The nature of education varied according to race and sometimes gender. Black students usually received a three-year education in day or night schools. Since Hampton was not an endowed school, black students in particular had to engage in paid work that Hampton prepared in order to support their costs of living in the boarding school. Most of the Indian students, on the other hand, were fully supported for their three-year education by the government. Both day and night schools were divided into “junior,” “middle,” and “senior” classes. In these classes, students learned language (grammar, reading, spelling and writing), drawing, arithmetic, geography, zoology, bible study, history (including U.S. history), and other civics classes.⁸⁶ Students in the Normal School were encouraged to work in their home communities between their first and second years. The seniors were required to engage in practice teaching at the “Butler school,” which was designed for young black students on Hampton’s campus. Thirty-eight of the 133 Indian

⁸⁴ “Based on Hampton’s archival account, the largest tribal groups represented at the school between 1878 and 1923 were Sioux at 473, followed by Oneida, 194; Seneca, 112; Omaha, 64; Winnebago, 63; Cherokee, 61; and Chippewa, 51” Note 4 in Buffalohead and Molin, “A Nucleus of Civilization,” 60.

⁸⁵ The Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute. *Annual Reports For Year Ending June 30, 1890*, 24.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 36-47.

students studied in the Normal school, and the rest remained in the Indian Department.⁸⁷ There, English language, elementary geography, arithmetic, and a course called “First Steps in Scientific Knowledge” (“largely oral, in physiology and natural history. In connection with the former, the effects of alcohol upon the human system have been taught”)⁸⁸were offered for Indian students.

In addition to the academic training, all students had to acquire manual/industrial skills by working in the school, which differentiated Hampton from other boarding schools of the time. Alice Bacon, who was an Anglo American teacher at Hampton, divided the training into three categories: “(1) Those purely educational and which do not contribute to the support of the student (2) Those in which the industrial education of the worker is the chief object and support of the student is of secondary importance (3) Those in which the chief object is the support of the student in the school, or the work to be done, and in which industrial education is secondary.”⁸⁹ The work in category one included a “Technical Course in the Indian Training Shops” (carpentering, wheelwright, or the smithy over nine months) for Indian male students; “Winona household” (any work deemed necessary for Indian female students in the residence named “Winona”); and “Carpentering,” and “Cooking School” for Indian female students. The work in category two included “Indian Training Shops,” (carpentering); “The Harness Shop,” “The Paint Shop,” “The Shoe Shop,” “The Tin Shop,” “The Printing Office,” and “The

⁸⁷ According to the Hampton’s *Annual Report*, three (two boys and one girl) left during the school year and one student died in the year of 1890 (27).

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 29.

⁸⁹ The term “support of the students” that Bacon uses here refers to financial support (earning money) for the cost of living.

Blacksmith and Wheelwright Shops”; “Huntington Industrial Works” (carpeting and woodworking); the “Engineering Department and Pierce Machine Shop”; “The Girls’ Industrial Room (tailoring, shirtmaking, and dressmaking)”; and “the Girls Garden” for both black and Indian students. The work in category three included the “Household Department” (any work necessary for the living of teachers and students like cooking, cleaning, washing, and cleaning house); “The Teachers’ Home,” and “The Students’ Laundry”; two farms, “The Home Farm” and “Hemenway Farm”; and “The Saw Mill,” “The Knitting Room,” and the “Greenhouse” (gardening). Each task was done by both Indian and black students; the students sometimes worked full time or part time under the supervision of white teachers and occasionally black assistants.

Although these industries were open to both races, most of the industries were gendered. Outside work (or “professional work”) was practiced by male students and also supervised by male teachers; domestic work, such as cleaning, sewing, and washing, was taught to female students and conducted under the guidance of female teachers. Through the praxis of this division of labor, Indian students learned how the “normal” white genders were supposed to function and how gendered work should be done “appropriately” through the white male and female bodies but sometimes through the bodies of black students.

This manual labor and industrial education was not merely a means of earning money or acquiring industrial skills for the future. When Armstrong mentioned “industry,” it came from the “parlance of the missionary; he meant the development of ‘industrial habits,’ of self-discipline, which he thought that most

freedmen sorely lacked.”⁹⁰ Through the praxis of routine labor, Armstrong believed that the students’ bodies as well as their minds would be trained and “disciplined.” This “self-discipline”/bodily practice was considered a way of transforming the colored students into good Christian subjects. Armstrong stated:

... The real financial question as to manual-labor schools is this: Shall the expenses of teaching a student a trade, and making him self-reliant and manly, be met in the same way as is that of teaching him mathematics and Greek? It may cost twice as much to train the hands and head together as to train the head alone. Of course I will not pay in a money way but it will pay in a moral way. It will make them men and women as nothing else will. It is the only way to make them Christians.⁹¹

Armstrong’s desire to preserve universal Protestant morality (such as “industrial habits”) might have reflected the prevailing reactions/resistance against the forces of “mechanization” to every aspect of American life.⁹² Or, by teaching it to his own students, as I previously explained, he was also proving his white male identity in relation to the Other. This construction of white male identity was also reproduced in Oyabe’s life. For Armstrong, however, manual labor was oriented toward education; although he intended to utilize it for character-building, it also contributed to creating the productive citizens and workers that American society desired at the time.

⁹⁰ Ibid., 80.

⁹¹ Helen Ludlow, ed., “Personal Memories and Letters of General Samuel C. Armstrong,” 1898, unpublished manuscript in Hampton University Archives, Hampton, Virginia quoted in Engs, *Educating the Disfranchised and Disinherited*, 80.

⁹² Trachtenberg, *Incorporation of America*, 45. He explains that Protestants were threatened by the forces of “mechanism” and felt that it would destroy Christian moral values: “The prospect of mechanizing moral choice raised fears particularly among Americans clinging to a Protestant belief in free will, in the efficacy of human effort, and especially in the value of properly trained and disciplined ‘character.’ Preservation of a belief in a ‘moral universe’ in which rewards and punishments flowed from character and moral choice assumed an urgency in these years of massive mechanization.”

School Events and Commemorations at Hampton

Hampton's emphasis on "self-discipline" was also reinforced through the school's policy regarding time and events. How were the students' everyday schedules organized? What kinds of events, especially celebrations, were prepared and repeated annually? These daily and annual repetitions of events and routines should be analyzed in addition to the students' industrial education. The commemorations at Hampton, such as "New Year's Day" and "Dawes Bill Day," resulted in an annual reproduction of the official American narrative, which was embodied through the students' participation.

The students were quite busy following such a tight schedule. "[E]ach half hour or hour of their day was programmed"⁹³ from their start in the morning at 5:15 a.m. with the "Rising Bell" until "Taps" or "Lights-out" at 9:30 p.m. After breakfast at 6 a.m., school officials inspected each room. Male students had to form cadets, wear uniforms, and march to class, work, and service at chapel. Girls were not required to form cadets as their male counterparts did, but teachers and matrons in the dormitories always supervised them. Night school students also followed busy schedules. They worked for ten hours a day⁹⁴ and attended classes after they finished each day's work. Armstrong acknowledged the students' busy and tight schedules. Rather than reduce their workloads, however, he considered such demanding schedules a benefit to their learning capabilities:

But to the question 'Do your students have sufficient time to study all their lessons faithfully?' I should answer, 'Not enough, judging from the common

⁹³ Engs, *Educating the Disfranchised and Disinherited*, 106.

⁹⁴ The Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute. *Annual Reports For Year Ending June 30, 1890*, 34.

use of time; but under pressure they make use of the houses they have; there is additional energy put forth, an increased rate of study which makes up for the time spent in manual labor, while the physical vigor gained affords abundant strength for severe mental labor.' Nothing is of more benefit than this compulsory waking up of the faculties. After a life of drudgery the plantation hand will, under this system, brighten and learn surprisingly well.⁹⁵

Armstrong believed that by emphasizing hard work, the students would be able to climb the social ladder to be productive and responsible workers in society.

Events/commemorations practiced at Hampton became an annual routine. Teachers and students gained knowledge about what should have been celebrated and how events should be memorialized. As I explained in the previous section, the early stage of Hampton education engaged in this kind of training in addition to the industrial and manual labor training. Some of the commemorations were unique to the institute. For instance, in 1895, according to Alice Bacon, there were nine major events and commemorations celebrated on campus: Thanksgiving, Christmas, New Year's Day, Founder's Day (January 30), Dawes Bill Day (February 8), George Washington's Birthday Celebration (February 22), April Fools' Day (April 1), Commencement (the third week of May), and Decoration Day (May 31).⁹⁶ Some of the commemorations were religious, but most were also celebrated nationally. Two commemorations, however, New Year's Day and Dawes Bill Day, were unique to Hampton because they celebrated the "emancipation" of the races.

New Year's Day at Hampton may have appeared legitimate to mark the day for remembering the history of slavery, but the way that the commemoration was

⁹⁵ The Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute. *Annual Reports For Year Ending June 30, 1890* ("First Report of the Principal"), 4.

⁹⁶ Bacon, "General Armstrong and Hampton Institute," 640.

practiced at Hampton, according to the description by Alice Bacon, seemed to disrupt the historical continuity of the black race by highlighting the radical transformation of black culture. Bacon, a white teacher at Hampton wrote in 1895:

At the head of the procession, and in number growing smaller as the years go by, march the white headed 'Sons of Abraham' the survivors of those among the Negroes hereabouts who fought in the war. Their steps are growing feeble, their eyes dim, and soon the time will come when the last of these old Sons of Abraham shall have folded his toil-hardened hands and closed his sorrowful eyes forever; but while they live they will celebrate this Emancipation Day as the day that means the most to them of any in the whole year. These boys, standing in their solid ranks, with their neat blue uniforms, their silver buttons, and their happy, bright faces do not know, and never can know, what those bent, infirm old men are thinking as they head that Emancipation Day procession. *They are separated from them in many ways, more widely than we are from our ancestors of 200 years ago.*⁹⁷

Her description of the commemoration highlights the radical difference between the old and new times and, therefore, old and new blacks. Of course, the descriptions of young black students at Hampton, with “happy, bright faces” and “their neat blue uniforms” with “their silver buttons,” represent the new black race, the progress that the Institute had always wanted to promote. Another description of the commemoration also shows the discontinuity of the history of the black race:

...but who has not the power to meet these old soldiers on the common ground of their war experience: who knows their present, but whose life does not extend into their past. And so one tie that bound these old men to the school with its forward march is broken, and they will miss, so long as they live, the great man who has gone out from among us.⁹⁸

Bacon highlighted changes and transformations since the Civil War. As a result, young black students must have experienced a kind of difficulty connecting the present to their own past in this commemoration. Only a “great man” (a person like

⁹⁷ Emphasis mine. Ibid., 640.

⁹⁸ Ibid., 640-641.

Armstrong) could be the bridge that reconnects the historical discontinuity between the old and new black races.

The “Emancipation Day” for Indian students was “Dawes Bill Day,” celebrated on February 8, the day that Congress passed the Dawes Act. This act divided the lands of Indians into allotments for individual Indian families. Thus, “Dawes Bill Day” was a celebration of “Indian Citizenship Day” describing “...one to be marked by some exercise that will impress the past, the present and the future on their minds, and awaken them to a sense of their responsibility to their country and their people.”⁹⁹ The 1890 Annual Report of the school also describes how the Institute commemorated this day. Indian male and female students dressed in the “picturesque costume... recited appropriate quotations or gave original addresses.”¹⁰⁰ Also, as part of the day’s activities and because of their limited English-language skills, the Indian students “performed” the meaning of their “citizenship”:

Sometimes Columbia, seated upon a throne, asked representatives of all races who applied for citizenship, what they could do prove themselves worthy. Sometimes the traditional Brother Jonathan received a series of historical personages, each telling what he had done, or tried to do, for good of the country, or for humanity. In these performances as many of the Indian school as possible took part, so that a lively interest in the spectacle was created.¹⁰¹

In these historical reenactments, the Dawes Act was interpreted from the perspective of the state, not from the perspective of Native-Americans who eventually lost a vast amount of land as a consequence of the Act. The citizenship

⁹⁹ Ibid., 644.

¹⁰⁰ The Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute. *Annual Reports For Year Ending June 30, 1890*, (“Social Life of the Indians”), 50.

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

represented in this description reinforced a particular notion of citizenship, granted to people who could contribute to the state. It also implied that Native Americans were automatically positioned in debt. Although Native Americans did not offer anything good to the state, because of the state's "favor" (that was the Dawes Act), they were granted citizenship. This state discourse not only disrupted the historical narrative of Native Americans but also transformed it, determining what their future was supposed to be. Since they were in debt, they were requested to repay the state. The state's expectation that Indians would contribute to the state (or do good/valuable things for the state) shaped this model figure of the good citizen in the United States. The commemorations at Hampton, such as "New Year's Day" and "Dawes Bill Day" annually reproduced the state narrative and embodied it through the students' participations in these events.

Gender in (Concepts of Home/Family) at Hampton

In addition to strategically divided gender roles and labors practiced in industrial education, gender norms, partially in the spheres/concepts of home and family, were instilled in the social lives of Indian students. In these carefully designed environments, students were expected to learn what the "normal" home should have looked and felt like. The school, including black students, was concerned with the extreme masculinity ("much inherited manliness"¹⁰²) of Indian male students. The teachers made efforts to shift these students' interests to the legitimate concept of home and family because they believed that "home makes the

¹⁰² Johnson, "Social Life of the Indians," 70

man”¹⁰³ meaning that home was the beginning of Christian and American civilization.

Before establishing separate dormitories for Indian male and female students, Armstrong matched the Indian students with black student roommates in order to initiate the Indian students in emulating certain manners and behaviors. The teachers considered that black students, although their race was regarded as “inferior” to the white race, were much more “civilized” than Indian students because most of them were already partially assimilated as slaves in society. Eng claims that “the black males had to convince their Indian roommates to sleep on top of, rather than underneath, their beds; and had to remind them to put on all their clothing before leaving the room.”¹⁰⁴ This strategy of imitation sometimes worked fine, but it also created frictions between black and Indian students.

Even after placing Indian students in separate dormitories, the contacts between black and Indian students continued because black students were assigned as supervisors of Indian dormitories.¹⁰⁵ Booker T. Washington served as the first supervisor there. Indian male students learned appropriate maleness by watching the practices of student supervisors as well as other Indian classmates. The teachers matched the students in order to supplement each others’ characters and embrace “courtesy and politeness toward each other and unfailing thoughtfulness and courtesy toward their house-mother.” This acquisition of “normal” maleness in

¹⁰³ Ibid.

¹⁰⁴ Engs, *Educating the Disfranchised and Disinherited*, 121.

¹⁰⁵ “There are two janitors who, besides taking care of the building, are responsible for the quiet at night and order of the rooms. A senior Captain, ‘in charge’ has the general oversight and responsibility of all the boys” Johnson, “Social Life of the Indians,” 70.

relation to the concept of American family was considered important because “(m)any of them have had no home training.”¹⁰⁶ Oyabe’s Abuta Gakuen also provided a learning place where the Ainu children were able to learn the “Japanese way” by looking at how the Japanese teachers in the school behaved.

Furthermore, the concepts of home and family were taught in various ways in the Indian male dormitory. For example, in Winona, a dormitory of Indian students, there were three sitting rooms that were “always open for them,” and this openness of the house was designed to teach them the unity of family.

(T)heir assembly room, large sunny and warm, with checker board tables, games, daily and weekly papers, magazines and a small library of books, a comfortable lounge for the weary or sleepy. Opening from this is another room, smaller, but quite as bright, with open fire, books and plants and pictures, some big rocking chairs and another well used lounge. This room belongs to the lady who may be ‘house-mother,’ and is meant to be the living room, the center of the home. The recent enlargement and arrangement of these rooms has given openness to this family lie.¹⁰⁷

This description of the house illustrated what “home” should have been like. Various props in the house represented the perfect picture of home, for example, the atmosphere of home, and, more important, the “openness” of home. In these rooms, Indian students were allowed to play games and music for their pleasure in the morning until 8:35 a.m. and at night between 8:30 and 9:00 p.m. All props tied into the ideal concept of space as home. In reality, it also functioned to “break down the old tribal feeling and brought togetherness to this family life.”¹⁰⁸ The dormitory, and Hampton life in general, functioned as a text for the students to learn the requirements of being American citizens.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

Indian male and female students were usually separated from each other except during meal times, which happened three times a day, and during other festival events. This gendered spatial separation also served as a text for learning gender norms. The following description illustrates what gendered lives meant for Indian students. This is a scene of Indian male students returning to their dormitory after participating in an event organized by the Normal School's Debating Society:

The clock was on the first stroke of nine, and a Grant March had been announced that Winona for that time. So we found our way down again and had a pleasant walk, in the mild summer-like April air to the last—but it wasn't the least entertainment of the evening. On the way we had to pass the Girls' Cottage, and of course went in. The festivities of the evening seemed to have culminated in a treat of lemonade. The girls were seated about the parlors sipping the cooling drink and chatting merrily.¹⁰⁹

This describes an interesting contrast between the lives of Indian male and female students. It illustrates a scene in which the male students went to see the Debating Society event while the girls chatted in the parlor, enjoying the summer weather in Virginia. When the male students stopped at the female dormitory, the female students treated them nicely by serving lemonade. These limited interactions between the genders in separated spaces helped to promote the Victorian notion of femininity and masculinity.

Oyabe's American Experience in *A Japanese Robinson Crusoe*

When Oyabe came to the United States, the antagonism against Asians was apparent, particularly in California. Between 1895 and 1908, more than 130,000 Japanese came to the United States and Hawaii, and many of them were single male

¹⁰⁹ Chickering "Social Life," 49.

entrepreneurial laborers.¹¹⁰ Immigration to the United States was considered an important part of Japanese expansionism, which aimed to promote territorial, political, and commercial developments as a national cause.¹¹¹ However, anti-Japanese sentiment or the threat of “yellow peril” accelerated after the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882. Although many Japanese tried to distinguish themselves from the Chinese in order to avoid this antagonism,¹¹² the Gentlemen’s Agreement reached between 1907 and 1908 shows that the Japanese were not able to escape from being targets of racial exclusion. Japanese men, like Chinese men, were regarded as permanently foreign and queer¹¹³ because they were not qualified to be citizens (but allowed to be laborers) in American society.

Despite this racial exclusion, or because of it, Oyabe’s memoir describes his racial experience somewhat anomalously. In 1898, Oyabe completed his education

¹¹⁰ Azuma, *Between Two Empires*, 29.

¹¹¹ Azuma explains the diverse ideological backgrounds of Japanese immigration to the United States and identifies three currents of immigration that directly affected the development of Japanese America in the late nineteenth century (Azuma, *Between Two Empires*, 20).

¹¹² Oyabe was not exceptional. At a barbershop in New York City, Oyabe is scorned and almost refused service because he looks Chinese: “‘Aee, John, git out from here. Oi don’t cut a Chinaman’s hair!’ I told him that I was not such a man, but a Japanese. ‘Ou, ye Javanese, a country of lots of coffee! All right; sit dan, my goot fellar.’” (Oyabe, *A Japanese Robinson Crusoe*, 116). It is interesting that the barber thinks that Oyabe is Javanese, not Japanese and offers the service.

¹¹³ Lisa Lowe in *Immigrant Acts* claims that racialization of Asian Americans along the legal definition of citizenship can also explain the process of how they were gendered (how masculinity was ascribed to Asian Americans). David Eng in *Racial Castration* expands the notion of queer and argues that despite Asian Americans’ sexual practice, punitive immigration and exclusion laws disavowed their status as U.S. citizens and rendered them “queer.”

at Yale University. Just before leaving for Hawaii en route to Japan, he published his memoir,¹¹⁴ *A Japanese Robinson Crusoe*, from The Pilgrim Press in English.¹¹⁵

Regarding his experiences in the United States (especially places where he had studied), he almost exclusively describes his relationships with Anglo American male “genuine philanthropists.” The stories show not only his identification with them but also their acceptance of him. For example, Oyabe arrives in New York and moves to Virginia to attend a “large industrial school.” This school, although Oyabe does not mention the name of the school, was the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute established by General Samuel Chapman Armstrong, who was a commissioned officer in the Union Army during the American Civil War. Oyabe introduces the school in this way: “(i)t was exactly such an institution as I had looked for, and desired to establish for my people.”¹¹⁶ Oyabe sends a letter to Armstrong indicating his desire to attend the school. After a brief correspondence, they finally decide to meet at the Everett House on Union Square in New York City. Oyabe does not know Armstrong’s face, but he waits at the meeting place, looking for Armstrong. At first, Armstrong speaks to Oyabe: “Is this not my young man whom I love and am looking for?” Oyabe answers, “Is this the General?” The meeting

¹¹⁴ It is certainly debatable how this book should be or can be called. In this paper, I refer it as his “memoir.”

¹¹⁵ His memoir consists of twenty chapters and a preface. In chapters 1 through 3, he writes about his memories of his childhood in Japan (the time before he left for America) mainly in Akita, where he was born; Aizu, where he studied with his father; Tokyo, where he studied Western arts and philosophy in a government school; and Ezo, where he lived with the Ainu. In chapters 4 through 11, he writes about his experience travelling to the United States from Ezo and passing through Kurile Islands, Ryukyu Islands and China. The rest of the chapters (chapters 13 through 20) describe Oyabe’s experiences in America, particularly in New York City, Virginia (the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute), Washington, D.C. (Howard University), Hawaii, and New Haven (Yale University).

¹¹⁶ Oyabe calls the Ainu as “my people” in his memoir.

scene continues: “Now he (Armstrong) came to me and shook my hand. ‘Yes, Yes! Very happy to meet you, my son. Your thought in the letter which you sent me was very fine, too. I will look after you, and pay all your school expenses for you so far as I can. Come now with me to my home.”¹¹⁷ Armstrong accepts him into the school and secures living costs for Oyabe. Oyabe’s school life is described in a way that centers on his relations with Armstrong. There are almost no descriptions of other students at Hampton.

A similar narrative occurs when he chooses to study theology at Howard University in Washington, D.C. Using the same approach he used for Hampton, Oyabe sends a letter to President Jeremiah Eames Rankin of Howard University and expresses his desire to study at the school. In the letter, he asks President Rankin: “How can I learn Christian civilization among these wild Indians?” He then continues:

It is most astonishing to see *how the mind and heart of the true sons of God are drawn to each other*, as in the cases of David to Jonathan, and Paul to Timothy. Although I never met with the president, nor was recommended to him by any friend, yet, only by one communication, he looked through my heart at once, and knew this poor refugee from bottom to top. He answered my letter with the following words: ‘We have concluded that you can enter one of our departments...’¹¹⁸

In this correspondence between Oyabe and Rankin, Oyabe presents a mutual understanding because they are both the same “true sons of God,” who commit themselves to a similar duty: educating the “wild” races, such as Indians. Oyabe emphasizes his close relationship with Rankin in the various descriptions of his school life. For instance, Rankin calls Oyabe “Isaiah,” and Oyabe writes:

¹¹⁷ Oyabe, *A Japanese Robinson Crusoe*, 137.

¹¹⁸ Emphasis mine. *Ibid.*, 145.

Now, my American patron, the president, knew my heart better than my own parents; and the close friendship between the Doctor (Rankin) and myself was increased day by day. He called me "Isaiah," and I was often his page and companion whenever he was invited to various noted public meetings, and by his introduction, I met with several illustrious men of the day¹¹⁹

In the memoir, Oyabe's exclusive identification with Anglo American philanthropists such as Armstrong and Rankin appears natural because Oyabe deliberately determines what should and should not be told.¹²⁰ What is not told in his narrative is the nature of these schools. If he were to do so, Oyabe's identification with the philanthropists, and their acceptance of him (the presentation of mutual acceptance) would not be convincing, and they might be considered "fiction" or a "delusion" to the readers.

Between 1868 and 1925, Hampton also provided industrial and agricultural education to Native Americans. In the late nineteenth century, social Darwinism, like anthropology, spread widely in the intellectual community, and the discourse of an evolutionary racial hierarchy (the "civilized, semi-civilized, and savage paradigm"), which was in theory, supported by scientific evidence, was also popularized and implemented in U.S. society.¹²¹ It was white men's mission to "civilize" the "less civilized" or "uncivilized" races, such as African Americans and Native Americans, through education. Educational institutions like Hampton and Howard functioned as vehicles to convey civilization (especially morality, as well as productivity in

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 150.

¹²⁰ Watson analyzes the intricate politics of autobiography and explains the important relationships between the reader, the contents of autobiography, and the writer's identity: "what his reaction will be and how he responds will in turn depend upon his perception of himself, his sense of what the purpose of the autobiography should be, and what he chooses to reveal or hide" (Watson, *Of Self and Nation*, 13).

¹²¹ Baker, *From Savage to Negro*.

economic progressivism) to colored populations. Oyabe was one of those “colored” students to be educated by Anglo philanthropists. Instead of identifying with other colleagues, Oyabe constructs a picture in his memoir in which he is able to establish the equal and close relations with Armstrong and Rankin, and these educated Anglo philanthropists, in turn, accept him as their own colleague.

The lack of other Japanese students in Oyabe’s narrative serves to portray him as a unique and special figure as if he were almost “selected by God.” He similarly regards his time at Howard University. Instead of describing his classmates, he presents himself as a person who identifies with Anglo philanthropists, rather than with Native Americans or African Americans.

Western Anthropologists, the Japanese, and the Ainu

There were also competing narratives surrounding Oyabe and the Ainu. Oyabe, as a member of the major “Japanese” (*yamato*) ethnicity, constructed his ethnic identity as “superior” and “civilized” while constructing the Ainu as a subjugated ethnicity. In his memoir, what makes Oyabe and other philanthropists “similar” is the presence of “inferior” races, or the receptors of their care, kindness, and education. For Armstrong, Native Americans and African Americans at Hampton served as his subjects. For Rankin, African Americans served as subjects to whom he could provide a particular education. For Oyabe, it was the presence of the Ainu. In his memoir, he frequently describes his hope and desire to “save” and “educate” the Ainu. For instance, when he lives with the Ainu in Ezo for a short period of time before his departure to the United States, this is the reason he offers for leaving:

Just now we have no religion. The dark curtain of immorality and cruelty covers all classes of society. Charity is unknown even among worthy people.

The majority of them have no social standing and are treated but little better than brutes. For example, see the condition of your own people. In this glorious age you live as your ancestors lived a thousand years ago. Let me ask you why? Because none of our able and worthy men ever paid any attention to you, or gave any sympathy. In deed, this proscription, this galling yoke of bondage, must and shall be broken, if my heavenly Father will permit me to undertake the work...I must leave this country for the land of saints to learn first, under the guidance of my kind Providence, how to deliver you.”¹²²

Oyabe goes to the United States in order to learn Christianity and “deliver” or “save” the Ainu from their “poor” conditions. He distinguishes himself from the Ainu whose conditions have not changed for “a thousand years” (“uncivilized”) and appears as a “civilized” man who can teach what they need. The “inferior” or “uncivilized” races are the common metaphors that bind Oyabe and other Anglo philanthropists as a “similar” kind, a “civilized” kind, who can teach “inferior” races what to do

Oyabe needed the Ainu to present himself as a civilized man in order to challenge the American discourse of race that positioned him as uncivilized. In 1901, he established an elementary school for the Ainu in Abuta,¹²³ Hokkaido. The administration of the Abuta Industrial School was actually run by the local government of Hokkaido; however, Oyabe was an important figure in the school’s founding.¹²⁴ as a member of *Hokkaido Kyūdojin Kyūikukai*¹²⁵ and incorporated the

¹²² Oyabe, *A Japanese Robinson Crusoe*, 39-40.

¹²³ Abuta and Tōyason were joined and renamed as “Tōyakoson” in 2006.

¹²⁴ Oyabe assigned Ryujirō Shirai as school principal to implement his ideas. Twenty-eight hours of classes were offered each week, covering various subjects such as Japanese history, language, math, ethics, physical education, drawing, industrial arts, theories and practices of agriculture to the boys, and sewing to the girls. Oyabe taught at the school from its inception in February 1904 until 1909 and during this period the school trained approximately 600 students.

¹²⁵ *Hokkaido Kyūdojin Kyūikukai* was formed in May 1900 in Tokyo. According to Ogawa, the board members were politicians (Katō, Shimada Saburō, Ōkuma Shigenobu, etc), scholars (Tsuboi Shōjirō, etc), and educational authorities (Tsuji Shinjirō, Yumoto Takehiko, etc) (Ogawa, *Kindai Ainu kyōikuseidoshi kenkyū*, 150, note4). Yaguchi adds that other political figures such as Ninjō Motohiro, Itagaki Taisuke, Ōkuma Shigenobu, and Konoe Atsumaro,

Ainu into modern Japan. Oyabe also supported the *Kyūdojin hogo hō* (The Ainu Protection Act) in 1899 (See Chapter 2).¹²⁶

However, some European and U.S. anthropologists' perceptions of the Ainu were different and almost contradictory. It is important to address the matter here because the representational and conceptual gap can explain Oyabe's challenge to the Western discourse of race. For example, Frederick Starr (the first anthropologist at University of Chicago), who also had close relations with Oyabe, collected a group of the "living" Ainu for an exhibit at the 1904 St. Louis World Fair. James Vanstone, who researched the Ainu's exhibition at the exposition, points out that "(i)t is not completely clear where McGee and his associates may have thought the Ainu would fit into the evolutionary savage-to-enlightenment sequence."¹²⁷ Although the Ainu "magnified the racial characteristics that underlay Japanese progress," W.J. McGee thought that the Ainu's high quality of material arts had raised Japan to the "leading rank among the world's nations."¹²⁸ This interpretation shows that the Ainu were

and Ninjō headed the board (Yaguchi, "The Ainu in U.S.-Japan Relations," 99). Along with the prominent figures of the Meiji, Oyabe was one of the board members of the society. They held charity concerts in order to donate money to an elementary school (*Abuta Daini Jinjyō Shōgakkō*) as well as to the Hokkaido administration to establish the Abuta Industrial School. This industrial and agricultural school was for the Ainu children who graduated from the elementary schools. The primary mission of this society was "to save and nurture (*kyūiku*) the Ainu by providing them with the knowledge of industrial arts, technology, and agriculture and by teaching them the path to an autonomous life" (Ogawa, *Kindai Ainu kyōikuseidoshi kenkyū*, 150).

¹²⁶ Oyabe established the school for the Ainu but also supported *Kyūdojin hogo hō* (The Ainu Protection Act) in 1899, which drastically transformed the livelihood of the Ainu community. The Ainu's dependency on the Japanese government became inevitable after the implementation of the law.

¹²⁷ Vanstone, "The Ainu Group at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition, 1904," 90.

¹²⁸ McGee's "Anthropology" quoted in Vanstone "The Ainu Group at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition, 1904," 90.

regarded exceptional “savages” who raised the status of the yellow race, the Japanese.

Although where the Ainu fit in the process of civilization was a point of dispute, their status as “special savages” was exactly what Starr and other Western anthropologists wanted to see. Starr’s published field notes, *The Ainu Group: At the Saint Louis Exposition*—which visitors to the venue could purchase as a souvenir¹²⁹—offers his particular interpretation of the Ainu. The notes detail his trip from St. Louis to Hokkaido to “collect” the Ainu for the fair. Starr explains who the Ainu people are and perpetuates the images of Ainu people as “savage whites,” “curious whites”—someone who is close to white race but also “far”:

Who are the Ainu? Where did they come from? What is their past? They are surely a white people, not a yellow. They are more our brothers, though they live so far away, than of the Japanese, to whom, in place, they are so near. That is not to say that all men are not brothers; our meaning we think clear. We, white men, are fond of assuming an air of great superiority, when we speak of other people. We take it for granted that all white men are better than any red ones, or black ones, or yellow ones. Yet here we find *a white race that has struggled and lost!* It has proved inferior in life’s battle to the more active, energetic, progressive, yellow people, with which it has come in contact.¹³⁰

The images of the Ainu are constructed through white men’s desire to discover a “curious” white race. It is important to note that this “inferior” white race is a result of “contacts” with the yellow race, the Japanese. The Japanese contaminated the Ainu and made them “inferior.” The idea of the “inferior whites” as a result of Japanese colonialism seemed to be a main reason Starr did not agree with the

¹²⁹ Breitbart, *A World on Display*, 63.

¹³⁰ Italics in original. Starr, *The Ainu Group*, 110.

Japanese colonization of the Ainu.¹³¹ The image of “savage whites” has been perpetuated and represented through photography in books and popular media.¹³²

As I have previously explained, the education to the Ainu was an ineluctable part of Japanese colonial policy over the Ainu in the domestic context. However, Oyabe’s representation of Japanese subjugation of the Ainu can be interpreted as his challenge to international racial discourse while examining the life of Oyabe, who experienced the United States and international racial discourse, making the Ainu subjugated to the Japanese can be interpreted as his challenge to the discourse and an important strategy to present the Japanese as “civilized” in relation to the Ainu as well as in relation to the white race in America. Oyabe’s story evolves in the transnational landscape of racial discourse of the turn of the twentieth century and shows us the way in which the Japanese constructed their ethnic identity via relations to the West as well as to the Ainu.

Conclusion

I have examined the competing racial discourses in the United States and Japan at the turn of the twentieth century by focusing on the life history of Oyabe Zenichirō (1867-1941). Narratives around Oyabe are constructed along multiple

¹³¹ Oppenheim looks at the correspondences between Frederick Starr and Baron Ishii, Japanese Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs in 1911 and analyzes Starr’s relations to colonial Japanese government. The letters suggest that Starr advised Baron Ishii and told him how Japan should colonize Korea. Oppenheim describes Starr as “colonial adviser.” Here I see his inconsistency in the ideas about colonialism and imperialism. On the one hand, Starr encouraged Japanese government to colonize Korea; on the other hand, Starr was against the colonization over the Ainu. I think that the inconsistency was resulted from his different perception of the Ainu as “white” race.

¹³² Melvin Gilmore’s news article in *Omaha World Herald* (May 21, 1905) features the Ainu exhibition held at the 1904 St. Louis Exposition. The news title says, “Among the Ainu People-A Very Peculiar White Race in Japan: An Enigma to Anthropologists, They Are Believed to Be Our White Brothers.” Even today, the Ainu photographs that were taken at the exposition are still circulating on the Internet to explain the Ainu culture.

axes, and they play crucial roles in shaping his particular ethnic identity as a Japanese man. The Japanese modern identity was mediated by the exposure to the international racial discourse and simultaneously being shaped by the domestic relation to the Ainu.

First, there was a representational gap between U.S. racial discourse and Oyabe's representation of the self. The racial discourse at the turn of the twentieth century underpinned the hierarchical categorization of the civilized and the primitive. Ideas about race, gender, and human revolutionary progress intertwined and produced a dominant narrative of the civilized. Therefore, the racial discourse of the United States positioned Oyabe as Asian, which was considered "uncivilized" and "inferior" to the white race. For example, Oyabe might have chosen the universities where he studied, particularly Hampton and Howard University, based on his pedagogical interests. Nonetheless, Oyabe was not differentiated from other Indian and African American students in these institutions. In contrast to American racial discourse, Oyabe's memoir frames his experience as one of the fellows of white philanthropy. Hampton Institute, in particular, enabled him to explore the discourse of civilization and interact with Armstrong, who was a historical agent for producing a dominant narrative of the civilized.

Second, there were also competing narratives surrounding Oyabe and the Ainu. Oyabe as a member of the major "Japanese" ethnicity constructed his ethnic identity as "superior" and "civilized" while constructing the Ainu as a subjugated ethnicity. Oyabe established the school for the Ainu in 1901, and it resembled the Hampton Institute which he attended in the United States. In Oyabe's memoir and in

his life, the Ainu played an important role for constructing his particular ethnic identity, which attempted to challenge the western discourse of race. Some European and U.S. anthropologists such as Frederick Starr and William John McGee claimed that the Ainu were an “ancient” white race (the myth of “noble whites”) and used those narratives to criticize Japanese colonial policy over the Ainu. Although Oyabe was familiar with this Western anthropological knowledge, he instead argued for the superiority of the Japanese.

At the turn of the twentieth century, for Oyabe and for many other Japanese from the Meiji period through the Showa period, the question of how the Japanese fit into the international discourse of race was critical for constructing their Japanese ethnic identity. In the case of Oyabe, his Japanese identity particularly pivoted on his relations to the Ainu. When examining Oyabe’s life in the United States, which was exposed to the racial discourse of the turn of the twentieth century, his Japanese identity was constructed via particular relations with the West and with the Ainu.

Chapter 2

The Philosophy of *Jitsugyō*: Oyabe, Hokkaido Kyūdojin Kyūikukai, and Ainu Education Praxis

Introduction

Oyabe returned to Japan on December 25, 1898. After his return, especially the years between 1898 and 1909, relations with the Ainu preoccupied him. During this time, he devoted himself to “activism” for the Ainu, particularly through his political organization, *Hokkaido Kyūdojin kyūikukai* (Hokkaido Association for Saving the Ex-Primitives, hereafter *kyūikukai*). He was even called “*kyūdojin kyōiku neshinka*” (a devoted educator for the Ainu) in *Hokkaido Kyōiku Zasshi* (*Journal of Hokkaido Education*).¹³³ The main purpose of the organization was to provide education to the Ainu children. Oyabe played a crucial role in establishing and running *Abuta Jitsugyō hoshū gakko* or *Abuta Gakuen*, a supplementary industry school. The school centered on the idea of *Jitsugyo*, an idea that legitimized industrial and agricultural trainings for Ainu children.

In this chapter, I discuss Oyabe’s *kyūikukai* and its main educational project of establishing the Abuta School. I particularly examine Oyabe’s philosophy of *Jitsugyo* by putting it in the historical context of Japanese policy toward the Ainu. I also contrast his *Jitsugyo* with other Japanese educators’ ideas and experiences at the time, such as Izumi Munehiro and Yoshida Iwao. Oyabe’s pedagogy of *Jitsugyō* aimed to make the Ainu as laborers, farmers, and crafts-people. His anthropological interests and research enabled him to preserve Ainu culture. It did not, however, help to develop modern Ainu subjectivity. On the contrary, Izumi and Yoshida saw

¹³³“Dojin kyōiku ni kansuru chōsa” in *Hokkaido kyōiku zasshi*, no. 85, 43.

the limitations of Oyabe's *jitsugyō* pedagogy. Izumi publicly criticized Oyabe's ideas in *Hokkaido kyōiku zasshi* (*Journal of Hokkaido Education*). Despite the fact that Yoshida worked for Oyabe in *Abuta Gakuen*, he experienced the contradictory praxes occurring between Japanese education and anthropological research on the Ainu, which attempted to preserve their language and culture. Izumi and Yoshida, although unable to subvert the Japanese educational system of the time, recognized the limitations and imagined alternative Ainu education for developing modern Ainu subjectivity.

History of Japanese Policy toward the Ainu: From Buiku to Kyūsai and Jitsugyō

Oyabe returned to Japan from the United States on December 25, 1898. The late 1890s was a critical time for determining colonial relations between the Japanese and the Ainu. The final stage, which culminated in the establishment of *Kyū dojin hogo hō* (The Ainu Protection Act) in 1899, completed the institutional assimilation of the Ainu to Japanese society.¹³⁴ Through this law, a group of the Ainu became Japan's ethnic minority, subjects of the Japanese government's "protection." The Ainu were renamed "*kyū dojin*" in the Japanese language, a term that had remained in Japanese legal discourse until 1997. The Ainu, which literally means a "human" or "human being" in Ainu language, was transformed to "*kyū dojin*," the "primitives."

¹³⁴ The Japanese efforts of establishing the Ainu protection law started in 1893 when Katō Masanosuke, a *Kaishintō* politician from Saitama prefecture, submitted a proposal concerning Ainu protection. In addition, in 1895, Suzuki Mitsuyoshi (or Jūbi) proposed a similar protection law, but rejected it after the discussion in the Diet. Finally, on February 14, 1899, *Kyūdojin Hogohō* (The Ainu Protection Law) was passed in the thirteenth meeting of the Imperial Diet. For more details about the process of drafting the law, see Tomita, 1990, 47.

Oyabe was a “good incentive”¹³⁵ for promoting the paternal idea of “protection” toward the Ainu, as I will explain soon, but may not have been a central figure who directly influenced the drafting of the law because of his absence from the Japanese political scene. Nonetheless, Oyabe tried to show his continuous effort and involvement in the movement to establish the Ainu protection law. For example, in his “Hokkaido kyūdojin kyūikukai enkaku oyobi hōkoku (“The Development and Report of the Kyūikukai”),” Oyabe starts his narrative with his research on Native Americans at Yale University, explaining that his interests in the Ainu started much earlier. When he lived as a Christian minister in Hawaii between 1895 and 1897, he claimed that he proposed protecting and educating the Ainu to the Japanese government via Shimamura Hisashi, a Japanese envoy to Hawaii. In 1899, when Oyabe returned to Japan, Hoshi Tooru, a Japanese envoy to the United States who was residing in Washington, D.C., sent notifications to Kabayama Sukenori of the Ministry of Education, and Saigo Jūdō of the Ministry of the Interior, introducing Oyabe as “a candidate for a possible educator for the Ainu”¹³⁶ and requested an educational institution for the Ainu.

Despite nine years of absence from Japan, or because of his condition as an outsider, Oyabe attempted to place himself in the domestic circle of Ainu reformers. Oyabe sometimes purposely used the specific rhetoric of “brotherhood” in letters to Iwatani Naojirō, who was a school inspector of the Hokkaido government. He describes Iwatani as “taikei” (大兄 — a big brother— a designation of “you,” but

¹³⁵ Takamura’s *Shinban Ainu seisaku shi* quoted in Tomita, 1989, 6.

¹³⁶ Yoshida. “Ainu chōsa sho furoku sono ichi” (in the section entitled as “Hokkaido kyū dojin kyūiku kai abuta gakuen enkaku). *Obihiro sōsho* No. 66 (forthcoming).

only used in a letter of correspondence between men to show a certain respect) and called himself “shōtei”(小弟 — a small brother — a designation of “I,” also used only in a letter of correspondence between men to indicate a condescending attitude).

Oyabe lamented that people in Japan were not concerned about the Ainu and says:

Alas, why do people not feel apathy toward the Ainu? You must lament it. Even though *you* [taikei] are here, Japan is quite big. *Only you [taikei] and I [shōtei]* are concerned about the *shinmin* [imperial subjects, in this context, the Ainu]. And these two represent the conscience of forty million people. *We* have spent so much time. *We* can pursue *our* determination.¹³⁷

It might have been natural for them to build such an affectionate relationship because there were not many people who were even sympathetic to the Ainu situation at the time. The Ainu educational community remained small. Although he was absent from the Japanese scene, Oyabe became a recognizable Ainu educator in Japan.

***Jitsugyo* in the History of Japanese Policy toward the Ainu:
From The idea of “*Buiku*”撫育 to *Jitsugyō* 実業 and *Kyūiku* 教育**

The history of Japanese policy toward the Ainu prior to Oyabe’s return to Japan should be examined in order to understand not only the historical continuity of his ideas about “saving” the Ainu but also a shift from the Confucian policy of the Tokugawa period to the progressivism-oriented policy of incorporating the Ainu into Japanese society.

In the Tokugawa period, Ezo was absolutely considered “foreign” for most of the Japanese, but it was not too “far” to conduct cultural and commercial

¹³⁷ Emphasis mine. “Kyūdojin kyōiku neshinnka” *Hokkaido kyōiku zasshi*, Vol.85 (February 25, 1900), 43.

exchanges.¹³⁸ In fact, for nearly two centuries, (from the sixteenth centuries to the early nineteenth centuries) the Matsumae domain served as an exclusive agent for keeping contact with the Ainu through, for example, commercial trades and fisheries.¹³⁹ After nearly two centuries of establishing commercial ties with the Ainu, the critical shift in the system of Ainu administration occurred in the early nineteenth century. The Tokugawa shogunate established the Hakodate magistracy (*bugyō*) in 1802 in order to govern the region of Hokkaido. This political transformation deprived the Matsumae domain of its exclusive administration of the Ainu and required the Tokugawa regime to reorganize its governmental status within the regime. Therefore, the 1802 establishment of the Hakodate magistracy, Brett Walker argues, should be considered an opening of *kinsei*, the early modern period, as a critical move in incorporating the Ainu population and community systematically under the scheme of assimilation.¹⁴⁰

Based on this analysis, Walker argues that after the year of 1802, the Tokugawa shogunate policy toward the Ainu, was summarized as a Confucian policy of *buiku* 撫育, “to care, tend to, or show benevolence toward.”¹⁴¹ The Confucian policy of *buiku* made the Japanese officials believe that the Japanese had to “rescue” the Ainu from “a barbaric oblivion characterized by disease and starvation.”¹⁴² *Buiku* served as a legitimate philosophy/reason to colonize the Ainu, and not even

¹³⁸ Walker, *The Conquest of Ainu Lands*, 40.

¹³⁹ Ibid. Walker traces the historical process of how Japan absorbed Ezo and the Ainu from the sixteenth to the early nineteenth century and how Ainu became a minority of Japan from semi-independent people.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., 227-228.

¹⁴¹ Habuto Masayasu, *Kyūmei Kōki* quoted in Walker’s *The Conquest of the Ainu Lands*, 2001.

¹⁴² Ibid., 229.

critically influence Japanese intrusion into the Ainu communities. Walker also points out that “*buiku* developed into the Confucian equivalent of Western notions of the march of civilization, similar to European immigrants’ justification for colonizing Native Americans.”¹⁴³

Nonetheless, the policy of *buiku* was not processed thoroughly by the Tokugawa *bakufu*. It would be more accurate to say that the relations between the Japanese and the Ainu were not strongly established through this idea or the Confucian policy, but rather through the “proto-industry or capitalism”¹⁴⁴ of contract fishery. The *buiku* policy was translated into an avenue to develop the fishery and commercial trades with the Ainu. It provided the Ainu with “aid for the old, support to the people who did not have a family [such as the widowed, children without parents, and the old], and aid for the sick or disabled.”¹⁴⁵ However, *bakufu* policy never overcame the exploitation of Ainu labors by the Japanese. For example, in the system of *basho ukeoi*, a contract herring fishery, Japanese merchants were granted exclusive administration rights by the Matsumae domain to use/exploit Ainu laborers.

Moreover, the contact fishery of *basho ukeoi*, compared with other places, became an important contact zone where the Japanese and Ainu interacted through production. The Japanese established the system of *kaihō*, which originally aimed to “take care” of the Ainu who were poor due to their primitive livelihood. The Matsumae domain brought various products that the Ainu wanted, such as sake,

¹⁴³ Ibid., 229.

¹⁴⁴ Howell, “Proto-Industrial Origins of Japanese Capitalism,” 271.

¹⁴⁵ Takakura, *Ainu seisakushi*, quoted in Morita, “Meiji/minken shisōni tatsu ainu kyōikuron,” 175.

kimonos, tobacco, salt, and pottery, once a year in summer. The Ainu, in return for Japanese “*kaihō*,” provided products such as animal skins (bear, deer, sea otter, and seal), salmon, herring, and seaweed. Since the Ainu exchanged their products with the Japanese, the *kaihō* system was a ritual made of trade.

Walker’s analysis of the Confucian policy of *buiku* toward the Ainu does not extend beyond the historical framework of the early nineteenth century. However, *buiku* continued after the Meiji Restoration. The specific idea of *buiku* persisted, yet transformed, while Japan was exposed to modern and Western interpretations of civilization and progress. Oyabe’s philosophy of *jitsugyō* shows a continuity of the Confucian policy was disrupted because of industrialization and progress. The discourse of western civilization was particularly encouraged and voraciously absorbed into every aspect of the Meiji life. Oyabe’s project of “saving” the Ainu also uplifted the positionality of the Japanese.

After the collapse of the Tokugawa regime in 1868, the outcast members (generally called *eta* and *hinin*) and Tokugawa’s old peripheries, including the Ainu, together with ex-samurai were all legally incorporated into the Meiji imperial order and became imperial subjects. Once again, the Meiji government was required to reinterpret “the realm of civilization”¹⁴⁶ in order to claim Japanese sovereignty over Hokkaido against Russia¹⁴⁷ and to include ethnic others such as Okinawans and the

¹⁴⁶ Howell, *Geographies of Identity in Nineteenth-Century Japan*, 8.

¹⁴⁷ Although Russia recognized Japanese sovereignty over Hokkaido and the southern Kuriles in 1855, the border in Sakhalin remained undetermined until the Treaty of St. Petersburg of 1875. According to this treaty, Russia received the exclusive right in Sakhalin and Japan gained its sovereignty over the entire Kurile. As a result, the Japanese government relocated 841 Ainu from southern Sakhalin to Hokkaido and ninety-seven from the northern Kurils to the island of Shikotan (Ibid., 186).

Ainu. For the Ainu, however, what was important was the abolishment of *basho ukeoisei* in 1869, where many Ainu laborers were systematically exploited by the Japanese.

Howell points out that the abolition of social status cast all people in the same category of the “quotidian,” and they were equally subjected to a commercial market (capitalism) assuming the same responsibility to pay taxes and other duties. Howell summarized the three stages of how the Japanese government policy toward the Ainu evolved in the Meiji period. In the first stage, between the Restoration and the 1882 Development Agency (*kaitakushi*), “negative” policy was the main policy toward the Ainu, “attacking both Ainu cultural practices and what remained of the traditional economy without making more than a token effort to replace them.”¹⁴⁸ After the “negative” policy of bashing Ainu culture and destroying their traditional livelihood, the second stage (in the mid-1880s) was characterized as a stage of teaching farming and animal husbandry to some members of the Ainu community. The final stage, with *Kyū dojin hogo hō* (The Ainu Protection Act) in 1899, completed the institutional assimilation of the Ainu to Japanese society.

Ogawa claims that farming and education were the key vehicles of Japanese policy toward the Ainu in the Meiji period. By the 1880s (according to Howell’s categorization, this time during the second stage, in terms of implementing Japanese policy), the documentation that described various deprivations of Ainu communities were well circulated among Japanese officials.¹⁴⁹ In order to respond to the situation, the Japanese authority decided not only to provide food temporarily but

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., 178.

¹⁴⁹ Ogawa, *Ainu kyōikushi seido shi*, 53.

also to make the Ainu engage exclusively in farming. They lent the Ainu some lands to farm as well as seeds and the necessary farming tools. Only in the case of successfully cultivating the assigned lands, would the farming lands be given to the Ainu free of charge. In Nemuro Prefecture, this farming project started in 1883 and continued for five years, and it lasted for ten years, from 1885 to 1895, in Sapporo Prefecture.¹⁵⁰The farming projects forced the Ainu communities to relocate to locales which the Japanese authority selected specifically for them. According to Ogawa, this farming project was used as a political strategy to gather the Ainu communities in locales where Japanese officials found it easy to control and monitor them.¹⁵¹It is important to recognize that farming was the exclusive focus in changing the economic lives of the Ainu. The Japanese authority demoted not only the Ainu's traditional livelihoods of hunting, fishing, and gathering but also their recent economic lives as wage laborers.¹⁵²Howell explains the reasons farming was particularly encouraged for the Ainu: "This effort was in part motivated by a legitimate concern that Ainu wage laborers were vulnerable to exploitation (conditions at the contract fisheries had been abysmal, after all), but it also reflected a pervasive attitude that farming was the only truly worthwhile occupation available."¹⁵³

In addition to the farming project for the Ainu, education was emphasized as a way of "improving" the deprived conditions of the communities and "*kyūsai*" or "saving" them. Japanese officials determined the cause of poverty in Ainu

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 56.

¹⁵¹ Ibid., 56.

¹⁵² Howell, *Geographies of Identity in the Nineteenth Century Japan*, 181.

¹⁵³ Ibid., 180.

communities as the Ainu's "unsanitary," "not diligent," and "ignorant"¹⁵⁴ natures and considered that through Japanese education these Ainu natures would be changed and would eventually solve the problem of poverty in Ainu communities.¹⁵⁵ Only between 10 and 20 percent of Ainu children actually went to the Japanese schools.¹⁵⁶ The early educational efforts were not considered as successful. The failure of the early educational efforts invited more attention to the educational policy toward the Ainu.

At the same time, along with the Japanese effort to establish public schools for the Ainu, Christian ministries such as John Bachelor, particularly from the Anglican Church, also established Christian schools to "save" the Ainu. These Christian schools were governed by different principles than the Japanese schools held. Although Japanese schools taught subjects only in the Japanese language, the Christian schools taught in the Ainu language.¹⁵⁷ The Christian schools were established as a part of the missionary work of "*kyūsai*" or "saving" the Ainu and the Japanese. Both kinds of schools (Japanese and Christian) proposed to "save" the Ainu, but the contents or meanings of "*kyūsai*" the Ainu were articulated different by them: on the one hand, Japanese schools cared about the problem of poverty and focused on "autonomous" livelihoods or "self-sufficiency" through Japanese language acquisition and farming. On the other hand, the Christian schools focused on spiritual freedom through the doctrine of Christianity, allowing the use of the

¹⁵⁴ The original terms in Japanese are 「不潔」 ("unsanitary"), 「無気力」 ("not diligent"), and 「無知」 ("ignorant").

¹⁵⁵ Ogawa, *Ainu kyōikushi seido shi*, 107.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 110.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 110.

Ainu language at school. In the eye of the Japanese officials, the presence of these Christian schools could appear as an oppositional force that might have intervened with the Japanese policy.¹⁵⁸ It certainly ignited the Japanese officials' more systematic implementations of the Japanese public schools and made them prepare countermeasures against the Christian schools.

The 1899 *Shiritsu gakkōrei* (Private School Act) also put the Christian schools under its control. These schools started undergoing the Japanese officials' surveillance like other Japanese public schools. Furthermore, *kyūdojin hogohō* (Ainu Protection Law) and *kyūdojinjidō kyōiku kitei* (Educational Code for Ainu Children) advised these schools to follow the official standards such as a school curriculum and grading system. Eventually, the Japanese systematic control over the Christian schools made the Churches withdraw from school business in the Ainu communities.¹⁵⁹ Due to the abolition of the Educational Code for Ainu Children in 1922, and the revision of the Ainu Protection Law in 1937, all the Japanese Ainu schools were abolished by June 1937.¹⁶⁰

Hokkaido Kyūdojin Kyūikukai

A) Trip to Hokkaido

In November 1899 (the year that the Ainu Protection Law passed), Oyabe traveled to Hokkaido to visit Ainu villages and observe the conditions of the Ainu with his own eyes (*jissen kyūkō* 実践躬行) instead of “arguing or writing about Ainu

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., 112.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., 161-162.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., 371.

issues fruitlessly (*hōgen kōron* 放言高論)¹⁶¹ in the city of Tokyo. This trip was his second one since 1884, when he first went to Yūfutsu, Hidaka, prior to his departure to the United States. During this trip, he visited Muroran, Tōya, Noboribetsu, Azuma, Mukawa, Monbetsu, Biratori, and Sapporo and stayed with Ainu families in these villages.

During this trip, Oyabe observed how Ainu's livelihoods and culture were changed yet remained unchanged in the multicultural environments where the Ainu, the Japanese, and foreign missionaries all resided together. He was interested in observing Ainu culture and education, as well as health and disease conditions in the Ainu villages. He was particularly concerned about the negative consequences of cohabitation between the Ainu and the Japanese. He noticed not only Japanese influences over Ainu livelihoods (and vice versa) but also the influences from the foreign missionary.

Oyabe wrote a story about his visit to a poor Ainu family in Biratori for a newspaper article series that featured his Hokkaido expedition. A seventy-something elder, who was lying on the floor, immediately stood up when he saw Oyabe entered the house and politely greeted him with the Ainu's old-fashioned custom. Oyabe writes, "This situation reminded me of a poor samurai after the Meiji Restoration, the time of being overwhelmed by the new period of *Taisei bunmei* (Western civilization). The Ainu were like the poor samurai overwhelmed by various international forces (*shokoku no taisei*)."¹⁶² The scene of a poor Ainu elder overlaps with a poor samurai after the restoration, overwhelmed by the western

¹⁶¹ Oyabe, "Ainu buraku tanken 1," *Hokkaido mainichi shinbun*, August 22, 1900, 2.

¹⁶² Oyabe, "Ainu buraku tanken 5," *Hokkaido mainichi shinbun*, August 21, 1900, 2.

forces about thirty years ago. The samurai, compared with international standards, looked outdated and ignorant. Oyabe reused the rhetoric of “saving the poor samurai after the restoration,” which was the representative discourse of the early *jiyūminken undō*. The analogy of saving the ex-samurai in this context also works well because many low-class and deprived samurai migrated into Hokkaido to develop the barren land or start their own businesses around the 1880s.¹⁶³

At the end of his newspaper series “Ainu buraku tanken” (Expedition to Ainu Villages), Oyabe describes the necessary steps to help the overwhelmed Ainu and improve their living conditions. He criticizes the apathy of people who abandoned the Ainu and ignored them as *kegai*, as well as people who think that the Ainu are the disgrace of imperial Japan and need to be eradicated. By criticizing such cold heartedness, he attempts to remind the people of “*gikyō*” (chivalry) which, he claims, is the characteristic of the Yamato race. Then, Oyabe questions:

Why don't we have it (*gikyō*) now? Is it an exhaustion of the public mind? Does the prevalence of egoism suppress the spirit of *gikyō*? Or is it because the *Ishin's* great revolution destroyed the doctrine of *bushidō* and we still cannot find religious faith and discipline that replace it? I believe the biggest cause is the last one. Therefore, we need it. When the right time comes, all Japanese persons should be like Lee Wingston??, or [sakura] Sōgo, or [Yoshida] Shōin who was stirred up to justice (*gi*).¹⁶⁴

Oyabe was upset upon encountering the deprived and unchanged conditions of the Ainu communities. Throughout this trip, he was determined to devote himself to reform, particularly by engaging educational projects and promoting the cause in Japanese society.

¹⁶³ Hatate, “Nihon shihon shugi to Hokkaido kaitaku” in *Nihon Rekishi Kindai* 3, 340-314.

¹⁶⁴ Oyabe, “Ainu buraku tanken 7,” *Hokkaido mainichi shinbun*, September 8, 1900, 4.

B) A Procession to the Inauguration of *Kyūikukai*

The trip to the Ainu villages made from November 1899 to April 1900 in Hokkaido¹⁶⁵ assured Oyabe's long-term belief that the Ainu were in need of help, exactly as he had felt in his previous trip of 1884. After this trip, he returned to Tokyo and organized a political organization called "*Hokkaido kyūdojin kyūiku kai*" to start his Ainu "activism." On May 26, 1900, Oyabe and seven other people (including one Ainu) organized a public speech to discuss the issue of saving the Ainu in a western-style building called *Tokyo kirisutokyō seinei kaikan*—the building of the Tokyo Young Men's Christian Association in Kanda, Tokyo. This building was built in 1894 by Josiah Conder, who transformed the landscape of Tokyo into a modern city. He is now remembered as the "father of modern architecture."¹⁶⁶ This building was also a mecca of public forums and discussions in the Meiji period, which included the Japanese Christians' search for liberal theology and independence from the American YMCA.¹⁶⁷

The inauguration meeting was successful. More than 1,200 people gathered in the hall to listen to them.¹⁶⁸ The meeting was held for four hours from two to six o'clock. The speakers, including Saibara Seiō (1861-1939)¹⁶⁹; Ishikawa Yasujirō

¹⁶⁵ "Zatsuroku" in *Hokkaido kyōiku zasshi* Vol.159, 304.

¹⁶⁶ Horie, "Nihon Igaku Toshokan," *Igaku Toshokan* 32(3): 291. Accessed March 23, 2013: <http://www015.upp.so-net.ne.jp/reposit-horie/Nihon-igaku2.pdf#search='コントロール%20東京青年'>

¹⁶⁷ Davidann, "The American YMCA in Meiji Japan," *Journal of World History* 6(1).

¹⁶⁸ "Zatsuroku: Hokkaido kyūdojin kyūikukai enkaku oyobi hōkoku," *Hokkaido kyōiku zasshi*, No.159 (April 25, 1906), 25.

¹⁶⁹ Saibara was a *jiyūminkenka* (activist of the Movement of Freedom and People's Rights) and a lawyer. He was also selected as a Diet member of Shūgiin (House of Representatives) in 1899. In 1900, he became president of Dōshisha University. He moved to Texas to start farming. He was chosen as one of the "100 Tallest Texans who left their mark on Texas and the rest of the world in the 20th century" in 2000. The following is the introduction and his

(1872-1925); Tsuboi Shōgorō (1863-1913); Honda Yōichi (1848-1912); Katō Masanosuke (1854-1941); and Oyabe were a *jiyūminken* activist and lawyer, journalist, anthropologist, Christian minister and educator, politician, and Ainu activist, respectively. And at least three of them were Christians: Saibara, Honda and Oyabe. The meeting started with an opening remark by Saibara, who was selected as a member of *Shūgiin* (the House of Representatives) in 1899. Ishikawa Yasujirō, journalist and *kensei kai* member of the House of Representatives, selected in 1924,¹⁷⁰ had a speech about the theory of the Japanese nation. Oyabe talked about his fifteen years of hardship studying pedagogy for the indigenous population.¹⁷¹ Konusai, as a representative of the Ainu from Chikabumi, argued against the unfair and illegal takeover of the Chikabumi land by the Ōkura gumi (founded by Ōkura Kihachirō). Tsuboi, an anthropologist at the University of Tokyo, demonstrated that

contribution to the state of Texas. In 1903 Saibara came to Texas and began rice farming on a 1,000-acre lease near Webster in Harris County, which he later purchased. At that time the average rice yield from seed from Honduras or the Carolinas was eighteen to twenty barrels an acre. Using Japanese seed, Saibara obtained a yield of thirty-four barrels. These crops were the foundation of the multimillion-dollar rice industry, a mainstay of the Gulf Coast economy. In 1904 National Geographic magazine printed a photograph of Saibara and his son Kiyooki standing in a rice field in the Webster area. During World War II, Kiyooki Saibara was interned in a concentration camp because of his Japanese ancestry. All of his sons served in the U.S. armed services during that war. Kiyooki Saibara died in 1972, one of the most respected citizens of the Clear Lake area. (*Houston Chronicle*, November 5, 2001. Accessed May 16, 2011. *Houston Chronicle* Archives

http://www.chron.com/CDA/archives/archive.mpl?id=2000_3255943).

Saito brought his family and another thirty Japanese people to work together and established a Japanese Christian colony in Webster, Texas. (*Houston Chronicle*, "Peace of History: Cemetery a Poignant Reminder of Bygone Days," November, 1, 2001. Accessed May 16, 2011. *Houston Chronicle* Archives:

http://www.chron.com/CDA/archives/archive.mpl?id=2001_3350343)

¹⁷⁰ Research Navi at the Japanese National Diet Library accessed through the web on May 16, 2011: <http://rnavi.ndl.go.jp/kensei/entry/ishikawayasujirou.php>

¹⁷¹ "Hokkaido dojin kyūikukai hakkai shiki" *Yomiuri shinbun*, May 28, 1900, 1. Accessed May 16, 2011 the database of *Yomidasu rekishikan* on May 16, 2011.

the Ainu had “enough of capability to develop”¹⁷² by presenting their clothes and artifacts to the audience. Under the title of “Hogo hōan no seishin,” (“The Principle of Ainu Protection”), Katō claimed that the reason the population of the Ainu had decreased was because of the migration of *naichijin* (mainland Japanese). His argument was parallel to an example of U.S. racial history, in which the Anglo-Saxons had exterminated the Indians. By using the example of the United States, he argued that the problem was the lack of *kyūsai* (saving and nurturing) of the Ainu. This successful meeting generated widespread media attention and marked a formal inauguration of Oyabe’s *Kyūikukai*.

The first meeting of *Kyūikukai* was held in the official residence of *kizokuin* (the House of Peers—Konoe Atsumaro was chairman of the House from October 3, 1896, to December 4, 1903) on June 26, 1900. There, the fundamental structure of the organization, such as the prospectus of the organization and various officers, were discussed and determined. The participants selected Nijō Motohiro (1859-1928) as its president and selected six secretaries, including Oyabe Zenichirō, Katō Masanosuke, Tsuboi Shōgorō, Tsukamoto Dōen, (dates are not known),¹⁷³ Fukuoka Hidei (1871-1932),¹⁷⁴ Yumoto Takehiko (1858-1925),¹⁷⁵ and Shimada Saburō (1852-

¹⁷² Ibid., 1.

¹⁷³ Further research is necessary for his life, however, he was an agriculturalist and scientist. Tsukamoto and Inoue Masayoshi co-authored “Suisangaku” in 1904 (Tokyo: Hakuhinkan).

¹⁷⁴ Fukuoka Hidei (1871-1932) was a jurist who studied Law at Cumberland University in Tennessee. He also studied politics and administration in Europe. “Fukuoka Hidei, *Nihon jinmei dai jiten: Japan knowledge*” Accessed May 12, 2011. <http://www.jkn21.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/body/display/>.

¹⁷⁵ Yumoto Takehiko (1858-1925) was an educator. In 1886, he edited and published “Dokusho nyūmon,” which was ordered by Mori Arinori (the Ministry of Education). He was also an educator for Harunomiya, who thereafter became Taishō Emperor. In 1889, he went to Germany to study “kazoku ni kansuru kyōikugaku oyobi hōhō” (A pedagogy and method

1923).¹⁷⁶ In addition to these members, Matsumae Nagahiro, and Konoe Atsumaro were selected according to “Hokkaido yūdojin kyūikukai shushi (“Prospectus of Hokkaido yūdojin kyūikukai”).”¹⁷⁷ The meeting consisted of various kinds of people, including educators, politicians, lawyers, journalists, and an anthropologist and agriculturist. These *yūshi* (people with good will) from different fields gathered for the purpose of “saving” the Ainu. In this circle, Oyabe served as a representative of the association and advocated for the cause to gain wide support in Japanese society.

B) The Purpose of *Kyūikukai*

Kyūikukai was a political working association. The members of the group defined their own agendas and implemented them, instead of limiting their activities simply to academic research and discussion. The main purpose of the organization stated in “Hokkaido kyūdojin kyūikukai shui (“The Prospectus of Hokkaido Kyūdojin Kyūikukai”), encapsulates the idea of *kyūiku*: “to save and nurture” the Ainu. The purpose was stated as follows:

for the peers. After he came back to Japan, he was a editor of “*Kyōiku jiron*” in 1896 “Yumoto Takehiko, *Kokushi dai jiten: Japan knowledge*” Accessed May 12, 2011. <http://www.jkn21.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/body/display/>.

¹⁷⁶ Shimada Saburō (1852-1923) was a journalist and politician. In 1872, he became a translator/editor of *Yokohama Mainichi Shinbum*. As a leading member of Ōmeisha, he helped establish the political party of *Risshin Kaishintō*. In 1886, he was converted to Christianity by the efforts of Uemura Masahisa. He was selected as a member of the House of Representatives in 1890 and after that time, he was actively involved in social, political, and labor issues such as “Siemens Incident” and “Ashio dōzan kōzoku Incident” as a journalist as well as politician. In 1894, he was appointed president of *Mainichi Shinbum*. “Shimada Saburō, *Kokushi dai jiten: Japan knowledge*.” Accessed May 17, 2011. <http://www.jkn21.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/body/display/>.

¹⁷⁷ This document does not have a date of publication, but it was printed after September 12, 1902, when *kyūikukai* was officially approved as a *shadan hōjin* (association) by the Minister of Education. Tsuboi Shōgorō Archives (No.4125, 11-9-10) at Multi-Media and Socio-Information Studies Archives, The University of Tokyo Interfaculty Initiative in Information Studies Graduate School of Interdisciplinary Information Studies.

The Ainu, who are known as Hokkaido's *kyūdojin*, are a part of Japanese nation. Although they bask in the imperial stream of the Meiji Emperor, why do they receive little freedom? Why are they granted little happiness compared with others? One says that since there are no intellectuals in the Ainu society and many of them are ignorant, the Ainu do not possess the same capability as others. Others say that since they are not diligent people and many of them are actually lazy, the Ainu are not capable to walk and advance with other people. Are they really ignorant? What did the predecessors teach them? Are they truly ignorant? How did the former leaders lead them? They are not like the people who do not develop their capabilities after they receive education and guidance. If they are ignorant and lazy, it is a disgrace for the nation. It is also a disgrace for the nation that we do not care about them abandoning those people as they are. *Teach the Ainu. Lead the Ainu. In other words, let them gain freedom and enjoy happiness like others.* The idea of *Kyūiku* (saving and nurturing the Ainu) also serves for raising the *hin'i* (moral, status, or dignity) of the nation. We organize the people who are interested in the *kyūiku* of the Ainu, and name the organization *Hokkaido kyūdojin kyūikukai*. *Kyūiku* is not simply giving money and materials to the poor. Neither is it providing lessons to the youth. It is saving the deprived and to teach them to be self-sufficient through appropriate education. We avoid education that is not easily translated into the real world after graduation. This kind of work only results in exacerbating a sense of dependence. *The initial work of the organization is to build a school close to the Ainu communities and to provide industrial, technical, and agricultural education to them.* One of the advocates, Oyabe Zenichirō, not only has great sympathy toward the Ainu, but also has experience of teaching the undeveloped people. Oyabe has decided to take his responsibility to develop the Ainu and moved to Hokkaido to manage the school and improve the quality of the education. We have so many things to do. We plan things according to our financial capacity. Those who have compassion toward the Ainu, respect the nation, and care for humanity, please support our proposal, help us and actualize your thought through this organization.¹⁷⁸

The key term of *kyūiku* was used in a very limited context and usually referred to the relief and aid for the people who needed special kinds of help, for

¹⁷⁸ Emphasis mine. "Hokkaido kyūdojin kyūikukai shui," Tuboi Shōgorō Archives at Multi-Media and Socio-Information Studies Archives, The University of Tokyo Interfaculty Initiative in Information Studies Graduate School of Interdisciplinary Information Studies. (No. 4960, ID: TSAG 05293, 11-9-10).

example, aid to the poor.¹⁷⁹ The prospectus of the association explains the concept of *kyūiku* well: “*Kyūiku* is not simply giving money and materials to the poor. It is neither providing lessons to the youth. It is to save the deprived and to teach them to be independent (self-sufficient) through appropriate education.” The appropriate education included industrial, technical, and agricultural training, which Oyabe and others believed differentiated it from “education that cannot be applied to the real life.” Therefore, their education should be industrial and “practical” in the sense that education should be a means to become “self-sufficient” in society. Oyabe conceptualized the appropriate avenue for the Ainu’s participation in Japanese society solely through their labor, such as manual labor farming, and handicrafts.

Oyabe consistently tried to recruit new members who were willing to work for the cause. The list of the core members of the association changed according to the documents since new members were always welcome.¹⁸⁰ He recruited people who worked in various fields including politics, education, law, journalism, and academia. Their expertise and interests were differentiated from each other, but the association consisted of people who showed strong interests either in the Ainu or

¹⁷⁹ The Tokyo government started a new move in terms of poverty relief. They established the first *hin'in* (貧院 poorhouse) on April 6, 1869, in Mita to accommodate the vagrants who wandered in Tokyo. According to Ikeda, the number of people who were accommodated into the poorhouses was 5,586, which was almost equivalent to the combined number of *ex-hinin* and “*Gokugokuhin'min*” (the most poor) that accounted for over one percent of the population. *Hin'in* was renamed *kyūikujo* (教育所) on April 24 and two additional poorhouses were established in Kōjimachi and Takanawa, Tokyōfu, for the first time, spatially demarcated the poor from society and placed them in a segregated area. See Ikeda, *Nihon shakai fukushi shi*, 182-184.

¹⁸⁰ “Hokkaido Kyūdojin Kyūikukai nyūkai mōshikomisho” (“Membership Application Form for the Kyūikukai), Tuboi Shōgorō Archives at Multi-Media and Socio-Information Studies Archives, The University of Tokyo Interfaculty Initiative in Information Studies Graduate School of Interdisciplinary Information Studies (No. 4952~4959, ID: TSAG05286~TSAG05292; 11-9-9-1~11-9-9-7).

Hokkaido. As the prospectus of *kyūikukai* explicitly states, Oyabe reiterated that the Ainu's assimilation and their self-sufficiency totally depended on the efforts of the Japanese, and the success of the project promoted the positionality of Japan as a modern and civilized nation based on the international discourse of race.

C) Education for the Ainu: *Abuta jitsugyō hoshū gakko*

The first project of *kyūikukai* started with establishing an elementary school for the Ainu. The *kyūikujo* consisted of a place for industrial education, a students' dorm, and facilities for food and tool storage.¹⁸¹ This educational or *kyūiku* project was underpinned by the Ainu Protection Law enacted in 1899. In 1901, they received an unofficial notification of approval from the Home Ministry regarding this establishment of the school as well as their appointment of school teachers who would work there.¹⁸²

Oyabe traveled to Hokkaido to decide the location of the school. He chose Maruyama Village for the first locale, which is close to Sapporo. This plan was declined, however, by the Hokkaido authority (specifically by Shirani Takeshi who was the Hokkaido Councilor sent from the Home Ministry) because this decision was against the law that limited educational locations to communities with a large Ainu population.¹⁸³ In May 1901, Oyabe traveled again to Hokkaido to visit Oshima,

¹⁸¹ "Ainu kyūikujo sekkeisho" ("The Design of the Ainu Kyūikujo"), Tuboi Shōgorō Archives at Multi-Media and Socio-Information Studies Archives, The University of Tokyo Interfaculty Initiative in Information Studies Graduate School of Interdisciplinary Information Studies (No.4125, 11-9-10).

¹⁸² Yoshida. "Ainu chōsa sho furoku sono ichi" (in the section entitled as "Hokkaido kyū dojin kyūiku kai abuta gakuen enkaku). *Obihiro sōsho* No. 66 (forthcoming).

¹⁸³ The Maruyama plan that was aborted in the process is discussed in *Shin Sapporo Shishi* (Chapter 6: "shakai mondai no shosō").

Iburi, and Hidaka and selected Abuta as the location of their school and *kyūikujo*. He thought that Abuta was a perfect location for agriculture and fishery.¹⁸⁴

In the same year, Hiram M. Hiller was visiting Japan from Philadelphia to make “zoological ethnographic collections”¹⁸⁵ for the University of Pennsylvania. As a translator of English and Japanese, Oyabe accompanied him for the trip to Hokkaido. Hiram and two others from Philadelphia (William H Furness III, and Alfred C. Harrison) made the first collection trip to Borneo in 1895. This was their second trip back to Borneo to enrich the university’s Asian collections.¹⁸⁶ Oyabe also brought Shirai Ryūjiro, who would become a principal of the school. The selection of Abuta was finalized in the councilors’ meeting, which was held on August 30, 1901. They also obtained approvals from the Home Ministry and Ministry of Education,¹⁸⁷ to be granted a land that would be used for school and agricultural training.

Oyabe moved on September 1, 1901, with his wife and small son to Abuta to commence *Abuta dai ni kōjō shōgakkō* (Abuta No.2 Normal Elementary School) and *kyūikujo*. Before this school was established, the Ainu children in Abuta were enrolled in *Abuta dai ichi jinjō kōtōshōgakkō*. Three of them had already finished its normal course, and seventeen of them were transferred to the Abuta No.2 Normal

¹⁸⁴Oyabe thought that Abuta was a perfect location for agriculture and fishery because it faces the Uraga bay in the south, agricultural land in the east, and mountains in the north (Yoshida Iwao Archives, *Hokkaido kyūdojin kyūikukai abuta gakuen enkaku*—this is also printed in *Abuta gakuen hō* No.1 and No. 2 published in January 1910 and February 1910 respectively).

¹⁸⁵Katz, “Borneo to Philadelphia” in *Expedition* 30(1), 1988.

¹⁸⁶Ibid.

¹⁸⁷Yoshida. “Ainu chōsa sho furoku sono ichi” (in the section entitled as “Hokkaido kyū dojin kyūiku kai abuta gakuen enkaku). *Obihiro sōsho* No. 66 (forthcoming).

Elementary School.¹⁸⁸ Although the construction continued from December 1901 until completion of the building in April 1902, Oyabe allowed his residence to be used as a school for the kyūdojin children. Oyabe assigned Shirai Ryūjiro as principal of this school, who graduated from Tokyo Imperial University.

The *Abuta dai ni kōjō shōgakkō* provided a four-year education.¹⁸⁹ Due to the establishment of this Ainu-only school, the school that had been located in Abuta since 1884 (it added *kōtō ka*—an advanced or higher course renamed *Abuta jinjō kōtōgakkō* in 1897 and *Abuta dai ichi jinjōkōtōgakkō*, Abuta No.1 Higher Normal School in 1907) lost its Ainu children.

In 1905, Oyabe received an approval from the Ministry of Education to build an additional *kyūikujo* for the Ainu children who had finished this four-year elementary school education. It was a “*jitsugyōhoshūgakkō*” (supplemental industrial school)¹⁹⁰ that provided training in agriculture, woodworking, and sewing specifically for the girls. Oyabe was appointed by the *kyūikukai* as a representative of the school, Ōgoshi Renji as a teacher in charge of subjects (a department chair), Shirai Ryūjirō as an agriculture instructor, and Nakayama Katsuragi (or Keiji) as a sewing instructor.

D) Curriculum and Activities of Abuta Gakuen

Abuta Gakuen provided a three-year education in total, targeting the Ainu students who had graduated from the normal elementary schools. (The first semester was from April to June; the second semester was from September to

¹⁸⁸ Moritani, *Abuta son shi*, 1919, 169.

¹⁸⁹ Moritani, *Abuta son shi*, 1919, 170.

¹⁹⁰ “Hokkaido kyūdojin kyūikukai Abuta gakuen enkaku” in *Hokkaido kyūdojin kyūikukai abuta gakuen hō* Vol. 4, released in April, 1910.

December; and the third semester was from January to March). They also had to be older than ten years.¹⁹¹ There were students from the Abuta region and its neighboring village, Usu, who commuted to school from home. Students collected from other villages, such as Tokachi, Kushiro, and Iburi, were placed in a boarding house, and they lived with the school teachers. The numbers of the boarding students varied depending on years, but they were approximately twenty.¹⁹²

Another Yoshida essay (“Kokoro no ishibumi”) records that in total only twenty-two students came to the school from different parts of Hokkaido over three years.¹⁹³

Abuta Gakuen provided twenty-eight classes per week for each grade of students. The subjects included morals, Japanese (including geography of Hokkaido and Japanese history), arithmetic, agriculture, gymnastics, drawing, manual arts (handicrafts), and practical training in agriculture. The first-year class consisted of nineteen Ainu students in total: eleven students who graduated from *Usu dojin shōggakō* and eight from *Abuta dojin shōgakkō*. The school hours were all day long. Students usually spent their mornings (four hours) learning subjects and afternoons on their agricultural and industrial training. Boarding students worked in Abuta (outside of the school) as apprentices in various shops of blacksmith, carpentry, woodwork, and Japanese wooden sandals making.¹⁹⁴

In addition to the regular curriculum, they had various activities such as school trips, singing and organ music, playing games like *karuta*, and informal discussions at night, and participation in the *dōsōkai* (a meeting of graduates of

¹⁹¹ “Jitsugyōbu jitsujyō hoshūgakko no soku dai 2jō” (*Abuta gakuen hō* No.1).

¹⁹² Yoshida. “Danchōroku” in *Obihiroshi shakaikyōiku sōsho* No.6, 21.

¹⁹³ Yoshida. *Kokoro ishibumi*, 35-36.

¹⁹⁴ Yoshida, “Danchōroku” in *Obihiroshi shakaikyōiku sōsho* No.6, 21.

Abuta dai 2 jinjō shōgakkō). Every Saturday night, Yoshida Iwao, a teacher of the school, and the Ainu students spent their evenings together discussing Japanese historical events and Ainu stories and myths.

As a principle, the Ainu children studied in their school. Nonetheless, occasions such as the mentioned *dōsōkai*, night study, sports day, military style gymnastics¹⁹⁵ and *arei* exercise¹⁹⁶ allowed the Ainu and the Japanese children to study together beyond normalized segregation praxis. It is important to mention, however, that the flow of interaction was not mutual; usually, the Ainu children visited the Japanese to join their activities. Because of financial reasons and the volcano of Usuzan, this school had to be closed in 1909.

E) Philosophy of *Jitsugyō*

At the turn of the twentieth century, the praxis of *Jitsugyō* prevailed in Japanese society under the accelerating development of Japanese industrialism and capitalism.¹⁹⁷ *Jitsugyō* is a “subordinate” concept that encompasses agriculture, the manufacturing industry, and commerce/business, and it pairs with the educational philosophy of *jitsugaku*, which emphasizes practical, elastic, and transferrable education and value into praxis: industry. The *jitsugyō gakkō* (industry schools),

¹⁹⁵ For example, Ega Torazō wrote in his journal dated as May 24, 1910: “honjitsu ha *rengō undōkai* ni tsuki kangei, shukuji tō wo kakukoto ni natta... sho [hiru---added by Matsumoto and Fujimura] yori tomo ra ha *dai ichi gakkō* he heishiki taisō wo narai ni ikeri...” (I ended up writing a welcome and congratulatory speech because today we have a *joint sport festival* ... After lunch, my friends went to *dai ichi gakkō* [Abuta No.1 Elementary School] to learn the militaristic gymnastics. Emphasis mine). Ega, “Nikki 4: Abuta gakuen nisshi” in *Obihiro shōsho* Vol.37, 65-66. (Emphasis mine).

¹⁹⁶ Ega Torazō wrote in his journal (May 25, 1910) that he went to *dai ichi gakkō* [Abuta No.1. Jinjō shōgakkō] to study the military gymnastics as well as *arei* [wooden dumbbells] exercise. Ega, “Nikki 4: Abuta gakuen nisshi” in *Obihiro shōshō* Vol.37, 66.

¹⁹⁷ Naganuma, “Kindai nihon no ‘jitsugyō’ gainen: Hōtoku undō no saikent no shitsuyōsei,” *Jiyugaoka Sanno College Bulletin*, No.41, 2008, 83-93.

according to *Jitsugyō hoshū kyōikuron* published in 1894, were expected to promote agriculture, industry, and commerce by applying scientific knowledge as well as to support various regions' businesses.¹⁹⁸

Oyabe's Ainu Industrial school, Abuta Gakuen should be contextualized in the economic and political environment of the turn of the twentieth century. Oyabe promoted Ainu education, particularly the industrial education of the Ainu as part of the national *takushoku* (development and colonization) project in Hokkaido. The school was expected to educate the aborigines and promote high productivity in Hokkaido. It is also important to note that the *takushoku* project in Hokkaido was one of the primary national policies.

Synchronization with other national moves certainly made Oyabe's work easier and translatable. However, his *jitsugyō* philosophy developed out of his American experience studying at Howard University and Hampton Institute. Whenever given an opportunity, Oyabe recalled his American experience and attempted to reproduce or apply it in Japan. For example, Oyabe argued for the efficiency of *jitsugyō* by referring to his experience with Samuel Armstrong of Hampton Institute in the United States:

Reflecting that I went to an industrial school to work with "Armstrong" to be trained an actual method of saving and nurturing the aborigine, the education of the aborigine is not an education of theory, but a practical education that builds a small society in the premise of a school. If a student in a department of livestock farming butchers a cow, the meat is sent to students in a different departments who study beef cooking, and the bones goes to a plant to produce fertilizer artificially. Students are paid in exchange of those labors. Their money are deposited to a model bank, and everything can be purchased through the bank account. In this way, students are given socially organized education (students are socially educated). Because of

¹⁹⁸ Ibid., 89.

that, as soon as the graduates of the school return to their villages, it brings a great effect to the villages.¹⁹⁹

Oyabe was also a strong advocate for educational segregation between the Japanese and the aborigines like many other Japanese educators of the time. It was no doubt that they all agreed on the idea of segregation, but Oyabe articulated his reasoning uniquely based on an “anthropological” interpretation of the Ainu. For examine, Oyabe claims in a speech delivered at the meeting of an educational association in Otaru, Hokkaido:

Observing elementary schools in Hokkaido which mix the *naichijin* (the mainland Japanese) and the aborigine together to educate, it is unreasonable. One party still possesses a brain of two thousand years prior; and another possesses a brain that has been developed for two thousand years. For instance, there is a difference between undeveloped and developed lands; on the developed land, a seed sprouts by being given a fertilizer, but on the undeveloped land, the fertilizer gives little effect. It is not right to blame the aborigine; whether aborigine education succeeds or not solely depends on education itself.²⁰⁰

For Oyabe, the segregation system that educated both parties of the Japanese and the aborigine separately in different schools was necessary to uplift both parties properly since their intellectual capacities were considered different. Oyabe set up this segregation system and boundaries that both parties could not easily transgress.

Criticism against Oyabe’s Pedagogy of *Jitsugyō* and the Possibility of Justice Education

A) Izumi Munehiro’s Pedagogy

¹⁹⁹ “Oyabe tetsugakuhakase no enzetsu” in *Otaru kyōikukai hōhokusho*, released in March 1901.

²⁰⁰ Ibid.

The significance of Oyabe's educational philosophy is the emphasis on vocational training for the Ainu to make them laborers, farmers and craft-persons. It was assimilation with limitations that incorporated the Ainu into general Japanese society in specific ways. It was also a new method of teaching when it came to the Ainu education, but not everyone agreed with Oyabe's philosophy.

Izumi Munehiro, a former principle of *Muroran jijnjō shōgakkō* (Muroran Normal Elementary School), was a noted Ainu educator who showed a strong opposition to Oyabe. Izumi's main argument focused on Oyabe's philosophical statement in the news: "I affirm that the main purpose of Ainu education is to cultivate workers who are diligent and thoughtful." Ignited by Oyabe's statement, Izumi first argued that Oyabe's statement implied that the Ainu were not innately diligent. Izumi defended the Ainu by explaining Japanese exploitative history over Ainu laborers and the consequent conditions in which the Ainu had been forcefully affected by the lowest class of *wajin* people. While Izumi partially agreed with Oyabe's emphasis on *tokuiku* (moral education) rather than *chiiku* (intellectual training), he proudly proclaimed: "I affirm that the main purpose of Ainu education is to cultivate the *chūkun aikoku no tami* (the people of loyalty and patriotism) who are thrifty and know a sense of honor."²⁰¹

Second, Izumi challenged Oyabe's comment made specifically on current Ainu education as follows:

Oyabe says, 'Looking at the current Ainu education, the authorities use a similar pedagogy to the one used in a normal (*kōjō*) elementary school. Foreign clergy tend to teach their own culture and an indolent life without labor. The former results in cultivating a rural pedagogues (*sonpūshi*) who

²⁰¹ Izumi, "Oyabe shi no kyōiku bikō wo yomu," *Hokaido kyōiku zasshi*, Vol.163, 57.

wears *haori hakama* (a formal wear), and the latter may create an adverse influence that helps to cultivate the poor youth who just rely on people's charity and donation. I expect the authorities to reflect on the issues.'²⁰²

Izumi argued against Oyabe's comment by pointing out the fact that "twelve Ainu are currently learning in Hokkaido government teachers schools and twenty-three Ainu men and women are working as missionaries" and positively evaluated these great improvements made possible by the government as well as by the foreign missionary. Izumi bashed Oyabe's philosophy which limited its pedagogy only to the acquisition of labor rather than allowing the Ainu to receive justice in society. He enlightened Oyabe on the fact that rights among the people were drastically different than they had been under the previous feudal society. Izumi described that Oyabe's philosophy resembled to the feudal way of thinking and, therefore, his idea was "*bōron*" ("irrational" or even "violent"). He claimed:

The Ainu are equally the Japanese nationals. It is different from the old time, thirty or forty years ago. Since all people are equally imperial subjects, they hold the rights of *shiminbyōdō* (four classes are equal). As long as they have wealth and intelligence, they hold the rights to proudly discuss their governance in the legislature. If there are moral Ainu people who want to work for themselves, we should help and lead these people to pursue their will. This is the work for the people who have true sympathy toward the Ainu. It is *bōron* ("irrational" or even "violent") that you do not allow these Ainu people to exercise justice in society by exclusively making them laborers. This is exactly like a treatment that a *shijin* (samurai) gives to a *heimin* (commoner) in a feudal society. I have to say this is extremely absurd and immoral.²⁰³

Izumi strongly criticized Oyabe's pedagogy of *Jitsugyō* because it limited the Ainu's performance and ability to fully participate into Japanese society. Instead, Izumi argued for egalitarian education in order to produce and support the Ainu moral

²⁰² Ibid., 57.

²⁰³ Ibid., 59.

intellectuals and activists (He even mentioned the possibility of Ainu's political participation in the legislature!). And, Japanese educators should have believed the Ainu's capabilities and possibility to rise independently in general society.

B) Yoshida Iwao and Abuta Gakuen

Oyabe established the school as the "ideal" place to materialize his educational philosophy. Although he was the representative of the school until 1909, during his stay in Abuta, he was more occupied with publicity, hosting visitors from other parts of Hokkaido as well as Tokyo, visiting Tokyo for fund raising, and archeological research on Ainu lands. Yoshida Iwao (1882-1963) and Shirai Ryūjirō were important figures who helped Oyabe to maintain this *Abuta Gakuen*. Yoshida, throughout his life, worked as a teacher in various Ainu schools. At Abuta Gakuen, he served as a department chair (*kyōiku shunin*) and a proxy of the school representative between September 1907 and April 1911.²⁰⁴ Shirai was a school teacher at Abuta dai 2 jinjōshōgakkō.

Oyabe and Yoshida maintained a teacher-student relationship. Yoshida greatly respected Oyabe and assisted his research²⁰⁵ and work (ranging from cataloging earthenware and stoneware²⁰⁶ that Oyabe collected; revising and making

²⁰⁴ Yoshida, "Danchōroku" in *Aikyō sōshi: Obihiroshi shakaikyōiku sōsho* No.6, 21.

²⁰⁵ For example, Yoshida writes about Oyabe's research on Abe Hirafu's remains close to Yotei zan in his journal (November 12, 14, 15 in Meiji 40) in *Obihiro sōsho* No.23: *Yoshida Iwao nikki dai* 4, 254 . Oyabe also researched his family genealogy of Shiratori and asked Yoshida's help (for example, January 23, February 22, 23, 24, 25, 27 in M42. When Oyabe was writing about a myth of korobokkuri, he was asked to provide the materials that Yoshida collected in Tokachi.

²⁰⁶ Yoshida's journal on June 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, July 1, 2, 5, M42 reprinted in *Obihiro sōsho* No.24: *Yoshida Iwao nikki dai* 5.

his letters, writings, and essays²⁰⁷ including cleaning and polishing his resume²⁰⁸; and organizing lists of the *kyūikukai* members, seeding, weeding, fertilizing his potato²⁰⁹, onion,²¹⁰ cabbage and eggplant²¹¹ and daikon²¹² gardens to cleaning up Oyabe's house²¹³) as well as his family matters including supervision of Masayoshi's (Oyabe's son) daily study work,²¹⁴ as needed. Yoshida called Oyabe "sensei" in the journal that he kept almost every day and compiled detailed memories with Oyabe in "Danchō roku"²¹⁵ and "Sentesu wo kataru (seikō udoku shō)."²¹⁶ Especially in "Sentesu wo kataru (seikō udoku shō)," Oyabe was described as a "tesujin" (intellectual or philosopher), and the conversations that he had with Oyabe and the activities that they did together were narrated in great detail. Since the work that Yoshida did for Oyabe was so extensive, and his experience might have been overwhelming, Yoshida frequently expressed exhaustion and frustration resulting from his busy schedule, that he could not afford the time to conduct his own Ainu research.²¹⁷ Because of Yoshida's meticulously preserved records, his writings help current researchers reconstruct the project of Abuta Gakuen.

Yoshida's Distress: Torn by His "Double Mission" Positionality

²⁰⁷ Yoshida's journal on July 28, M42, p.71; on July 31, M42, p.72; August 3, M42, p.72; August 31, M42 (gakuen enkakushi). *Obihiro sōsho* no.24: *Yoshida Iwao nikki dai* 5.

²⁰⁸ Yoshida's journal on June 24, July 5, M42. Ibid, 67.

²⁰⁹ Yoshida's journal on June 4, M42. Ibid., p.63.

²¹⁰ Yoshida's journal on July 21, M42, p.70.

²¹¹ Yoshida's journal on July 22, 23, M42, p.70.

²¹² Yoshida's journal on August 12, M42; August 23, 24, 25, pp.83-85.

²¹³ Yoshida's journal on July 28, M42, p.71, on July 30, M42, p.72; on August 3, M.42, p.72.

²¹⁴ Yoshida was asked to supervise Masayoshi's (Oyabe's son) daily study work described in parts of Yoshida's journal (For example, August 3, M42, p.72)

²¹⁵ Yoshida, "Danchōroku" in *Aikyō sōshi: Obihiroshi shakaikyōiku sōsho* No.6, 21-26.

²¹⁶ Yoshida, "Sentesu wo kataru (seikō udoku shō)" in *Aikyō sōshi: Obihiroshi shakaikyōiku sōsho* no.6, 26-48.

²¹⁷ Yoshida describes that he helped Oyabe even "scarifying his own work" (Yoshida's journal on July 11, M42, in *Obihiro sōsho* 24: *Yoshida Iwao nikki* 5, 68.

As a Japanese colonial educator for the Ainu, Yoshida Iwao expressed paradoxical feelings in various essays, such as “*Hokkaido senjūmin ni tsuite*” (“Regarding the Hokkaido Indigenous People”)²¹⁸ and “*Ainu ni kansuru zatsuwa*” (Miscellanea about the Ainu”).²¹⁹ His two positionalities—as a Japanese teacher working to discipline the Ainu to become like the Japanese and as an ethnographer who collected, investigated, and preserved their culture, language, and history—appeared contradictory. On the one hand, Yoshida was responsible for transforming the cultural praxis of Ainu children into “Japanese” ones for progress and civilization; on the other hand, he was keen on preserving the “native” culture of the Ainu as an ethnographer. What makes this story worth examining is that Yoshida was acutely aware of the double-edged affects of his positionality. That is why he was deeply distressed—he was aware of the contradictions of Japanese colonialism.

Yoshida described his paradoxical positionality as being committed to the “double mission of destruction and construction.”²²⁰ He confessed that what he did as a Japanese teacher was the “destruction” of Ainu culture and simultaneously the “construction” of Japanese culture. He was tremendously distressed because he was not able to resolve the paradox as a Japanese teacher, and he participated in the

²¹⁸ It was originally a manuscript of his speech for The Obihiro Library Local Lecture (Obihiro toshokan kyōdo kōenkai) held on November 7, 1936. From November 10 to 15, it was released as a 6 article series in *Tokachi mainichi shinbun*. Also, it was reprinted in *Aikyō sōshi: Higashi Hokkaido Ainu koji fūdo shiryō (Obihiroshi shakai kyōiku sōsho no.4)* in November 1958.

²¹⁹ It was originally published in *Kamikawa chūgakkō gakuyūkai zasshi* in July 1912, and reprinted in *Aikyō sōshi: Higashi Hokkaido Ainu koji fūdo shiryō (Obihiroshi shakai kyōiku sōsho no.4)* in November 1958.

²²⁰ Yoshida, “Hokkaido senjūmin ni tsuite,” 36.

“mission of destruction” for his entire life. Yoshida powerfully confessed his experience of being trapped and torn by his dual missions, and the tremendous distress that resulted from his experience:

I spent five years in Iburi, three years in Hidaka, and twenty years in Tokachi. To be precise, for thirty years and three months (from August, 1906 to November, 1936), if you exclude my past full five years of seclusion, for twenty something years, I taught in *dojin*²²¹ elementary schools and a *jitsugyō hoshū gakkō* (vocational supplementary school). Because of that, time and opportunities to ceaselessly experience the real lives of the Ainu were given, and my life was blessed when it came to resource collecting and organizing. However, in order to fulfill my mission of being a teacher or a juvenile officer, I always always [sic] had to overcome psychological contradictions and various unreasonableness and difficulties due to *the double missions of destruction and construction. From the point of conscience, I am troubled even now from not being able to change my principle/position.*²²²

Right after his confession about being trapped in his “double mission,” he concluded that “the double mission” was contradictory in principle and that it was impossible to find equilibrium. The un-equilibrium between “the double missions,” and perhaps the forceful weight on “the mission of destruction,” troubled him for his entire life.

Yoshida’s regret, frustration, and distress of not being able to change his principles or even challenge the dominant discourse, or simply his “conscience,” made him more committed to Ainu research. Yoshida insightfully articulated why

²²¹*Dojin* is now a derogatory term for describing the indigenous populations. There were many terms the Japanese used to refer to the Ainu in the Meiji period. The Development Agency of Hokkaido (kaitakushi) in 1878 decided to call the Ainu as *kyū dojin* (ex-indigenous people) although the Ainu also became equal subjects under the emperor due to the political reforms made through the Meiji Restoration. By marking and registering them as *kyū dojin*, the discrimination against them had continued. The term of *dojin* had existed in Japanese legal discourse until 1997 when the *Hokkaido Kyū Dojin Hogohō* (The Ainu Protection Law) was abolished (Historical Museum of Hokkaido, *Kindai no Hajimari [The Early Modern Era]*, 44).

²²² Emphasis mine. Yoshida, “Hokkaido senjyūmin ni tsuite,” 36.

the double missions were contradictory. He even confessed that un-equilibrium and his “conscience” connected him to Ainu research for the rest of his life:

When I, as a same individual, on the one hand, faced them [the Ainu] as the object (target) of education, on the other, forced them to be the object of research, I was deeply troubled all the time. The linchpin of education was to assimilate the primitives entirely (in every aspect). The linchpin of research was not to intervene with the native and primitive conditions and rather to investigate faithfully while preserving them. To find the intersecting (matching) points of or harmony between the both projects had been consistently impossible. *I am no longer in the position of the former. However, my conscience still does and forever will tie me to the latter; I have to confess that consciousness constrains my future.*²²³

This passage in particular needs to be recognized as an affect of Yoshida’s Ainu school experience. An affect invites other affects. As Sedgwick explains, “Affects can be, and are, attached to things, people, ideas, sensations, relations, activities, ambitions, institutions, and any number of other things, including other affects. Thus, one can be excited by anger, disgusted by shame, or surprised by joy.”²²⁴ Yoshida was haunted by his distress for quite a long time, and in his inability to overcome his distress he inevitably recommitted himself to researching the Ainu culture and language. This inevitability was another affect of his distress, which influenced him for his entire-life.

Yoshida’s “Unspeakable” Affect in Japanese History Class and the Intersubjectivity of Despair

Yoshida’s conflicts in his “double positionalities” were highlighted while he was teaching Japanese history at *Abuta Gakuen*. His internal conflicts and distress became “unspeakable” and unbearable for him when realizing Japanese colonial history from the side of the Ainu, from the side of the people in Ezo, who were

²²³ Emphasis mine. Yoshida, “Hokkaido senjyūmin ni tsuite,” 36.

²²⁴ Sedgwick, *Touching Feeling*, 19. Kindle edition.

invaded by Japanese conquerors. Articulating the unsolvable contradictions of his double missions silenced as well as distressed him—knowing the narrative from “the other side,” from the side of the Ainu, while, as a Japanese teacher, his responsibility was to tell a Japanese colonial story as national history. He described how this experience was “unspeakable,” and he could not justify his position as a Japanese teacher because he had articulated the contradictions within Japanese colonial schools. However, he still had to uphold his role as a Japanese colonial teacher in public. Later in his life, he confessed this unbearable distress and actually cried for the unreasonableness of Japanese colonialism by empathizing with the Ainu’s subalternity:

In history, whenever I encounter a word of Ezo, a kind of unspeakable feeling [iubekarazaru] invokes. Moreover, when I speak in front of the pitiful party (karera--- in this context, the Ainu children), a drop of tear inevitably comes out. We say *Ezo* [the people of *Ezo*] rise in rebellion or we take revenge or attack *Ezo*. These are not wrong as our national history. Nonetheless, speaking from their side, from the people who were expelled as *kegai no tami* (people of *kegai*), it is a reality that they think their native land had been invaded and damaged. That’s why they rebelled. In this case, their rebellion was not absolute violence, but to some extent, it could be interpreted as a self-defensive vendetta. This interpretation is not necessarily a justification that is too affected by them. We should greatly feel compassion for them. Moreover, in the current situation which impartiality is guaranteed under the emperor [*isshidōjin*], they should not be excluded as *kegai no tami*. If exclusion exists, it is too lamentable to bear it. *I am so filled with emotion that I cannot speak about the situation.*²²⁵

At a very particular moment in class, Yoshida provided time and space where Ainu children could express their own emotions and feelings. All the Ainu students cried over their history, and some Ainu students explicitly uttered their frustrations,

²²⁵ Emphasis in final line added. Yoshida, “Ainu ni kansuru zatsuwa” in *Obihiro shi shakai kyōiku shōsho* Vol.4: *Aikyōshōshi, tōhokuhokkaido Ainu koji fūdo shiryō*, p.31. This tattle originally appeared in *Kamikawa Chūgakkō gakuyūkai zasshi* in 1912.

oppositions, and desire for vengeance against the Japanese conquest (certainly under the limited conditions). While the Ainu children constituted their subjectivity by speaking and crying, Yoshida deconstituted his subjectivity by being silent. However, both Yoshida and the Ainu students shared a moment articulating the contradictions within Japanese colonialism, coupled with a simultaneously unsolvable despair with Yoshida.

For instance, Yoshida told the story of Sakanoue Tamuramaro in his history class during a third session on November 16, 1908. Sakanoue Tamuramaro, along with other ancient and medieval Japanese heroes such as Yamato takeru no mikoro, Abe no hirafu, and Minamoto no Yoshitsune, are considered significant Japanese historical figures to the regions of Tōhoku and Hokkaido. These heroes are frequently depicted, narrated, and memorialized, especially in modern historiographies, essays, and historical documents regarding those regions.²²⁶ Sakanoue Tamuramaro was appointed by Emperor Kammu in 791 to expel the native people of northeastern Honshū called “Ezo.” Due to the military success controlling the region, he became the first recipient of the title “*sei taishōgun*” (“barbarian-subduing generalissimo”).²²⁷ Kikuchi Iwao, who is a historian of *Hoppōshi* (Northern History), points out that regional consciousness has been synchronized with the viewpoint of conquerors rather than with the ones being conquered. The espoused history of the Ezo Conquest (*Ezo seibatsu*) has consisted of the core of identity/consciousness of the people in the Tōhoku region. Kikuchi

²²⁶ Kikuchi, *Kita nihon ni okeru tamuramaro, yoshitube densetsu no kindaiteki tenkai*, kagaku kenkyūhi hojo kin, kiban kenkyū (C) kenkyū seika hōkokusho, 1.

²²⁷ “Sakanoue no Tamuramaro, *Encyclopedia of Japan: Japan knowledge*.” Accessed May 17, 2011. <http://www.jkn21.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/body/display/>.

further analyzes that this historical consciousness of the Ezo Conquest has underpinned the collective sense of “nationalism” from locality, from the region of Tōhoku.²²⁸

In the subsequent class, after Yoshida taught the story of Sakanoue Tamuramaro, he unexpectedly changed his teaching schedule and asked the students how they felt about the conquest history and what they would have done if they had lived in the time of Tamuramaro’s conquest. While he told the Japanese audience who gathered to listen to his lecture that their essays were affective, he tried to disguise his experience with Ainu students in order to make it sound like an authentic Japanese colonial narrative. Aware of the potential critiques of being too affective with the Ainu, he switched back to the positionality of a Japanese colonial officer, justifying that the purpose of hearing the voice of the Ainu was for his research and to know the Ainu better for colonial projects:

On one occasion, when I told the historical evidence about generalissimo Tamuramaro’s conquest of *Ezo*, I gave them an assignment to write under a theme of “Alas, Tamuramaro generalissimo” in order to find out their honest thoughts. I received something interesting and extremely touching. I cannot reveal the contents of their essays here; however, in the Meiji emperor’s period, I believe that it is significantly worthwhile to investigate what kind of mettle they have in the brains of the second classed nationals.²²⁹

From this statement, we can understand that Yoshida was definitely curious about what Ainu children thought about the Japanese conquest history of Ezo. However,

²²⁸ Kikuchi has several essays on historical legends and myths particularly in Tōhoku, but an essay on Tamuramaro is entitled as “‘Ezo Seibatsu’ to chiikishi ninshiki: Tsugaru chihō no tamuramaro densetsu wo chūshinni” in *Rettō shi no minami to kita: Kinsei chiikishi fōramu*, 241-264.

²²⁹ Yoshida, “Ainu ni kansuru zatsuwa” in *Obihiro shi shakai kyōiku shōsho Vol.4: Aikyōshōshi, tōhokuhokkaido ainu koji fūdo shiryō*, 33.

his intention in creating a particular moment is difficult to determine. Again, it could be for the purpose of colonizing the Ainu or for documenting the psychology of the Ainu as an ethnographer.

According to Kikuchi's explanation, Yoshida's teaching of Tamuramaro to the Ainu children should be considered a determined act of imprinting Japanese consciousness. However, a lot more was happening at those moments of implementing Japanese consciousness. Yoshida was silent and distressed, wetting his eyes with tears ("a drop of tear inevitably comes out"), while the Ainu children also cried and showed their resistance. They both shared the moment of despair as an affect of the contradictory projects of Ainu schools under the Japanese colonialism.

Yoshida discussed his experience teaching Tamuramaro to the Ainu in his personal journal. His journal records this class as follows:

In third session, history, we talked about the Sakanoue Tamuramaro. In the following fourth session, using the time assigned for handicraft, I suddenly wrote on the blackboard: "Alas, Sakanoue Tamuramaro Generalissimo." I asked each one to write whatever they think. Each one cried after they finished writing.²³⁰

Although Yoshida was reluctant to share specifically what Ainu students wrote for this assignment, he kept clean copies of their essays. When this assignment was given, some students had already taken the conquest story as their own and took the conqueror's view as I will show here. They consequently showed their appreciation for Tamuramaro's conquest because they understood that his conquest and control over the Tōhoku region [called Ezo] theoretically led to the current

²³⁰ Yoshida, *Yoshida Iwao nikki* No.5 (*Obihiro shōsho* Vol.24), 42.

progressive situation (although his conquest had been made in the eighth century) in which the Ainu were incorporated into the modern Japanese nation. For example, a first-year student who was thirteen years old at the time, said, “Alas, I would have become an ancestor of Tamuramaro and beaten up the bad people. If Tamuramaro did not have existed, we would not be there. It is truly grateful that we had Tamuramaro.”²³¹ Another first year student expressed his appreciation toward him in this way: “If Tamuramaro Generalissimo had not existed, we would not have neither studied in school and nor felt relaxed. If I had been there at that time, I would not have fought in war. Instead, I would have studied and done other things. Our ancestors did a truly stupid thing. Ah, it was really good that we had Tamuramaro Generalissimo.”²³²

While some Ainu children calmly accepted and even appreciated the achievements made through the Tamuramaro’s conquest over the Ezo, other students revealed not only their frustrations about Tamuramaro’s merciless violence toward their ancestors and land but also strong opposition and resistance against him. It is also important to note here that they understood that opposition to Tamuramaro might have been “disrespectful” to the emperor and, by extension, to the state. Therefore, it simply should not have happened. Nonetheless, these students accused Tamuramaro of violence toward their ancestors. For example, a student in his third year in school who was thirteen years and five months old at the time, wrote:

²³¹ “Ā, Sakanoue Tamuramaro shōgun.” Yoshida Iwao Archives, Obihiro City Library. These children’s essays are also used in Kokuni’s “Ainu kyōiku ni okeru kokuminka to minzokuka,” 83-84.

²³² Ibid.

Generalissimo, this is way too much.²³³ You are such a violent generalissimo who attacked our residential *kuni*. It is way too much that you destroyed our ancestors' houses. Generalissimo, please listen to me carefully. Just because of you, only you, generalissimo, we are now in a very small land of Hokkaido, being laughed by *wajin* [the Japanese]. Don't you have love for us? If you do, please take care of us kindly. I heard that you and our ancestors fought in war to a great extent. We attacked and also were attacked. If I had been there at that time, I could have killed you and gotten your head [as a sign of our victory]. Ah, it is too unfortunate [that I could not have done]. Oh, I have written something bad. Even though I have written something disrespectful to the emperor, this is not about him. I am writing to the generalissimo. Please forgive me, the emperor. Perhaps our ancestors did not know the existence of the emperor. In my mind, I believe they fought in war just because they thought that you came to attack their *kuni*.²³⁴

On the one hand, this student showed his acknowledgement of how he was expected to respond to the story of Tamuramaro (he even said to the Meiji emperor, "Please forgive me") because Tamuramaro is considered a Japanese historical hero who fought under the order of an emperor; on the other hand, the student explicitly disapproved of Tamuramaro's violence against the region and aggressively expressed his vexation and revenge against Tamuramaro. He was very careful not to sound too oppositional to the Japanese emperor system and the current assimilation politics of the states, but he eloquently framed his oppositional consciousness to Japanese history and the state.

²³³ Writings of Ainu children are not always grammatically correct. I translate their essays in order to make sense of the meanings. If I have to speculate meanings or find "errors" in terms of Japanese language grammar, I signal those places and put my interpretations as well their original sentences. The first sentence goes in his original essay: "Shōgun, anmari muri dewa naika (将軍アンマリムリデハナイカ)" I think what he means here is this: "Shōgun anmari dewa naika (将軍アンマリデハナイカ--- "Generalissimo, this is way too much!"). Also see, Kokuni, "Ainu kyōiku ni okeru kokuminka to minzokuka," 83.

²³⁴ Yamada (anonym) quoted in Kokuni's "Ainu kyōiku ni okeru kokuminka to minzokuka," 83-84.

Oyabe's Vision for Ainu's Future

In 1909, Oyabe submitted a formal recommendation on the issue of Ainu protection, "Hokkaido kyūdojin hogo ni kansuru kengi," to local as well as national authorities. He wrote this recommendation after he had worked at the Abuta Gakuen in Hokkaido and returned to Tokyo for financial and health reasons. He was frustrated by the Ainu's situation, which had not been ameliorated much, he thought, because of the lack of serious support of people who wanted to physically work (emphasis on praxis) instead of having insincere and empty arguments. In the recommendation, he frames the issue of Ainu protection as a serious "ethnic and moral issue of the nation," and asks for immediate and effective help from the governments.

In his recommendation, Oyabe outlines three reasons the government should protect the Ainu and suggests two concrete methods of helping them. First, Oyabe sheds light on a moral aspect of the issue. It is morally "imperative" for the government to aid the population of 17,000 who live in Hokkaido. Oyabe criticizes the people who do not work, letting the foreigners and Japanese volunteers work for the Ainu.

He also disagrees with the idea that individuals should not get involved in social enterprises because such endeavors are the territory of the authority. He says, "it is the biggest loss of the state if we underestimate the philosophy and labor of volunteerism." He claims that by setting up a relief committee, by dealing with the Ainu morally, the protection simultaneously becomes a moral and spiritual education of the nation."

Second, Oyabe brings up a reason for *takushoku* (*kaitaku* and *shokumin*—land development and colonization). He writes that to have undeveloped people is a loss of the state the same as having undeveloped lands. Therefore, Oyabe argues that it brings a profit to the state if we transform the indolent to the diligent through education. To educate the Ainu helps development of land and people, and eventually increases the power of the nation.

As a third reason, Oyabe discusses sanitary problems among the Ainu and the threat of transmission to the Japanese community. He analyzes that since diseases such as tuberculosis, syphilis, and eye and skin troubles are prevalent in the Ainu communities, if Japanese society doesn't take care of the diseases, it would bring considerable damage to Japanese migrant populations—perhaps even destruction of the Japanese species.

In addition to the three reasons to protect the Ainu, Oyabe proposes two concrete methods for saving them. One is to build a special committee in Hokkaido government to engage in areas of education, sanitation, relief and aid, promotion of industry (*kangyō*) as well as of academic research on the Ainu. Another is to gather Ainu villages in one or two locations such as Abuta in the east and Mukara or Shiraoi in west and build an office, elementary school, and industry-promoting institutions, such as agriculture, fishery, and livestock farming. He also lays out his argument that the land of the Ainu should be granted to them rather than lent to ensure land ownership by the Ainu.

At the end of his recommendation, Oyabe indicates that the measures for the Ainu can apply to other places, such as Sakhalin, Taiwan, Manchuria, and Korea,

which required Japanese protections in order to appeal the urgency and importance of Ainu issues. The parallel to other Japanese colonies shows Oyabe's tactful strategy situating the Ainu as subjects of Japanese expansionism at the turn of the twentieth century.

Conclusion

Oyabe's life between 1898 and 1909 was significant in the sense that he devoted himself to "activism" for the Ainu. He returned to Japan in 1898, and his "activism" received special attention soon after his return from the United States. He was completely away from Japan for approximately nine years, therefore, he needed to resume correspondence with other Ainu reformers and participated in the circle. Oyabe actively worked for the Ainu mainly through the political organization called "Hokkaido kyūdojin kyūikukai," that aimed to save the Ainu through education, particularly the *jitugyō* training like industrial and agricultural practical training to lead the Ainu toward the life of self-sufficiency. The concept of up-lifting "uncivilized" people through industrial training, which Oyabe observed and experienced at the Hampton Institute in Virginia, was reproduced through Oyabe's Abuta Gakuen.

Oyabe's could not have maintained his "ideal" school, *Abuta Gakuen*, without other involved individuals' effort and support. Yoshida Iwao and Shirai Ryūjirō were particularly important figures in Oyabe's educational project. Yoshida, throughout his life, worked as a teacher in various Ainu schools. At Abuta Gakuen, he served as a department chair (*kyōiku shunin*) and a proxy of the school representative between

September 1907 and April 1911.²³⁵ Shirai was a school teacher at Abuta dai 2 jinjōshōgakkō.

While Oyabe was a strong advocate for providing “appropriate” education to assimilate the Ainu into Japanese society mainly as laborers, Yoshida questioned the legitimacy of Oyabe’s educational philosophy and praxis. Later in life, he confessed that he was tremendously distressed by the dual positionalities of being a Japanese educator and a researcher of the Ainu culture. Surprisingly, Yoshida was aware that his mission at Abuta gakuen was paradoxical. As an ethnographer, he was committed to researching and preserving Ainu culture. As a Japanese colonial teacher, he was an agent of Ainu assimilation. Yoshida articulated this paradoxical positionality as the “double mission of destruction and construction.” This paradox prompted him to describe his experience as “unspeakable” each time he faced Ainu subalternity in school. Oyabe advocated the epistemology and methodology of industrial education for the Ainu through his school. He reiterated ways in which the Ainu should be assimilated into Japanese society as industrial workers. Oyabe reproduced the idea of progressivism. This discourse of progressivism stemmed from his experience in the United States. In 1909, Oyabe had to close the school. He promoted intricate relations between progressivism and colonialism. As an expert on Ainu issues, and with American experience, he submitted a proposal to the government about how to govern the Ainu and other colonized people in East Asia and Sakhalin.

²³⁵ Yoshida, “Danchōroku” in *Aikyō sōshi: Obihiroshi shakaikyōiku sōsho* No.6, 21.

Chapter 3

Minamoto no Yoshitsune Fever: Intellectual Debates over Historical Truth and Oyabe Zen'ichirō's Interventions in Japanese Imagination in the 1920s

Introduction

The legends of Yoshitsune consist of writings accumulated since the Muromachi period (1338-1573). The vast volume of literature about the life of Minamoto no Yoshitsune (1159-1189), a Japanese warrior from the twelfth century, continues to illustrate his persistent popularity in the Japanese imagination. Ivan Morris, in *The Nobility of Failure*, describes Yoshitsune as “the perfect exemplar of heroic failure,”²³⁶ a concept that permeates Japanese sensibility. While he was a powerful and successful warrior, in the end he was surrounded by the forces of his trusted elder half-brother, Minamoto no Yoritomo (1147-1199), and committed *seppuku* at an early age. His “glorious failure”²³⁷ secured his status as “Japan’s quintessential hero”²³⁸ in Japanese history as well as in the realm of popular imagination, although his contributions to objective history are less significant—or simply not as verifiable—as those of Yoritomo, who was the first shogun and founder of the Kamakura *bakufu* (1185-1333). Yoshitsune’s popularity shows us the paradox of historical imagination: objective and written documents do not always contribute to our ways of commemorating, particularly mourning for the past.

Yoshitsune’s legends consist of four types of narratives: 1) stories of his childhood in Kuramayama, Kyoto and Ōshū; 2) legends of his victorious adolescent

²³⁶ Morris, *The Nobility of Failure*, 67.

²³⁷ *Ibid.*, 102.

²³⁸ *Ibid.*, 67.

military life; 3) the tragedy that began after the Battle of Dannoura, and concluded with his suicide by sword in Koromogawa; and 4) the legend of his survival, in Ōshū, Ezo and elsewhere on the Asian Continent, that Yoshitsune and Genghis Khan were one and the same.²³⁹ This last legend, although there are many variations, generally claims that Yoshitsune did not die at Koromogawa no tachi in 1189 when being attacked by Fujiwara no Yasuhira but, rather, fled to Ezo and passed through the islands of Sakhalin to the Asian continent.

In the 1920s, Oyabe Zen'ichirō became the most important reinterpreter of the legends of Yoshitsune's survival. Oyabe's reconstruction of the Yoshitsune legends refocused the discourse on history from arguments of objectivity to the affective, cosmopolitan, and more specifically imperial arguments of Japanese history. By claiming that Yoshitsune and Genghis Khan, a Mongolian hero, were the same man, Oyabe attempted to reconnect Japanese history and imagination to the great civilizations of Mongolia and China. His research methodology also spoke to the legend's divergent identity as mythical yet cosmopolitan; therefore, it was hardly conventional compared with those of other intellectuals. Oyabe legitimized and modernized oral tradition and myths, which had been regarded as mythical and pre-modern vis-à-vis dominant scientific methods; he visited domestic (the East Ōshū) as well as Siberian and Mongolian locales to collect evidence, which was made possible by modern mobility and his cosmopolitan sensibility. In other words, he made Japanese historical myths broader and more international. By doing so, he intervened in the Japanese imagination, celebrating the Japanese qualities of being

²³⁹ Abe, "Hokkaido no Yoshitsune densetsu no kōsatsu" *Hokusei Ronshū*, 218.

both retrospective and pre-modern as well as cosmopolitan to search for his way of being “modern.”

The project of imagining Japan, specifically narratives of the Japanese past beyond its borders, contributed to the identity transformation of modern Japan. Oyabe’s myth-making project was harshly criticized by other intellectuals because of his unscientific methodology and reliance on myth, but it was welcomed by the general public. In this chapter, I examine the furious intellectual debates over the Yoshitsune legends in the 1920s. The debate was not only observed in this particular era; it also was a part of the persistent and larger battles between the scientific, positivist, and “modern” commemorations of history in modern Japan and those that were mythic, nativist, and “pre-modern,” particularly during the Meiji period (1868-1912). Because of his transnational focus, however, Oyabe, regarded his mythical project as cosmopolitan and, therefore, “modern.” Overall, the intellectual’s debates over historical truth were a process of modernizing historical research methods, but I argue that these battles in commemoration also reflected how the Japanese reshaped their modern imagination and identity in relation to their ancient and pre-modern past. Particularly, Kindaichi Kyōsuke (1882-1971) and Shimazu Hisamoto (1891-1941), scholars of the time, help us understand how popular memory of historical heroes became an important cultural repertoire for their identity and imagination. They developed their arguments away from the dualism of positivist and mythical reasoning that summarized the intellectual debates over the Yoshitsune legends in the 1920s, which were also understood as debates over Japanese identity. The identity should have been defined by the

imperial lineage in the historical texts. Scholars of Japanese literature such as Kindaichi and Shimazu interpreted the Yoshitsune legends differently and provided a new dimension to the 1920s intellectual controversy. Their scholarship attempted to examine Japanese identity based on shared memory and mourning for heroes and the pre-modern past. Oyabe, by publishing stories about Yoshitsune's survival, transformed a cultural repertoire for Japanese imagination and identity, from Japan's founding myths and historical documents to cosmopolitanized and popularized memory of Japanese historical heroes.

Allegory in Sakaguchi Ango's "Kaze hakase (Dr. Wind)"

In his early influential story, "Kaze hakase (Dr. Wind),"²⁴⁰ published in 1931, Sakaguchi Ango allegorized the sensational intellectual debates of the 1920s over the resurrection of Minamoto no Yoshitsune. Oyabe Zen'ichirō stirred not only the intellectual community but also the general public by making the surreal and almost fanatic claim that Yoshitsune did not die but became the heroic Mongolian general, Genghis Khan. Intellectuals, particularly historians, relentlessly criticized Oyabe, wielding scientific historical evidence. The controversy in the 1920s over the Yoshitsune legends illustrated where scientific and mythic commemorations of the historical past clashed with each other.

To describe this controversy, Ango comically but vividly contrasts two doctor figures as "great Dr. Wind" and "vicious Dr. Octopus," representing Oyabe as Dr.

²⁴⁰ James Dorsey, who is an editor and translator of *Literary Mischief* (New York: Lexington Books, 2010), translates the title of the essay of *Kaze hakase* as "Professor Blowhard" (p.17). However, I use "Dr. Wind" as the translation for *Kaze hakase* because it captures Ango's playful and significant literary techniques in the essay.

Wind and Nakajima Riichirō as Dr. Octopus. Nakajima, who was a linguist and historian of *Toyōshi*, seemed to be most inimical to Oyabe.²⁴¹ Ango specifically highlights the animosity²⁴² between Dr. Wind (read: Oyabe) and Dr. Octopus (read: Nakajima) and illustrates Dr. Wind's consistent attempts to expose the real nature of Dr. Octopus, who is grotesque, smelly, and vicious. Within the structure of Ango's allegory, Dr. Wind is the main protagonist, but he is a phantasmal figure, present only in the narrative of his suicide note. Dr. Wind attempts to ridicule Dr. Octopus no matter what it takes. For example, one night, while Dr. Octopus is sleeping, Dr. Wind steals Dr. Octopus' wig from his bedroom so that he can no longer hide his bald-head. Dr. Wind contrives various plots to remove the wig, a cover—and, therefore, a “human mask”—from Dr. Octopus, revealing his real figure as a cephalopod mollusk. Ango writes, “He is nothing but an octopus.” Yet Dr. Wind's various schemes end in vain. After he has stolen the wig, Dr. Octopus shows up the following morning wearing a different wig and pretends that nothing has happened. Because of this critical incident, Dr. Wind accepts his defeat, commits suicide, and completely disappears. Science, although its real figure is grotesque, smelly, and vicious, stands steady while defeating other heterodox reasoning and claims.

Ango's comic allegory of the two doctors illustrates the core of the 1920s controversy. People furiously debated whether Yoshitsune survived and became the great hero of Mongolia. It was a clash between scientific and mythic claims over the historical past. Ango describes Dr. Wind as a “great” doctor who constantly

²⁴¹ See Yamane's “Sagacughi Ango ‘Kaze hakase ron,’ 62 and Kobayashi “Kaze hakase: Oyabe Zenichirō no gigaka wo megutte,” 132.

²⁴² See Yamane's “Sagacughi Ango ‘Kaze hakase ron,’ 62.

challenges “vicious” Dr. Octopus in order to prove his own rightness by revealing his opponent’s ignorance. Furthermore, Ango reverses the narrative of the intellectual debate in his allegory. During the debates of the 1920s, the positivist intellectuals (Dr. Octopus), who committed themselves to scientific reasoning, were the ones who constantly tried to reveal the inauthentic nature of Oyabe’s (Dr. Wind’s) claims. In his story, Ango reverses the narrative of the conflict between Dr. Wind and Dr. Octopus. Or more specifically the narrative of who accuses whom has been reversed. By exchanging the performative roles of Dr. Octopus and Dr. Wind, Ango’s allegory reflected the intense political trend of his time against scientific claims of truth. In 1941, for example, Tsuda Sōkichi (1873-1961), a Japanese historian, and his publisher, Iwanami Shigeo of Iwanami shoten, were prosecuted by the right wing organization, *Genri Nihon sha*, because Tsuda’s empirical scholarship on ancient Japanese history was considered “high treason thought”²⁴³ (*daigyaku shisō*) against the emperor. His four books, *Shindai shi no kenkyū* (1924), *Kojiki oyobi nihonshoki no kenkyū* (1924), *nihon jōdai shi kenkyū* (1930), and *Jōdai nihon no shakai oyobi shisō* (1933) were banned based on the Publication Law. A letter from the Tokyo Criminal Court dated March 27, 1941, claims that Tsuda’s scholarship “desecrate[d] the majesty of the imperial house.”²⁴⁴

Because strict police scrutiny attempted to ensure that the dignity of the emperor would not be violated, allegories were used to deliver hidden meanings to readers. Harry Harootunian interprets the Marxist historian Hani Gorō’s (1901-

²⁴³ “Gakumon no jiyūni taisuru danatsu” *Kindai 100 nenshi dai 15 shū* (1937~1940) reprinted in *Gahō kindai hyakunen shi* 5, 1206-1207.

²⁴⁴ Ibid.

1983) intellectual shift from Japanese history to the history of thought in Europe as an example of this. Harootunian pays particular attention to this “allegory of history,” a way of representing the political situation of the 1930s metaphorically, in Hani’s academic publications. He argues that it enabled Hani to remain critical of the parochialism of *kokugaku* nativists’ scholarship. On the one hand, Hani opposed the positivist method of historical research and appreciated cultural historians’ efforts to challenge it. On the other hand, he was aware of the risks taken by these cultural historians, as they made culture and history transcendent and timeless for their idealism. Hani, by “allegorizing history,” was able to refocus on “the present” and remained critical of the popularization of 1930s’ *kokugaku* scholarship.²⁴⁵ By creating an allegory of Yoshitsune’s intellectual debates, Ango, like Hani, was able to recognize the dangers that Oyabe’s fanatical claims might have produced.

Ango concludes the essay with a discussion of what he believes Dr. Wind represents and how readers should comprehend him. His allegory of the intellectual debates between the two doctors is developed through the playful literary technique of double entendre, represented by the words “Wind” (*kaze*) and “Octopus” (*tako*). Phonetically, *kaze* means either the wind or the cold or influenza. The *kaze* is the wind, which is ubiquitous yet invisible. Only when the wind touches a person does its presence become apparent, especially as a form of disease, influenza, which is contagious. Ango does not say that a disease is something bad or negative, but he emphasizes that this is how people bodily and affectively experience *kaze*—by coming infected and sick. Only his effects, particularly disease

²⁴⁵ Harootunian, “Rekishi no allegory ka: Marukusu shugi, Hani Gorō, soshite genzaikara no yōsei” in *Marukusu Shugi to iu keiken*, 227-260.

or pain,²⁴⁶ can make people realize what Dr. Wind is and what he does, that is, the psychic effects of historical legends. The last paragraph of the essay encapsulates

Ango's perspective on *kaze*:

You all, the great Dr. Wind became the wind. Did he become the wind at last? Yes, he did become the wind. His figure is gone. Invisibility means the wind? Yes, it is the wind. Because we cannot see the figure. This can never be nothing but the wind. It is the wind. It asserts that it is the wind, the wind, the wind. Are you all still suspicious of this apparent fact? That is very unfortunate. Then, I add determinate scientific evidence of it. On that day, at the moment of [his disappearance], the wretched Dr. Octopus was infected with the influenza.²⁴⁷

Dr. Octopus is infected with “*kaze*” (Oyabe's mythic claims) and, as a consequence, he gets a fever. This fever represents how historical legends are disseminated as a form of disease with a particular degree of contagiousness and excitement. The experience could be either painful or pleasurable,²⁴⁸ but either way, we only know the legends by their effects.

Dr. Octopus is also described in double entendre. The word *tako* can be either an octopus in the sea or a kite that goes up and flies bravely in the wind. Although the real figure of *tako* is a vicious octopus, it flies bravely and gets higher when utilizing and incorporating the forces of the wind. Ango reminds us that the winner of the debate is Dr. *Tako*; scientific reasoning always wins. Everyone, including Ango, admits this fact. However, an infection, a fever, or a symptom is a real

²⁴⁶ Freud, *The Ego and the Id*.

²⁴⁷ Sakaguchi, “Kaze hakase,” in *Nihon gendai bungaku zenshū 90: Ishikawa Jun and Sakaguchi Ango shū*, 235. Sakaguchi's writing is hard to translate because of his colloquialism. Also, Yamane Ryūichi points out that Sakaguchi's particular colloquialism found in this essay echoes with the speaking style of Fukumoto Kazuo, a Marxist philosopher and leader in Japanese Communist Party particularly in the 1920s.

²⁴⁸ Freud, *Narcissism: An Introduction*.

experience of the unreal. Therefore, it does not make sense or appear comical when intellectuals are obsessed with the vulnerability of scientific reasoning. What Ango suggests instead is that an authentic understanding of historical legends could lie in their effects, which appear as infection and disease. Regarding the 1920s debates over Yoshitsune's resurrection, as Ango suggests, the focus should be on an effect of the debate: what I call Yoshitsune fever.

Oyabe Zenichiro as *Kaze Hakase* (Dr. Wind)

During the intellectual controversy of the 1920s and '30s, Dr. "Kaze" (Dr. Wind), was Oyabe Zen'ichirō who acted as both the wind and the cause of Yoshitsune fever. Oyabe published three books which argued for the theory of Yoshitsune's survival: *Jingisu Kan wa Minamoto Yoshitsune nari* (*The Real Figure of Genghis Khan was Minamoto no Yoshitsune*) (1924), *Jingisu Kan wa Minamoto Yoshitsune nari: chojutsu no dōki to sairon* (*A Revision of the Real Figure of Genghis Khan was Minamoto no Yoshitsune*) (1925), and *Manshū to Minamoto kurōyo shitsune* (*Manchuria and Minamotokurō Yoshitsune*) (1933). In addition to these books served as Yoshitsune's rebirth story as Genghis Khan, he also wrote a life of Shizuka Gozen, who was considered a concubine of Yoshitsune, despite the paucity of historical records about her. He described her life story in *Shizukagozen no shōgai* (*The Life of Shizuka Gozen*) in 1930.

Oyabe's books, particularly his first book, *Jingisu Kan wa Minamoto Yoshitsune nari* (1924), provoked a public controversy because his claim about Yoshitsune was too fantastic to be accepted in the intellectual community. For them, Minamoto no Yoshitsune's death was a fact and not worthy of further examination.

These intellectuals tirelessly criticized the legitimacy of Oyabe's research, devoting a special edition of the academic journal called *Chūō shidan* in February 1925.

Scholars from various fields such as historians, philosophers, literary, folklore scholars, anthropologist, and linguists issued strong criticisms against Oyabe's claims about Yoshitsune's "posthumous" life. They needed to respond formally because Oyabe's first book was gaining in popularity, and journalists were curious about what scholars had to say to him.²⁴⁹ The list of scholars includes Ōmori Kingorō (1867-1937), Kindaichi Kyōsuke (1882-1971), Yanai Watari (1875-1926), Nakamura Kyūshirō (literary scholar), Numata Yorisuke (1867-1934), Nakajima Riichirō, Fujisawa Morihiko (1885-1967), Mitake Setsurei (1860-1945), Takakuwa Komakichi (1868-1927), and Torii Ryūzō (1870-1953). Most of them accused Oyabe of not being able to distinguish fiction from historical truth. Among them, Nakajima Riichirō, who was a historian of *Tōyōshi* and a linguist, published three articles ("Minamoto no Yoshitsune wa Jingsukan ni arazu" "Futatabi Oyabe shi no 'Jingisu Kan wa Minamoto no Yoshitsune nari' wo shō su" "Kasanete Oyabe kuregashi no Minamoto no Yoshitsune Jingisu Kan setsu wo nanzu") in the journal of *Chūō shidan*. He criticized Oyabe's fanatic obsessions with phonetic sameness and similarities that were not supported by scientific evidence. Because of Nakajima's precise, logical, and adamant criticism, he was allegorized as Dr. *Tako* (Dr. Octopus) in Sakaguchi Ango's essay.

²⁴⁹ Particularly, Nakajima Riichirō in "Minamoto no Yoshitsune ha Jin Gisu Kan ni arazu" and Takakuwa Komakichi in "Jin Gisu Kan ha Minamoto no Yoritomo ni arazu" talk about the popularity of Oyabe's book and necessity to explain the scholars' positionality on this issue.

In contrast to these intellectuals' critiques, the general public showed a fevered acceptance of the book. Since its first edition in 1924, the book has been reprinted in more than ten editions from the Tomiyama bō publishing company. Furthermore, the enlarged version from the Kōseikaku was published in its fifteenth edition in 1930.²⁵⁰ In a response to the intellectual community, Oyabe revisited his book and further argued the legitimacy of his theory in the book *Jingisu Kan wa Minamoto Yoshisune nari: chojutsu no dōki to* (*A Revision of the Real Figure of Genghis Khan was Minamoto no Yoshitsune, 1924*). His efforts to prove his theory experienced little success in the intellectual community. It is important to note here, however, that people were nevertheless passionate about the “posthumous” or survival story of Yoshitsune.

Oyabe's commemoration of Yoshitsune was mythical, popular, narrative and memory-oriented. His strong advocacy for the Yoshitsune's legends was a challenge to the dominant scientific method of historical research, which had been firmly established by this time by eradicating mythical parts of Japanese history. It was a part of the intellectual conflicts between positivist historians and nativist (*kokugaku*)/Shinto intellectuals over historical research and writing that had frequently been seen from the early Meiji period. The primary concern for these nativists was the search for “Japaneseness” and resources for claiming an authentic Japanese identity. They often found it in orality and language that had been preserved in texts.²⁵¹ Oyabe's myth-making or reconstruction of Japanese

²⁵⁰ Oyabe, *Jin Gisu Kan wa Minamoto Yoshitsune nari*, 195.

²⁵¹ Burns discusses the pre-modern community that had been established by the common interests in the Divine Age narratives inscribed in *Kojiki* and *Nihonshoki*.

imagination should have resonated with these nativists' so-called culturalism projects, but it was an idiosyncratic attempt because he utilized a tragic but well-respected Japanese hero whom everyone knew and sympathized. Therefore, Oyabe recalled the ordinary people's memory of Japanese history and shifted its sacred resource from texts to historical memory. People accepted this because he imagined the collective Japanese identity through the affective memory of Yoshitsune as "authentically Japanese." His project was also an attempt at simultaneously remaking imagination expansive and transnational by modifying the memory that appeared to show ties to colonizing spaces including Ezo and Mongolia.

Historical Meaning of Oyabe's Myth-Making: Conflicts between Positivism and Nativism

Oyabe's claims about the Yoshitsune legends require a historical explanation in order to locate his argument within the Japanese intellectual community. To whom was he speaking? What was the issue in the dominant intellectual community in the 1920s and 1930s and even before that? And what was the cultural and political significance of his myth-making? This history writing, in turn, extended from Japanese intellectual debates about historical truth and attempts to preserve and remake Japanese identity vis à vis the imperial lineage.

Japanese historical myths had not simply been discussed in the realm of theology; rather, they had been the central issues of Japanese history and cultural politics. Particularly, Japan's foundation myths, which established the imperial line as a direct descendent of the Sun Goddess—and, therefore, the line of a mythical deity described in *Kojiki* and *Nihonshoki*—had been treated as an official history of

See Burns, *Before the Nation*. Kindle edition.

Japan and had never been challenged until the Tokugawa period by historians.²⁵² In modern historiography, challenging the Japanese Divine Age myths, the story of Japan's creation based on the ancient deity, was a controversial project because "history was at the heart of imperial sovereignty."²⁵³ Certainly, history—a way of commemorating the past—has been an important intellectual project that speaks directly to the authority of the imperial line and, consequently, serves as a rich memorial repertoire for claiming the authenticity of Japanese identity.

The Meiji government made tremendous efforts to establish its nationhood by legitimizing the imperial lineage and its subsequent natural rights to rule this divine nation through historical projects.²⁵⁴ The Emperor Meiji granted a written order to the court noble Sanjō Sanetomi (1837-91) to write history from 887, where the last book of *The Six National Histories*, *Nihon Sandai Jitsuroku* (*Veritable Records of Three Reigns of Japan, 901*), leaves off. The order reassured the divine imperial lineage as continuous from the past to the Meiji period. It aimed to foster firm recognition of the difference between common people and the emperor: it was "to set right the relation between civilization and barbarity, and to implant the principle of virtue throughout the empire."²⁵⁵ The office called Shūshikan (Bureau of Historiography) was established with government incentives, and it became a part of the University of Tokyo in 1888. Its primary project was to write *Dai nihon*

²⁵² Brownlee, *Japanese Historians and the National Myths*, 1600-1945, 5.

²⁵³ *Ibid.*, 30.

²⁵⁴ Brownlee, "The Beginning of Academic History" in *Japanese Historians and the National Myths*, 1600-1945, 81-91. Burns. *Before the Nation: Kokugaku and the Imagining of Community in Early Modern Japan*, Particularly Chapter 7 "National Literature, Intellectual History, and the New Kokugaku" (*Asia-Pacific: Culture, Politics, and Society*) (p. 187). Kindle edition.

²⁵⁵ Brownlee, *Japanese Historians and the National Myths*, 1600-1945, 82.

hennen shi (*Great Chronological History of Japan*), an annalistic history from 887, where *The Six National Histories* series ends, to the Meiji period.

Historians who were hired to work on this project were trained in the Confucian tradition of historical writing that produced “narrative histories” rather than the “annotation of texts.”²⁵⁶ Oyabe and these early Meiji historians or Confucian historians shared similarities in terms of their historical writing. Shigeno Yasutsugu, one of the core historians for the project, edited *Kochō seikan*, and its model was Tokugawa Mitsukuni’s *Dai nihon shi*, which Oyabe also used as fundamental evidence for his argument about Yoshitsune.

The historical writing of Shigeno and other Meiji historians, however, changed dramatically when Ludwig Riess (1861-1928) brought in a form of German methodology that introduced objectivity and scientific reasoning to the historians’ circle at Tokyo Imperial University. He taught history at the university from 1887 to 1902, and major historians such as Shigeno Yasutsugu, Hoshino Hisashi, Kume Kunitake who worked on the project of *Dai nihon hennen shi* were strongly influenced by Riess’ scientific methodology for history writing. John Brownlee analyzes Riess’ significant influence on historical research in prewar and postwar Japan. Riess helped build a foundation for the discipline of history by establishing the Historical Association and its academic journal, *Shigakukai zasshi* (*Journal of the Historical Scholarship*). This journal was renamed as *Shigaku zasshi* (*Journal of the Historical Scholarship Association*) in 1892; however, it continues to play a major

²⁵⁶ Iwai, “Nihon kindaishigaku no keisei” in *Iwanami Kōza Nihon rekishi bekkān 1*, 82. Burns, *Before the Nation: Kokugaku and the Imagining of Community in Early Modern Japan*, 192-193. Kindle Version.

role in the current intellectual community.²⁵⁷ The “*Dai nihon hennen shi*” (*Great Chronological History of Japan*) project, in which Meiji historians participated, did not carry on the genealogy of *Dai nihonshi*. As their research progressed, they considered that the time of the “*Nanboku chō*” (The Southern Court)²⁵⁸ required serious revision. They discovered that *Taiheiki* (*Chronicle of Grand Pacification*) which *Dai nihonshi* treated as an official history, lacked historical “authenticity.” By revisiting these historical texts and documents, the Meiji historians improved their “*kōshō*” (scientific inquiry or empiricism) techniques for historical research.²⁵⁹ Shigeno was even called “*massatsu hakase*” (Dr. Obliteration) because he kept slashing and eliminating the mythical parts of the Japanese history based on his empirical methodology. He claimed, “History should be a trial of evidence in every regard.” He continued:

Among historical evidence, there is, of course, true and false evidence. It is a connoisseurship of a historian to judge, and in any event, he makes an effort to collect any evidence. One falls in the pitfall of logical fallacy because he writes uselessly by simply relying on the existing texts.... Eventually, I got a title of ‘Dr. Obliteration.’ However, in order to write true history, I don’t mind standing against the entire nation (*ikkoku*). Truth is the ultimate victory.²⁶⁰

Shigeno’s firm belief in what a historian should do for historical truth set the tone for the positivist scholarship in the late Meiji period.

²⁵⁷ Brownlee, *Japanese Historians and the National Myths*, 1600-1945, see particularly Chapter 6 “European Influences on Meiji Historical Writing.”

²⁵⁸ Ashikaga Takauji (1305-1358), a founder of the Muromachi bakufu, installed a prince from the rival line of Go-Daigo as emperor Kōmyō, he placed the court in Kyoto, which became known as “*Hoku-chō*” (The Northern Court). The emperor Go-Daigo also claimed his authority and put his court in Yoshino, known as “*Nanchō*,” “The Southern Court.”

²⁵⁹ Iwai, “*Nihon kindaishigaku no keisei*” in *Iwanami Kōza Nihon rekishi bekkān* 1, 83.

²⁶⁰ Shigeno, “*Rekishi kenkyū hō*” in *Shigeno hakase shigaku ronbunshū jōkan*, 66.

The Yoshitsune legends were also an object of these Meiji historians' scrutiny. Hoshino's "Minamoto no Yoshitsune no hanashi" ("The story of Minamoto no Yoshitsune") in 1881 and Shigeno's "Minamoto no Yoshitsune" in 1896 assured that *Azuma kagami* (*Mirror of the East*) is the official and state history of the Muromachi and Kamakura *bakufu* and completely denied Yoshitsune's survival and his story about fleeing to Ezo. Other historical texts and tales were regarded as fabrications and considered less trustworthy. According to Shigeno, for example, the story of Yoshitsune's survival was produced through *Seietsu monogatari* (清悦物語) in the seventeenth century and *Takadachi sōshi* (高館草子, the writer and publication date are unknown). Although the protagonist in these stories was not Yoshitsune but his retainer, Hitachibō Kaison, his eternal youth and longevity described in the story was transformed into Yoshitsune's survival legend. In the following centuries, texts such as *Yoshitsune kunko ki* and *Kamakura jikki* exaggerated the story, and it became more solidified in *Ōu kanseki monrōshi*.²⁶¹

These historians' lectures and essays were intended to respond to the people's curiosity and interests in the legends that became more distinct after *Yoshitsune saikōki* was published. This book was originally written by Suematsu Kenchō²⁶² (1855 -1920) in English as a thesis ("The Identity of the Great Conqueror Genghis Khan with the Japanese Hero Yoshitsune") when he was studying at the University of Cambridge in England. Uchida Yahachi, a student of Fukuzawa Yukichi, translated the book thereafter. Since the original book was written in English,

²⁶¹ Shigeno, "Minamoto no Yoritomo" in *Shigeno hakase shigaku ronbunshū chūkan*, 523.

²⁶² Suematsu is usually described as the first person who translated *Genji Morogatari* [*The Tale of Genji*] into English.

Japanese readers believed that some European scholar wrote the book. The uncertainty about this book also cultivated people's curiosity in the legends.

Not everyone agreed with the *Shūshikan* historians' movement for scientific legitimacy. Particularly, the *kokugaku* (nativist) and *shintō* intellectuals who associated with *kōten kōkyūjo* (established in 1882) accused the *shūshikan* of "destructive" activities.²⁶³ The nativists' *Kokushi ronhen*, for example, which published in 1903, consisted of eighty articles, many of which targeted the *Shūshikan*'s empirical research. The Kume Kunitake's incident showed explicit animosity between the *Shūshikan* (*kōshō* based) historians and nativist and Shinto intellectuals. It started when Kume's published the "Shintō ha saiten no kyūzoku" ("Shinto is an Old Custom of Festivals") in *Shigaku kai zasshi*. Because of this publication, he received a series of critiques and complaints from the nativist intellectuals. Kume eventually had to leave his university teaching position in 1892. Its impact went beyond Kume's leave; it resulted in discontinuing the empirical research at *Shūshikan* in 1893. This incident showed the power and reach of political and cultural surveillance of the era, which was sensitive not to challenge the imperial lineage and dignity of the emperor.

Oyabe also had strong ties to *Kōten kōkyūjo* and nativist scholars. Oyabe came back to Shinagawa, Tokyo, from Hokkaido in 1909 (he was an educator for the Ainu) and became an instructor at this Tokyo *kōten kōkyūjo* and at Kokugakuin University.²⁶⁴ In 1920, he was hired as an interpreter by the Ministry of War of

²⁶³ Iwai, "Nihon kindai shigaku no keisei" in *Iwanami Kōza Nihon rekishi bekkān* 1, 85.

²⁶⁴ Ikuta, "Oyabe Zen'ichirō to iu hito: Risō no genjitsu ni maishin shita fukutsu no shōgai" in *Japanī zū Robinson Crusō*, 239.

Japan and was sent to Chita, Siberia, (Russia) for two years. After the two years of work, he was asked to teach at the Military College²⁶⁵but refused the offer in order to focus on his research and writing. As a result, he published all of the books related to Yoshitsune's legends.

The Legends of Yoshitsune's Survival

What was Oyabe's argument?

Almost all of the Japanese myths had been revised or expunged from historical texts by the efforts of the positivist historians. By the 1920s, when Oyabe wrote Yoshitsune's legends, scientific history had become the dominant research practice. In this context, Oyabe's claims about Yoshitsune myths were totally divergent from the dominant scholarship because of Oyabe's heterodox evidence and his emphasis on oral tradition. Oyabe's selected historical documents, including *Dai nihon shi* (*History of Great Japan*) and *Honchōtsūkan* (*Great Mirror of Japan*) point to the resurrection of the neo-Confucian scholarship of the Tokugawa period, which had been neither influenced by European scientific methodology nor eradicated by Japanese historians who were thereafter trained in scientific methodology. Therefore, Oyabe's use of historical texts was a challenge to well-established historiography, particularly that produced by the earlier scientific historians, as well as his regressive ideology of nativism—which is usually used to claim authentic and pure Japanese culture and identity.

1) His Divergence in the Use of Historical Texts

²⁶⁵ Ibid., 242.

In his first book, *Jingisu Kan wa Minamoto Yoshitsune nari* (1924), Oyabe challenged the undeniable yet banal “fact” of the death of Minamoto no Yoshitsune. He argued that Yoshitsune did not die in Koromogawa. Local volunteers from Koromogawa, as well neighboring communities such as Hiraizumi, Sannohe, Hachinohe, and Kodairahama, helped him escape from the sudden attack by Fujiwara no Yasuhira in 1189. Yasuhira’s attack was plotted despite his dead father’s (Hidehira) order to protect Yoshitsune from his oppositional force, his half-brother, Minamoto no Yoritomo. After that, Yoshitsune avoided the Ōshū Road; he hid and used a small road from Iwaya dō, traveling through the villages of Ōmata, Setamai and Arizumi. Finally, he reached Miyako, where a major sea port in Mutsu is located. He waited patiently for a chance to travel to Ezo from Kita Tsugaru where Hidehisa, a brother of Hidehira, resided along the coastline. However, he eventually left Ōshū from the Mimuma Gulf, passed the Tsugaru Channel and entered the region of Ezo. While he stayed in Piratori of Ezo, he interacted with the Ainu there and gained tremendous respect from them. He then continued traveling and finally reached Mongolia. Because of his excellent military skills, he also became quite famous in Mongolia; in fact, he was Genghis Khan, the legendary Mongol general. Oyabe traced various legends attributed to Yoshitsune in Tō Oku, Ezo, and Mongolia, some of which were associated with the existing shrines that worship Yoshitsune as *kami* (deity).

Oyabe’s argument for the survival of Yoshitsune contradicts the descriptions found in the official *bakufu* records of *Azuma kagami* (*Mirror of the East*) and *Sonpi bunmyaku* (*Genealogies of Noble Families*) as well as the journal of Kujō Kanezane,

Gyoku yō, which is considered a document of the imperial court. The orthodoxy of these documents had been firmly established by the 1920s because of earlier efforts made by the historians Shigeno Yasutsugu, Hoshino Hisashi, Kume Kunitake, and others in the Meiji period. They distinguished reliable sources from the medieval and pre-modern historical myths and legends (I will discuss this point in detail later.) Oyabe criticizes his contemporary scholars' uncritical use of these historical documents because they accept them as "*kinka gyokujō* 金科玉條 (the golden rules) for reconstructing the Heian and Kamakura periods. Oyabe claims that their scholarship doesn't produce any new and significant findings because they just imitate each other. He writes, "It is like an expression of "*ikken kei ni hoyure ba hakken koeni hoyu* (when one dog sees something and starts barking, then other 100 dogs hear its voice and join in crying). There is no aptitude in treating these as orthodoxy and repeating the same thing."²⁶⁶ Instead of using these works as a canon, he legitimatizes other texts, including *Dai nihon shi* (*History of Great Japan*), which was written by the Mito scholars ordered by Tokugawa Mitsukuni and *Honchōtsūkan* (*Great Mirror of Japan*), written by Hayashi Ranzan and picks up the unsolved Yoshitsune question that these texts opened up. In these texts, Oyabe explains, the Yoshitsune death is made suspicious.

2) Oral Tradition as Legitimate Historical Source

In addition to using unorthodox historical texts, what Oyabe emphasized as a reliable source for claiming Yoshitsune's survival was *kōhi*, oral tradition. He claimed that oral tradition is equal to or more trustworthy than other, more

²⁶⁶ Oyabe, *Jin Gisu Kan wa Yoshitsune nari*, 23.

conventional historical evidence. He discussed the reliability of oral tradition as follows:

Fire absolutely exists in places where you see smoke. Speaking of oral tradition or legends, those are not simply free-floating in a vacuum, without a shadow or a figure. Because there was an actuality at the time, it became a monument without a form and a text without letters. Therefore, it is somewhat equal to a matter that a historian borrows texts in order to pass the historical truth to the later generations."²⁶⁷

He found tremendous potential in legends and oral tradition for reconstructing the past. He even pulled out *Kojiki*, which depicts the nation's founding stories submitted in the eighth century as an example of a historical document that is constructed based on legends and myths. Although he supported oral tradition as a legitimate historical source, his claims stemmed from his degraded idea about Ōshū and others as "remote" and "primitive" places. He admitted that orality was an alternative to literature, especially among the "primitive" people in remote places like *Tō Oku* (the East Ōshū): "For the primitive people [*domin*] in Tō Oku who have not been much in a hand of literary, there have been no alternatives to oral tradition to pass the hidden facts of history"²⁶⁸ "In this way, he emphasized that the research of Yoshitsune's "posthumous" life, which started with an escape at Takadachi, required a new resource as well as a new methodology.

As a result, his research method combines analysis of historical texts like *Dai nishon shi* and oral tradition. He claimed that the research of Yoshitsune's "posthumous" life cannot be complete if a researcher does not use the sources of oral tradition in Ōshū, Ezo, and Mongolia. He contrasted his claimed method with

²⁶⁷ Ibid., 57.

²⁶⁸ Ibid., 57.

other historians' conventional ways of reading old documents about Yoshitsune's death and argued that his method was new, active, and modern. Harshly criticizing the inattentive and lazy attitudes of historians who only relied on the canonical written texts, he described their research method as "*zagyō*" (sedentary business) or "*kakū no kijō ron* (imaginative theory that only works on paper), which²⁶⁹ is solely based on speculation in texts. Rather, Oyabe's research emphasized "*jicchi kenkyū*" (fieldwork),²⁷⁰ in which he visited existing ruins in order to trace Yoshitsune's movements as he fled and collect stories from the locals. His method of fieldwork is empirical, verified by the researcher's physical work. He explained his particular research methodology by legitimatizing oral tradition:

[A]lthough a suspicion about Yoshitsune's suicide at Takadachi is documented in the famous text of *Dai Nihon shi* published before the Meiji Restoration and even at present heard among the people who travelled to *manmō* [Manchuria and Inner Mongolia], it is a strange phenomenon. I have to say that it is a consequence of teaching by rote that many of the contemporary scholars, whose scholarship is said most advanced, still cleave to the theory of Yoshitsune's suicide simply relying on the old books. They are not breaking new ground. Only a relatively easier *zagyō* [sedentary business] or *sōsho shisaku* [contemplation in texts] is considered academic scholarship. If a scholar disregards a *jicchi kenkyū* [fieldwork], it is like a car that tries to carry a thing without a complete set of tires, and it certainly blocks cultural and academic progress.²⁷¹

Oyabe also denigrated the ignorance of scholars by pointing out the fact that modern technology such as trains made it easier to travel and research the oral tradition of places like Ōshū, once regarded as a remote area. His critiques were made against the academic conventions of historical research that only legitimatized textual analysis.

²⁶⁹ Ibid., 58.

²⁷⁰ Ibid., 23.

²⁷¹ Ibid.

Oyabe's persistent belief in oral tradition and existing ruins also extends to the phonetic aspects of oral tradition. He identifies things and persons through phonetic similarities among different languages and local dialects in order to prove that the real figure of Genghis Khan was Minamoto no Yoshitsune. There were a number of points that Oyabe intentionally connects to develop his argument. For instance, at the coast line of Siberia, there is a ruin of an old castle called Suchan (current Partizansk in Russia). According to the oral tradition of the local Shandan people there, the castle was built by a Japanese general who fled from Japan. Before this castle was built, this general was living in a cave, which the people, as a result, have regarded as a sacred place and refrained from entering. His name was "Kin u cho." As a local Shandan dialect, Minamoto no Yoshitsune 源義経 phonetically becomes "Kin u chī." This sound of "Kin u chī" is the same as "Chin ki sē han" in the Mongolian pronunciation of Genghis Khan. He therefore concludes that a Japanese general, Yoshitsune, built the castle in Suchan, and he was also the Mongolian general Genghis Khan.²⁷² Oyabe's methods of making random connections only through phonetic similarities looked idiosyncratic, unreliable, and even fanatical to other scholars. Oyabe's complete belief in orality became a central target of critique and consequently a symbolic feature of his research and the intellectual controversy.

The Yoshitsune Myths as Subjective Truth: Counter-Narrative Mourning of Historical Heroes

²⁷² See Chapters 6 and 7 of Oyabe's *Jin Gisu Kan wa Yoshitsune nari*.

Although Oyabe's use of oral tradition in his research was the object of criticism for many scholars, Kindaichi Kyōsuke (1882-1971), a philologist of Japanese language and a scholar of Ainu Studies, as well as Shimazu Hisamoto (1891-1941), a scholar of Japanese literature, responded to it more sympathetically. Rather than simply pointing out the naïveté of Oyabe's scholarship, these two scholars attempted to examine the creative roles of myths as a construction or genealogy that supposedly reflected a kind of reality of the people. In other words, they changed the discourse of Yoshitsune's intellectual debates by shifting the dualism of historical truth that divided scientific and mythic reasoning and finding its meaning, crucial for reshaping Japanese imagination and identity in relation to commemoration and mourning of heroes and the past.

Kindaichi Kyōsuke

Kindaichi Kyōsuke was a well-known scholar in Ainu Studies because of his devoted study of the Ainu's oral or epic tradition of *Yūkara*. Particularly, his *Ainu jojishi yūkara no kenkyū* (*Studies on the Ainu's Epic, Yūkara*) has been considered valuable research of the Ainu's *yūkara* culture. It won the Japan Academy Award in 1932. He continued publishing the eight volumes of *Ainu jojishi yūkara shū* (*The Ainu's Epic Yūkara Collections*). His scholarship on Ainu and Japanese languages was nationally recognized and constituted foundational studies in both fields.²⁷³

In the 1925 article "Ainu kenkyū no mondai oyobi hōhō" ("The Issues and Methods of Ainu Studies") originally published in *Ainu no kenkyū* (*The Ainu Studies*),

²⁷³ "Kindaichi Kyōsuke, *Kokushi jiden: Japan Knowledge*" Accessed March 7, 2013. <http://www.jkn21.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/body/display/>

Kindaichi claimed that oral tradition was as important as language for Ainu Studies sources because both were keys to studying “the interior”²⁷⁴ of the Ainu. He defined two kinds of Ainu research: “the exterior” and “the interior” and argued for the importance of the latter. The “exterior” included such scientific research as studies of the clothes and physical attributes of the Ainu, which were “visibly” marked and capable of being measured by analyzing statistics and taking photographs.²⁷⁵ This type of research had been primarily conducted by most of the Japanese as well as Western anthropologists. Kindaichi advocated instead for the research of the “interior” life, which was about the culture of the Ainu expressed in language, legends, myths, poetry, and religion. The research focused on the “invisible” parts of the Ainu lives, which one could not understand simply by taking photographs.²⁷⁶ Kindaichi understood that his approach was extremely challenging because the Ainu’s language is orally transmitted, and written documents are traditionally absent in their history and community. Therefore, in order to study the “interior” parts or culture of the Ainu, he claimed, researchers needed to shift their conventional method to a study of the “invisible,” more specifically, orality of the Ainu language and tradition.

By illustrating the importance of cultural and oral production in academic research, Kindaichi argued that legends were the “subjective truth” of the people. Such truth changed and transformed by reflecting thoughts of the people in different

²⁷⁴ Kindaichi, “Ainu kenkyū no mondai oyobi hōhō” in *Kindaichi kyōsuke zenshū dai 12 kan: Ainu bunka minzokugaku*, 22.

²⁷⁵ Ibid., 22-23.

²⁷⁶ Ibid.

times, but carried over for centuries in sympathy within the community. Kindaichi claimed that the “subjective truth” differed from the historical truth because it was a “philosophical truth” that did not state historical dates, but vividly illustrated the spirituality, philosophy, and culture of the people as visuality in “photography.” For Kindaichi, the myths and legends were considered equivalent resources to historical documents or visual representations in Ainu Studies. He claimed:

Therefore, things that legends describe may not include objective facts of what has happened, but these are the subjective truth, at least for the people who have transmitted. In other words, those are not historical but philosophical facts. Even though, those facts are without dates, they are the reality depicted by faith. Thus, these may not be valuable as historical sources; however, there is no problem as sources to use when examining philosophy and faith. Actually, there is nothing better than these resources. The legends, as if they were photographs of the exterior life, vividly and beautifully evolve the true contours of ethnic characteristics, national spirits or something formless and intangible of the interior life.²⁷⁷

Instead of devaluing the legends simply as “unscientific,”—and, therefore, useless as historical resources—Kindaichi appreciated them as alternative sources to examine the “interior” lives of people, including philosophy, culture or psychological history, and state of the society. The difference in approach between Oyabe and Kindaichi was whether they regarded the legends and myths as construction and kept a healthy distance from the object of their research. Kindaichi used the legends as analytical tools to study the oral culture of the Ainu, while Oyabe studied the legends as historical truth and aimed to prove their relevance.

Kindaichi also responded to Oyabe’s book, *Jingisu Kan wa Minamoto no Yoshitune nari*, which claimed that Minamoto no Yoshitune was Genghis Khan. His

²⁷⁷ Ibid., 32.

essay, “Eiyū fushi densetsu no kenchikara” (“From a Perspective of Eternal Heroes’ Legends”), provided a different approach to the intellectual debates of the 1920s because he paid attention to the ontology of the legends. In other words, he shifted the focus to what the historical legends, especially the legends about historical heroes, meant to the Japanese historical imagination and identity. Of course, he confirmed that the legends of Yoshitsune’s survival were totally unscientific, and Oyabe could not avoid “dogma”²⁷⁸ when intellectuals were supposed to argue objectively against their opponents. He also explicitly said that Oyabe’s book was anything but a “confession of ‘his belief in Yoshitsune’s legends’ (*Yoshitsune shinkō*).”²⁷⁹ The point of interest was not about historical truth, but Kindaichi argued, Oyabe’s book was the most typical and the most meticulous example of stories about “never-dying (or eternal) heroes” of the people (*minshū*), which even included the people who loudly disagreed with Oyabe.

The stories of the “never-dying heroes,” Kindaichi claimed, reflected the people’s sadness (*aiku*) and inability to mourn those heroes who died in an official history. As a counter-narrative to the official history, these heroes would be able to resurrect endlessly in the legends. As a result, they would be able to live or to be mourned eternally with the people, which can also provide “comfort” or “healing” to the people through certain commemoration:

On the one hand, historical research does not allow any false attempt to find the natural truth by eliminating every embellishment, on the other hand, as long as our longing for the most dramatic and splendid national hero is

²⁷⁸ Kindaichi, “Eiyū fushi densetsu no kenchikara” in *Kindaichi Kyōsuke Zenshū 12 kan*, 192.

²⁷⁹ *Ibid*, 210.

carried over, it is a national sadness and pity that do not continually allow to let those heroes die as an official history does. As long as this longing continues, the tear for pity does not dry out, in spite of all kinds of whip (or punishments) of science, Yoshitsune will resurrect by changing his form and appearance and watching and waiting for a chance. Or, he is even completely killed in history, he resurrects in legends. As a matter of fact, since the efforts made by Drs. Hoshino and Shigeno, no one in the intellectual community has believed in the legends, however, the legends have constantly reappeared. Ultimately, the body of Yoshitsune died, but the spirit of Yoshitsune vividly and eternally lives with the lives of the people. In this way, the hero who was not rewarded in his life would be rewarded eternally. Therefore, it comforts and heals the people. In order to live this harsh life, this is absolutely necessary. Finishing his [Oyabe]'s book, I can close the Yoshitsune debate with a smile.²⁸⁰

Taking a distance from the Yoshitsune debate, in this passage, Kindaichi elaborated his interpretation of Yoshitsune's legends. He articulated that the reappearance of the Yoshitsune legends was a way of commemorating the past and mourning for the historical hero, which was not possible in an official story. This mythical commemoration was considered a counter-narrative to an official history's commemoration because it attempted to rewrite the narrative and created an imaginative space for Yoshitsune's resurrection and eternal mourning of him.

Shimazu Hisamoto

Shimazu Hisamoto (1891-1941) explored the cultural and literary meanings of historical legends and conducted the most comprehensive research on the Yoshitsune legends. He published a book entitled *Yoshitsune densetsu to bungaku* (*The Yoshitsune Legends and Literature*) in 1935 and examined the intricate relations between the legends and national literature (*kokugaku*).

²⁸⁰ Ibid.

Shimazu's theoretical or methodological foundation grounded in German scholarship on Heldensage (heroic saga). Heldensage is translated as "*buyūden*" into Japanese language. This Japanese word of "*buyūden*" was not translated by Shimizu, but he mentioned that Haga Yaichi (1867-1927) translated it, and Shimizu agreed to use the translation in Japanese texts. Shimizu particularly explored Symons and Wundt's discussions of Heldensage. Both argued that three elements such as Myhus (myth), Geschichte (history), and Dichtung (literature and poetry) were the fundamental elements that consisted of Heldensage. There were two categories of Heldensage: Mythische Heldensage and Historische Heldensage. The elements of Myhus and Dichtung were highlighted in Mythische Heldensage, and Geschichte became an important constituent of Historische Heldensage.

Although Shimizu acknowledged these three elements as important to the creation of Heldensage, and, therefore, a particular methodology for research of Heldensage, he recognized an excess of Heldensage, something psychological that researchers could not fully comprehend because of the complexity and transformative nature of Heldensage. Shimazu's analysis generally coincided with Symons, who claimed that for the study of Heldensage, its starting point had to be a search for historical truth or evidence (*shi jitsu*). After the historical element was extracted from Heldensage, the mythic element and production of poetic imagination remained in Heldensage. A researcher then had to choose which elements needed to be examined first. This second methodological process of choosing between Myhus and Dichtung, Shimazu claimed, required some consideration and could result in losing something. His explanation:

In the case of historical truth, the extraction [from Heldensage] is not relatively difficult. Except for the cases that clear judgment is possible, these two elements [Mythus and Dichtung] are usually intertwined not only with historical truth but also with each other. Since both are especially psychological products, and in particular, they are circulated as the same artistic imagination, in either case, it oftentimes cannot anticipate adequate analysis. Furthermore, the polished and complete legends are generally not simple; the overlapping threads of the three elements are tight, and they do not easily allow an analysis of disjoining. If we only engage with this kind of analysis, it cannot say that we do not have a danger of losing something when the three elements are fused into or something that produced as a result of the conjunction and fusion of three elements but does not belong to any of the three categories. In short, it is indeed troubling to discipline the complex forms and contents as well as transformative liquidity of Heldensage under a general principle or law.²⁸¹

As his quote shows, while he saw the limitation of the methodology for the study of the legends, he simultaneously acknowledged the “something” else—maybe something psychological and artistic—existed, in the conjunction or infusion process of three elements as well as a final product resulting from the infusion of three elements.

Shimazu’s articulation of this psychological “something” was informed by an idea of “*taishū*.” The concept of *taishū* can be translated into Japanese context like the public, the mass, the people or community. Nonetheless, what he attempted to articulate was the physiological and emotional public, which should be translated as affective crowd or community. In the introduction of his *Yoshitsune densetsu to bungaku*, Shimazu argued that historical legends were an “*otogi*” [consolation] for adults and the “collaborative project of the *taishū*,” which “reflects the most the nation [*kokuminsei*] and ethnic spirit of the people [*minzoku seishin*]”²⁸² because it

²⁸¹ Shimazu, *Yoshitsune Densetsu to Bungaku*, 20.

²⁸² *Ibid.*, 3.

hardly disappeared even in a time when science was our dominant reasoning and epistemology. *Otogi* generally meant to accompany one to console one's solitude. In the Meiji period, writers such as Iwaya Sazanami (1870-1933) used this term to refer to stories specifically for children.²⁸³

Shimazu considered progress of our epistemology based on a progressive linear narrative; time progresses from an age of myth and fairy tales like epistemology to an age of "real" history [*shin no sekishi jidai*], which meant scientific epistemology. In order to reach an age of positivist epistemology, an age of historical legends was a necessary process to experience, located between the mythic age and scientific age. However, the historical legends, which were supposed to represent the pre-modern time, held on in the contemporary time. He said:

After the time of "real" history, even at present, due to people's nature for exaggeration, curiosity, creativity, idealism, ethnic consciousness and hero worship, and the interests in *buyūdensetsu* (of course, it is not limited to *buyūdensetsu*, but as I will argue thereafter it is certainly a major constant of national legends) never die out—The more science takes over the reality, the more imagination freely transcends the science— at any rate, *buyūdensetsu* throws us interesting subjects. The heroic epics and *buyūdensetsu*, in other words, is *otogi banashi* [a story for consolation] for adults and the collaborative project of the *taishu*, that is grounded in their belief in national and idealistic heroes, which reflects the nation and ethnic spirit of the people.²⁸⁴

Shimazu neither completely believed in historical legends nor rejected the values of the legends. What he attempted to do, although he might not have been articulate enough, was to acknowledge an excess of historical legends, which was particularly

²⁸³ "Iwaya Sazanami, *Nihon kokugo dai jiten: Japan Knowledge*." Accessed March 7, 2013. <http://www.jkn21.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/body/display/>.

²⁸⁴ Shimazu, *Yoshitsune Densetsu to Bungaku*, 3-4.

a consolation for the affective and national crowd and community, inspired by pre-modern reasoning and epistemology.

Both Kindaichi and Shimazu believed that the Yoshitsune legends reflected some kind of reality about the Japanese people, particularly the psychological state of the people or longing for the national hero as the pre-modern in a very scientific modern society. Instead of supporting either side of Yoshitsune's intellectual debates, scientific or mythical commemorations, they provided a new interpretation of the Yoshitsune legends. By doing so, they shifted the discourse of the debates on Japanese imagination and identity, which had been exclusively based on the imperial lineage in historical documents (which were symbols in the debates between scientific and mythical commemorations of Japanese history) and paid more attention to mourning the historical heroes, events, and pasts, and, therefore, memory of the people. New Japanese imagination and identity became possible through this popular mourning, which was also considered a commemoration counter to the official commemoration in the written history.

Conclusion

Oyabe Zen'ichirō argued for the survival of Minamoto no Yoshitsune. According to him, Minamoto no Yoshitsune did not die in Koromogawa but fled to Hokkaido and the Asian Continent and became the Mongolian hero Genghis Khan. He published three related books in the 1920s. In addition, he wrote a life of Shizuka gozen, who was considered a concubine of Yoshitsune despite the paucity of

historical records about her. He described her life story in *Shizukagozen no shōgai* (*The life of Shizuka gozen*) in 1930.

Oyabe's books, particularly his first book, *Jingisu Kan wa Minamoto Yoshitsune nari* (1924), provoked a furious public controversy, which I identify as Yoshitsune's fever. I have introduced Sakaguchi Ango's essay, "Kaze hakase," to illustrate how culturally influential the debates were in the 1920s and 1930s. Because of particular techniques such as allegory and double entendre, his readers were expected to be familiar with the cultural context of Ango's time.

Oyabe's mythical argument for Yoshitsune's survival and revival as Genghis Khan was not accepted at all. In fact, it was seriously criticized in the intellectual community where the scientific method in history had been absolutely conventional and dominant. The intellectual debates over Yoshitsune's legends in the 1920s should be contextualized within the larger and persistent debates between scientific and mythical or nativist commemorations of the past since the Meiji period. Particularly, historians such as Shigeno Yasutsugu, Hoshino Hisashi, Kume Kunitake made tremendous efforts in eliminating the mythical parts of Japanese history and modernizing their historical research methods. Nativists who argued for the legitimacy of the imperial lineage used Japan's founding myths and historical documents such as *Kojiki* and *Nihonshoki* to support those myths. Oyabe's project of the legends of Yoshitsune was a part of this cultural nativist movement, but his particular emphasis on "cosmopolitanity," in terms of oral tradition and the Yoshitsune legends, was idiosyncratic among the other nativist accounts. In other

words, although Oyabe used pre-modern evidence such as orality and myths, he made Yoshitsune's project transnational, making it modern as well as connected to greater civilizations. In relation to creating his own identity, Oyabe attempted to find a new way of being "modern" that was not simply determined by the Western discourse like empiricism.

Oyabe's interventions in the Japanese imagination and identity were to make Japanese historical myths transnational and transform a cultural repertoire in order to include the popularized memory of Japanese heroes. Scholarship by Kindaichi Kyōsuke and Shimazu Hisamoto, scholars of the time, identified the cultural significance of Oyabe's myth-making of the Japanese hero. Both scholars acknowledged Yoshitsune's legends as "subjective truth," compared with the "historical truth," which was the central issue of the 1920s intellectual controversy. By diverting the point of discussion, they also analyzed the affective meanings of the Yoshitsune legends in relation to Japanese identity and imagination. Particularly, Kindaichi considered Yoshitsune's stories as ways of "mourning" heroes, which had not been possible in official or scientific history. The Yoshitsune controversy shifted the cultural repertoire of Japanese imagination and identity from the written and official history to the more affective and popularized memory of Japanese heroes.

Sakaguchi Ango used the term of "*kaze*" in a form of double entendre to represent Oyabe in his essay. The word means both the wind and influenza. Oyabe brought a huge controversy to the intellectual community swiftly like the wind. The people who were touched by this controversial wind got affected physically and

more importantly emotionally. The scholarship by Kindaichi and Shimazu showed that the wind opened up an affective—emotional—space for the community, where the people were able to express their feelings toward the Japanese tragic heroes. Ango, in particular, carefully and critically observed Yoshitsune fever and the people's fascinations with mythical commemoration and mourning. Furthermore, his purpose in allegorizing the intellectual controversy of the 1920s was to depict his contemporary situation in the 1930s, when healthy positivism or science was prohibited due to political surveillance to control publications and scholarship that challenged the "dignity" of the emperor. It was a retrospective phenomenon compared with the modernizing process of historical research accelerated since the Meiji period. Through his essay, Ango identified the repetitive issue in the intellectual community and stayed critical about the danger of parochialism of both kinds—scientific as well as mythical ways of historical commemoration.

Chapter 4

Disheartened by the West: The New Formation of the Meiji Christian Intelligentsia

The new concern with self involved a new experience of self. The new form of the experience of the self is to be seen in the first and second century when introspection becomes more and more detailed. A relation developed between writing and vigilance. Attention was paid to nuances of life, mood, and reading, and the experience of oneself was intensified and widened by virtue of this act of writing. A whole field of experience opened which earlier was absent.

Michel Foucault²⁸⁵

Introduction

Japanese Christian converts in the Meiji period reconstructed their Japanese identity in a unique way, as a result of their proximity to or intersubjectivity with the West. Specifically, they held Christianity as their core and fundamental value. Katayama Sen (1859-1933), Uchimura Kanzō (1861-1930), Nitobe Inazō (1862-1933), and Oyabe Zen'ichirō (1867-1941)—whom I have focused on throughout my dissertation—were all educated in the United States. They published their writings and autobiographies in foreign languages such as English and Russian. Their life-long careers and personal motivations for seeking God were different from each other. It seems not to be appropriate to discuss them as a single group. However, they all struggled with how to approach the past and create their “Japaneseness” within a framework of newly acquired western values, knowledge, and language. Their experiences in the West significantly transformed their presence and epistemology. It was what they believed to be the right advancement and progress to happen. However, a more critical question for them was how to deal with their

²⁸⁵ Foucault, “Technologies of the Self,” 28.

Japanese culture, repertoire, and past, as many of them realized the perceived inferiority of Japanese culture in an international context. The Japanese past would never simply be erased as a consequence of the incorporation of the West, which, paradoxically, became an object of obsession for them. As Christian converts, they certainly considered Christianity an important matter. Nonetheless, it was equally or more critical for them to struggle with Japan and their Japanese past. I refer to them as the Meiji Christian intelligentsia. This new form of Japanese identity was mediated by a collective experience of being disheartened by Western racial discourse, as they attempted to overcome or subvert the positionality of the Japanese.

In this chapter, I will analyze the various essays and autobiographies written by Japanese Christians in the Meiji Period, although occasionally publication dates go beyond the Meiji: Katayama's *Jiden* (1923); Uchimura's *Japan and the Japanese* (1895) or *Representative Men of Japan and How I Became A Christian* (1895); Nitobe's *Bushido: The Soul of Japan* (1900); and Oyabe Zenichirō's *A Japanese Robinson Crusoe* (1898). My primary focus is how the Meiji Christians discussed their Japanese identity as men who came so close to becoming Western subjects. The Meiji Christian intelligentsia tend not to highlight those experiences and hide them in narratives but work through their sense of inferiority and the Japanese past in various ways, including a romanticized notion of Japanese responsibility or mission (*shimei*) in international society. However, the Meiji Christians shared the similar experience of being disheartened by the West, and they attempted to overcome it by creating a new kind of Japanese identity.

Japanese Christians as “Recognizable” Subjects

Westernization has been discussed as a central thread for understanding the Meiji experience. The slogan of *bunmeikaika* (civilization and enlightenment) described a political agenda for accelerating Japan’s westernization and attempts to “catch up” with the West and become a respected member of the international community. Industrialization and incorporations of Western knowledge radically transformed Japanese lifestyles, culture, and political, social, economic, and educational systems. These advances also developed Japanese modernity, as rapid westernization was encouraged by the state.

The subject position of the Japanese was drastically changed in relation to the West. While they were exposed to Western discourse, they acknowledged their “vulnerability” and, for the first time, they strived for certain “recognition” in international discourse. Judith Butler in *Precarious Life* discusses the concept of “vulnerability” and positions it as a “basis for humanism,”²⁸⁶ which starts establishing new relations with others. She explains, “Not only is there always the possibility that a vulnerability will not be recognized, and that it will be constituted as the ‘unrecognizable,’ but when a vulnerability is one precondition for humanization, and humanization takes place differently through variable norms of recognition, then it follows that vulnerability is fundamentally dependent on existing norms of recognition if it is to be attributed to any human subject.” When subjects start to recognize their own “vulnerability,” Butler claims that that recognition leads the subjects to “strive for recognition” in a new way. When they

²⁸⁶ Butler, *Precarious Life*, 42.

seek recognition of themselves as well as from others, the relations with the self and others also change, and, more important, those relations become interconnected.

Therefore, these subjects also begin to establish new forms of relations and intersubjectivity:

When we recognize another, or when we ask for recognition for ourselves, we are not asking for an Other to see us as we are, as we already are, as we have always been, as we were constituted by virtue of the address, a need and desire or the Other that takes place in language in the broadest sense, one without which we could not be. *To ask for recognition, or to offer it, it is precisely not to ask for recognition for what one already is. It is to solicit a becoming, to instigate a transformation, to petition the future always in relation to the Other.* It is also to stake one's own being, and one's own persistence in one's being, in the struggle for recognition. This is perhaps a version of Hegel that I am offering, but it is also a departure, since I will not discover myself as the same as the 'you' on which I depend in order to be.²⁸⁷

The Japanese intelligentsia started to master international languages in a way with which the West could clearly communicate, and they acquired the language and discourse of nineteenth-century American Christianity. The Japanese Christians became "recognizable" subjects through the language of the Other: the West. They were cosmopolitan subjects who seriously and aggressively started to research the new relations between Japan and the West based on their own experiences or their positionality in-between.

Christianity as New Corporeal and Literacy Experience in the Meiji

In contrast to previous eras, the Meiji government treated Christianity quite differently. To some extent, they welcomed the religion because of its exteriority, particularly its attachment to universalism and enlightenment that Meiji Japan prioritized for their *bunmei kaika* (civilization and enlightenment) projects.

²⁸⁷ Emphasis mine. Ibid., 44.

Christianity, through the Roman Catholic Jesuit mission, was imported to Japan in the mid-sixteenth century. It was part of Portuguese and Spanish colonial expansions to Asia. Although the missionaries witnessed incredible and immediate success as a result, in the following centuries, Christianity frequently became the target of exclusion. It was considered a “threat” to the social order. The Tokugawa shogunate banned the practice of Christianity, and the Meiji government officially continued the ban until 1873. In the Tokugawa period, the persecution of Christians, mainly against Catholics, was severe, especially after the Shimabara Rebellion (1637-1638), in which a mixed group of Catholics and peasants rebelled against Shimabara and Karatsu-han. The scale of the Shimabara Rebellion made Japanese rulers more cautious of the spread of Christianity in Japanese society. However, the practice of Christianity continued underground, and so-called “hidden Christians” survived until the nineteenth century, maintaining their faith by oral tradition.

When westernization became a prominent discourse in the Meiji period, Christianity was regarded as a symbolic representation of the West. Protestant missionaries in particular entered Japan, and, indeed, Protestantism gained popularity in Japanese society. For instance, Mori Arinori, Nishi Amane, and Tsuda Mamichi, who were the members of Meirokusha (the first modern discussion forum and society) and main contributors to *Meiroku zasshi* argued for religious freedom, which guarantees the rights of individuals by the government to choose and practice their own religion. Tsuda in particular claimed that the Japanese needed to incorporate Christian morality in order to promote the national slogan of *bunmei kaika*. Accepting the Western discourse of civilization and “survival of the fittest,”

Tsuda in "Method for Advancing Enlightenment," argued that "[t]here is no religion in the world today that promotes enlightenment as does Christianity. Nevertheless, since all Christianity is not an unmixed blessing, the best way at present to promote enlightenment is to adopt the Christian ideas that are most liberal, most civilized, and most advantaged." The number of Protestant Christians increased from only 59 in 1873 to 31,361 in 1891. After the first growth in the early Meiji, from the 1890s, the Meiji state became more careful about incorporating Christianity into the Japanese state because the central issue in the Meiji period was to unify the nation based on the emperor system, and the State Shinto should have cultivated its national identity. The state simply showed tolerance rather than incorporating Christianity fully. Even for Japanese Christians, the notion of Christianity was actively reinterpreted for acceptance in Japan. Mark Mullins in *Christianity Made in Japan* argues that Japanese Christians did not fully accept the foreign organizations and forms of the missionaries coming from abroad. Instead, Japanese Christians were critical about sectarian conflicts and politics among various Christian missionaries in the nineteenth century. Their dissatisfaction with and resistance to organized Christianity made the indigenous movement in Japan grow, which scholars tend to overlook because it has been considered a "new religion," and, therefore, as "illegitimate" Christian organizations separated from the official and organized churches. Nitobe Inazo, who is known as the author of *Bushidō*, described the problematic situation with the missionaries in the Meiji period:

The sectarian bigots revive on a heathen land their own petty jealousies, for which their forefathers fought and burned one another. Nothing is more ugly and repugnant to Japanese eyes than these sectarian quarrels and jealousies;

worse than that, the Japanese seekers find themselves puzzled by a maze of conflicting teachings of different Christian bodies.²⁸⁸

Japanese Christians' resistance to Western churches also can be frameworked as Japanese Christians' reflection and understanding about religion and identity.

Extensive travel was a new corporeal experience for the Meiji intelligentsia. In 1866, the *bakufu* lifted a ban that had restricted travel outside of Japan. Even before the ban, the *bakufu* and a few domains such as *Chōshū* and *Satsuma* were sending their representatives and students to the West, including the Netherlands, Russia, England, and France. The new Meiji government took a positive policy toward Japanese traveling and study abroad, for example, ordering fifteen large domains to send two representatives each to the West.²⁸⁹ The most famous embassy was called the Iwakura Mission, which allowed the officials to spend almost two years visiting twelve western countries from 1871 to 1873.

Mastering foreign languages was a critically transformative experience for the Meiji intelligentsia. Oyabe also mastered English after spending nine years in the United States, although his native dialect of Akita region (*akitaben*) was still distinct even after the stay.²⁹⁰ Yoshida Iwao, who was one of the Japanese teachers at Abuta

²⁸⁸ Mullins, *Christianity Made in Japan*, 24.

²⁸⁹ Miyachi Masato, Sasaki Takashi, Kinoshita Naonori, and Suzuki Jun. *Bijyuaru waido Meiji jidaikan*, 2005.

²⁹⁰ Shirai Ryūjirō was deeply impressed by the Meiji Ainu activists' speeches held in May 1899 at Kanda seinen kan in Tokyo, particularly by Oyabe's speech. Oyabe as a "graduate of Yale" spoke with an Akita dialect. Because of this meeting, Shirai decided to work with Oyabe and became an educator for the Ainu (Ikeda, "Yoshitsune=Gingisukan densetsu wo tukutta otoko Oyabe Zen'ichirōwo ou," 126).

gakuen, was totally “surprised” by Oyabe’s fluent English.²⁹¹ Some documents record that a granddaughter of Kikuyo (Oyabe’s wife) remembered that Kikuyo used to say frequently about her husband, “That person’s [Oyabe] face looks like a Japanese, but his inside is like a foreigner.”²⁹²

Uchimura Kanzō’s mastery of English was also compelling and powerful. He was born into a Takasaki-han samurai family in 1861. His particular samurai background in the early Meiji period influenced his searching for new and powerful Western ideas and language, which could potentially challenge or oversee the newly overthrown government and social system in the early Meiji period. Irwin Scheiner explains that Christian missionaries had a tremendous impact on the samurai class in the early Meiji period. As a result of the Meiji Restoration, the Tokugawa’s status driven society (*shi-nō-kō-shō*) was dismantled, and everyone became equal subjects under the Meiji emperor. For the samurai stratum, the result of this social status meant that they were no longer dominant subjects in the society. They lost the most important political discourse that constituted, defined, and legitimated their identity, presence and political power. Scheiner describes the samurai’s drastic shift in positionality as an “estrangement from power” that caused certain political, social, and psychological effects. He affirms that “estrangement” was not a single factor for the samurai’s conversion to Christianity, but he claims that “estrangement gave the impetus that caused some samurai to redefine their social and political

²⁹¹ Yoshida, *Kokoro no tabi*, “I was surprised by Bachelor’s [John Bachelor] fluent Japanese. Furthermore, I was surprised by Oyabe sensei’s fluent English,” quoted in Ikeda “Yoshitsune=Gingisukan densetsu wo tukutta otoko Oyabe Zen’ichirō wo ou,” 127.

²⁹² Ibid., 128.

situation in terms of a new normative synthesis and, eventually, to find in that synthesis an alternative path to power.”²⁹³

The acquisition of a foreign language was an assuring and transformative experience. Intellectuals and officials understood that Japan’s national progress depended on its westernization and degree of incorporating Western knowledge and systems. English as a powerful international language was also considered critical for Japan’s intelligibility within the international society. Therefore, Japanese intellectuals’ mastery of English aligned them with urgent national policy and provided them with leading positions in various important arenas.

For Uchimura, for example, the language learning directly linked to his conversion happened at the Sapporo Agricultural College. And, this new language, English, became Uchimura’s newly acquired literary tool to express himself openly and candidly. When Uchimura arrived at the Sapporo Agricultural College at the age of sixteen, he signed two kinds of pledges; one was for the abstinence from tobacco and alcohol and the other was for the baptism that converted him to Christianity. He easily signed the first one because he was not particularly attracted to those substances or he was seeing that his father was drinking sake even within the family’s limited financial situation and he disliked his father’s drinking. However, the second pledge, the covenant, was difficult and troubling because the act of signing disconnected him from his samurai background and his nation. Furthermore, this difficult covenant experience was also entangled with his struggle to decipher the English in which the pledge was written. John Howes, who published

²⁹³ Scheiner, *Christian Converts and Social Protest in Meiji Japan*, 25.

a book on the life of Uchimura, sees his covenant as the highlight of his school years at the Sapporo Agricultural College, and importantly, his conversion was made possible by his efforts to decipher the language in the pledge:

The high point of the experience for Kanzō came when he signed the covenant. He could not accept it in the spirit of a sentimental dream for self-improvement. He had to read the words one by one, check their individual meanings, and reassemble them into a whole. He could not escape the recognition that this act made him a different person. He had become a “new man” and had the training along with the outlook appropriate to this status.²⁹⁴

Even from the point of departure represented by this conversion experience, Uchimura’s Christian faith inevitably developed along with his search for a new language and literature. Therefore, Christianity was a literary experience for the Meiji Christian intelligentsia. John Howes pays attention to Uchimura’s process of mastering English and its significant effect on his life. He insightfully summarizes the process:

Their [the Japanese] recognition of Japan’s inferiority before the West had prompted them to seek new knowledge from the West, and to accomplish their aim they needed men fluent in Western languages. They considered these languages to be tools that differed so greatly that in the process of real mastery the student became a different person. Young Japanese who gained fluency in English discovered, as Westerners who gained fluency in Japanese were later to discover, that in the process of their accomplishment they themselves had changed. Kanzō set out to acquire a new weapon, and he discovered too late that this weapon, once mastered, had in fact mastered him.²⁹⁵

Miyabe Kingo, a successful botanist and a good friend of Uchimura and Nitobe, also commented on the great transformation brought to their mode of expression, particularly when it was applied to their personal, emotional, and candid expression. Miyabe said, “We felt that only with English could we express our

²⁹⁴ Howes, *Japan’s Modern Prophet*, 43.

²⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 26.

innermost emotions and thoughts.”²⁹⁶ His samurai background and adolescent English schooling in Tokyo, as well studying at Sapporo Agricultural College, connected him with many other prominent Christian figures and helped them establish a particular bond as a Christian community.

The Meiji Christian Intelligentsia

The word intelligentsia usually refers to a new stratum of people in Russian society that emerged between 1838 and 1848, almost a century after Peter the Great passionately promoted westernization as a state policy. In this westernization process, the intelligentsia were exposed to Western literature and ideas. They actively incorporated the technologies of the West into their own society and contributed to the modernization of Russia. Isaiah Berlin describes them as follows:

They [the intelligentsia] were a small group of *littérateurs*, both professional and amateur, conscious of being alone in a bleak world, with a hostile and arbitrary government on the one hand, and a completely uncomprehending mass of oppressed and inarticulate peasants on the other, conceiving of themselves as a kind of self-conscious army, carrying a banner for all to see—of reason and science, of liberty, of a better life.²⁹⁷

Acquisition of Western knowledge was a critical transformation for the Russian intelligentsia. It not only made them different from the “inarticulate” peasants, but truly liberated them from the old societal frameworks and customs and transformed their epistemologies. Since they were few in the society and shared Western romanticism, they also shared a strong bond. They functioned as a radical and active community to modernize the society.

²⁹⁶ Howes, *Japan's Modern Prophet*, 43.

²⁹⁷ Berlin, *Russian Thinkers*, 144.

Berlin's description of the intelligentsia can be applied to the general characteristics of the Meiji Christian intelligentsia. The people whom I examine in this chapter were also educated in the West, particularly in the United States, and became Christian converts. They regularly spoke and wrote in English and discussed international politics. In fact, many of their essays, as well as their autobiographies and memoirs, were written in English or in other foreign languages. They acquired skills and knowledge to maneuver appropriately, even in the Western societies and discourses. They came close but were never fully accepted.

Their conditions, however, were not that easy. In his *Shūhen bunmei ron* (*Theories of Peripheral Civilizations*, 1985), Yamamoto Shin, a Japanese scholar of comparative civilizations, compares the Japanese westernization process with the Russian one and claims that the intelligentsia were actually located in-between—between the West and their own indigenous societies—although they were recognized as promoters of Western civilization (he uses the metaphor “lever” to describe how a small population of the intelligentsia influenced societies on a large scale). Because of their idiosyncratic location, they were conflicted.²⁹⁸

Yamamoto finds a similar pathological feeling in Pyotr Yakovlevich Chaadaev's well-known *Philosophical Letters*, which he wrote in French between 1826 and 1831, and in Natsume Sōseki's speech entitled as “Gendai nihon no kaika” (“Civilization in the Contemporary Japan”), delivered in 1911. Both described unbearable and vulnerable feelings and conditions in indigenous societies, resulting from a powerful westernization. Yamamoto pays attentions to the emotional

²⁹⁸ Yamamoto, *Shūhen bunmei ron*.

descriptions, like “strange” (Chaadaev) and “a sense of vacuum” or “somewhat unsatisfactory or anxious” (Sōseki), used in those narratives. What Yamamoto discovers was that there was an intricate state of modernity that was never accounted for by the modernist’s linear development model, which simply measures the level of national development as “developed” or “undeveloped.” He explains:

I dare say that people who cannot be sympathy with the strangeness cannot understand its cruciality. To say simply, the Russian’s “un-development” was not described as “strange.” This is almost a non-intangible matter for those who only possess a schema of “developed” or “undeveloped (senshin-kōshin). When a culture is encroached by a heterogeneous culture, cultural conflicts occur. People who were caught in the conflicts see these conflicts “strange” and sense their experience “strange.” A diagram of “developed or undeveloped” only describes a gap between similar and coessential cultures. If the two cultures are similar and a belated culture is pulled out, it is called “progress” or “development,” but it can never be described as “strange.” ... Between the different cultures, what happens is neither progress nor development; it is rather “strange” blending and eclecticism, “strange” imitation and patchwork. The modern West, because it has not experienced the superior cultural influences, has not theorized cultural conflicts of indigenous societies due to an extrinsic inflow. It only has a diagram of “developed” or “undeveloped.” This “modernization” theory cannot delineate the reality of “westernization.”²⁹⁹

The westernization process cannot be fully understood through a modernist model of understanding development and civilization. Rather, the focus should be on the “strange” and “unsatisfactory or anxious” feelings and experiences of indigenous people and societies.

Furthermore, Yamamoto conceives of indigenous vulnerability in a framework of pathology, illustrating them as “the sick,” and their experience as “troubled souls” and “wounds.” He argues that the Japanese subject’s knowing that Japanese

²⁹⁹Ibid., 129.

modernity was extrinsic and externally inflicted (*“gaihatsuteki”*) was the discovery of “the sick,” who was “wounded” by westernization. He claims:

A large amount of rapid westernization disturbed the indigenous structures and impossible to organize or structure them. If the westernization process had been a small extent with a slower speed, it could have been incorporated into the indigenous context. It is said “extrinsic” because its foreign origin was overwhelming; it did not match to the indigenous context; it was impossible to be structured. Therefore as Chaadaev and Sōseki said, the westernization was superficial (*uwasuberī*). It was not simply like the situation where modern Japan was influenced by the modern Western civilization. If so, the autonomy or agency was relatively on our side. This was not the case. If the Western influence was too large and powerful, it became pathological. The Japanese civilization was culturally located under the governance of the Western civilization and from idea to system, Japan’s cultural sources, methods, and praxes completely depended on the imported Western ones. Japan’s cultural inspiration would dry up and exhaust quickly if it was drawn from the outside. Japan was always catching up with the state-of-the art ideas, technologies, and systems and preoccupied with producing a copy culture. Japan was completely defeated, culturally defeated.

The discovery of the Japanese modernity as “extrinsic” is a discovery of “the sick,” who was wounded by “Westernization.” For the souls which were not wounded by “Westernization” lacked the internal distortions that Sōseki and Chaadaev experienced and could not understand that it was a actually severe wound that could have led to the level of pathological disorder. They simply believed that absorption of the Western civilization would simply enrich them. For those “modern modernists” could not understand the meanings of their severely distressed ideas.³⁰⁰

To be wounded by “westernization” not only meant a difficulty of making the modern West their own, but also allowed the massive entry of external civilizations to trouble integrity and even to distract souls who were capable of feeling. Being wounded by “westernization” caused the pathological confusions of Chaadaev and Sōseki. The external civilizations troubled and tore the sensitive souls. The torn souls made them realize that indigenous modernity was imitative and superficial; therefore, it was “extrinsic.”

³⁰⁰ Ibid., 134.

A major troubling experience for the intelligentsia in peripheral civilizations like Russia and Japan was to know the critical discontinuities between Western civilization and their civilizations, developments, and histories. The embodiment of the Western discourses of the intelligentsia, as well as popular imitations of the masses, made them not only see their societies as “strange” but also sense their own experiences as “strange” and “anxious.” Their own embodiment of the West and the positionality of “in-betweenness” hardly gave them relief from their convoluted feelings. This was a traumatically ironic experience for the Meiji intelligentsia, and I would also say that it was a trauma for Japanese modernity.

Although Yamamoto’s approach to analyzing the emotions of Chaadaev and Sōseki enables us to articulate the concept of intelligentsia, which differentiates it from the linear developmental model or simple belief in westernization, it does not clearly give us what exactly a “strange” or an “anxious” feeling was. I will take his important approach to emotions and feelings and go further in order to examine what constituted these emotions, particularly through his experience in the West and returning to the Meiji intelligentsia of Japan.

Christianity and Self-Writing

Autobiographical writings provide us with important accounts for examining identity and the self, not only because of a simple assumption that those writings reveal the authentic self and “confess” but also because they comprise a reflective activity that constitutes, cultivates, and transforms the self. The autobiographical writings of the Meiji Christians are interconnected yet dialectical modes where various discourses meet, conflict with each other, and shape the self. And, by writing about themselves, paying attention to the details of their experiences, they also

experienced a new self, which they had not happened before. Foucault's essays, which specifically discuss his idea of "technologies of the self," explore the critical issue of "self-writing." They are useful for analyzing the Meiji Christians' autobiographical and self-writing, not only within the conventional discourse of Christianity but also within his discursive approaches to the relations among truth, subjectivity, and writing.

Christians write about themselves; this is not historically new at all in the history of the West (the flip side of it is that it is new to Japanese history). Foucault assures that "this is not a modern trait born of the Reformation or of romanticism; it is one of the most ancient Western traditions. It was well established and deeply rooted in Augustine starting with his *Confessions*."³⁰¹ If it has been a part of the long tradition of western thought and philosophy, why does this most banal act of "self-writing" matter for us? In his "Technologies of the Self," Foucault begins his article by asking about a particular relation between sexual interdictions and a necessary force that one "tell the truth about one's self." His primary interests, however, put in a larger context, lie in the "relation between asceticism and truth", or, more specifically, in the relations between self-disclosure (or writing) and self-denunciation in Western thought. He traces the history of technologies of the self by identifying two major practices: "to take care of yourself" and "know yourself (thyself)." He argues that in ancient Greco-Roman philosophy (for example, Plato's *Alcibiades*) a concern with the self meant a care for the self, exploring different

³⁰¹ Foucault, "Technologies of the Self," 27.

aspects of soul in order to “recover the efficacy which God has printed on one’s soul and which the body has tarnished.”³⁰²

While a concern or care for the self meant uncovering this divine functioning in the self, the Christian praxis, as well as the tremendous development of morality in the secular world, has limited the technologies of the self to a specific practice of “know thyself.” Christianity played a critical role in shifting the technologies of the self to a simple practice of “know thyself.” Christianity is significantly connected to “truth obligations”³⁰³ because it is a “salvation” and “confessional” religion that demands that the believers hold on to a sense of truth within the self and the relations to their externality, including God as proof of their faith. Foucault precisely explains:

...Christianity imposed a set of conditions and rules of behavior for a certain transformation of the self.... The duty to accept a set of obligations, to hold certain books as permanent truth, to accept authorization decisions in matters of truth, not only to believe certain things but to show that one believes, and to accept institutional authority are all characteristic of Christianity.³⁰⁴

Furthermore, he explains that Christianity requires a detailed or hermeneutical scrutiny of the self, an effort to know what is happening with the self and relations with others. Therefore, “the truth obligations of faith and the self are linked together. This link permits a purification of the soul impossible without self-knowledge.”³⁰⁵ For Christians, to “know yourself,” constitutes an inevitable praxis for the realization of faith.

³⁰² Ibid., 21.

³⁰³ Ibid., 40.

³⁰⁴ Ibid., 40.

³⁰⁵ Ibid., 40.

Consequently, self-disclosure becomes an essential practice in early Christianity and the church, in relation to technologies of self. He examines two forms of self-disclosure such as “*exomologēsis*,” and “*exagoreusis*,” which differed from the popularized, and verbally oriented ritual of “confession.” *Exomologēsis*³⁰⁶ was a public recognition and obtainment of one’s status as a sinner. Foucault explains, a Christian is “the aggregate of manifested penitential behavior, of self-punishment as well as of self-revelation.” Two acts, self-punishment and self-revelation, were inseparable. Through “*exomologēsis*,” Christians hoped to “rub out the sin and to restore the purity acquired by baptism,” however, paradoxically, it presented him as a sinner. Therefore, the ritual was not simply verbal; it was “symbolic, ritual, and theatrical.”³⁰⁷ “*Exagoreusis*,” on the contrary, was a spiritual and monastic way of self-knowing, though the continual contemplation and obedience to masters or God. This form was closer to another technology of self, “taking care of one’s self.”

Although both forms of self-disclosure differed, what they shared in common was that both required self-renunciation. Foucault asserts, “You cannot disclose without renouncing... Disclosure of self is the renunciation of one’s own self.” The³⁰⁸ paradox of the Christian technology of “know yourself” is that as much as a Christian pursues self-knowledge, he or she has to renounce the self. Foucault claims that the technology of “‘know thyself’ has predominated the technology of ‘take care of

³⁰⁶ Ibid., 41

³⁰⁷ Ibid., 43.

³⁰⁸ Ibid., 48.

yourself' because "our morality, a morality of asceticism, insists that the self is that which one can reject."³⁰⁹ He further explains,

We find it difficult to base rigorous morality and austere principles on the precept that we should give ourselves more care than anything else in the world. We are more inclined to see taking care of ourselves as an immorality, as a means of escape from all possible rules. We inherit the tradition of Christian morality which makes self-renunciation the condition for salvation. To know oneself was paradoxically the way to self-renunciation.³¹⁰

Self-renunciation and more broadly romanticization worked when Japanese Christians faced any challenges and difficulties in the West. When one considers the difference between the Meiji writers and the Christian intelligentsia, one discovers that the faith which made the Christian intelligentsia regard their challenges are given by God. Therefore, they might not have been fond of discussing their disheartening racial experiences and sense of failure in the West.

The Question of the Self, Writing, and Christianity in Modern Japanese History

Self-writing or autobiography has been an important part of Japanese culture and literature. Saeki Shōichi in "The Autobiography in Japan" shows the significantly long history of autobiography practiced in various genres and forms of writing, such as *nikki* (journal), since the Heian period (794-1185).³¹¹ In addition, Ann Walthall analyzes Suzuki Bokushi's (1770-1842) autobiographies, including *Hokuetsu Seppu* (*Snow Country Tales*), *Yonabegusa* (*Notes While Burning* *Accounting for the Ages*) and argues that these texts were used for establishing the cultural family lineage and identity of rural entrepreneurs by distinguishing

³⁰⁹ Ibid., 22.

³¹⁰ Ibid., 22.

³¹¹ Saeki, "The Autobiography in Japan," 357-368.

themselves from other peasants in the late Tokugawa period.³¹² However, in the quite long history of this cultural form of autobiography, many researchers claim that modern Japanese autobiography, including the popular genre of I-novel during the Taisho period, represents the essential quality of Japanese cultural and intellectual history,³¹³ succinctly summarized, for example, as “the alternation between extreme sensitivity and openness to outside influences and the truly tenacious clinging to an internally consistent nativism.”³¹⁴ More specifically, it is “the interplay between the traditional preoccupation with the self and the Western sense of the individual.”³¹⁵ As examples of works of modern autobiography in the Meiji period that demonstrate this modern feature, Saeki lists Fukuzawa Yukichi’s *Fukuō jiden* and Uchimura Kanzō’s *How I Became a Christian*.³¹⁶

If the central theme in Japanese modern autobiography is the conversation between “outside influences” and “an internally consistent nativism,” what was it like in the Meiji period?

Oyabe Zen’ichirō (1867-1941): Reinvention of Robinson Crusoe and Japan as a Nation of *Kami*

A Japanese Robinson Crusoe narrates Oyabe’s life starting with his childhood, his adventurous trip to the United States, his school life in America, his travels to Europe, and his life as a Christian minister in Hawaii. Like other Christian narratives, Oyabe’s disheartening experiences are not explicitly spelled out. As I have described

³¹² Walthall, “The Family Ideology of the Rural Entrepreneurs in Nineteenth Century Japan”.

³¹³ For example, Saeki (translated by Craig), “The Autobiography in Japan” in *Journal of Japanese Studies* 11(2), 1985 or Tomonari, *Constructing Subjectivities*.

³¹⁴ Saeki (translated by Craig), “The Autobiography in Japan,” 368.

³¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 368.

³¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 367.

in Chapter 1, Oyabe silenced his racial experiences, particularly regarding his Native American and African American classmates. Instead, he emphasizes the mutual acceptance between he shared with white philanthropists. In his memoir, however, Oyabe discusses the hardship he experienced during his travel and life in America and romanticizes it as a challenge given from God in order to prove his achievement and, ultimately, Christian faith. For example, the first time he attempted to travel to America by crossing the Arctic regions although he knew it was not a popular travel route to the United States. He left Ezo and traveled to Kamchatka (Russia), passing through the Kurile Islands. But there, a Russian officer stopped him and made him go back to Japan because he was not carrying his passport. He was also informed that it was impossible to cross the Arctic to get to America. He returned to Japan at once. The following is how Oyabe describes his adventure after returning to Ezo from Kamchatka:

“...Though now all my things are stolen and I have become the poorest man in the world, yet I must not give up my intense desire of visiting the wonderful country, America” I answered myself.

Truly, meeting with such obstacles, I suppose nine out of ten young men give up hope. Not only so, but demoralization would follow; and a robust young fellow would soon be beaten by it, and sink into the lowest society to his ruin. I came to understand that there is no journey upon this earth that a man may not make if he sets his heart upon it. There are no mountains he may not climb; there are no living creatures he cannot control, and there is nothing save the impossible that he cannot do. Then, if we work and wait, and are single-minded, we shall sooner or later reach our mark.

“Sail on; we’re men in this great age
 Now rich who once were poor.
 Why will you fret and waste your time?
 Up, man! to play your part.”³¹⁷

³¹⁷ Ibid., 66.

Oyabe compares the hardship he experienced on his trip and stay in the United States with with the hardship that Robinson Crusoe experienced in the novel written by Daniel Defoe in 1719. This book became popular in nineteenth-century America when Oyabe was living there. While describing Robinson Crusoe as an “old” Crusoe, Oyabe depicts himself as a “new” Crusoe. And, the difference between the two, Oyabe explains, is that “the former [the original Crusoe] drifted away unintentionally to a desolate island, while the latter [Oyabe] wandered purposely from island to island, looking for a ‘land of saints,’ and finally reached the shores of America, leading there. During nine years, a struggling life in pursuit for a higher education.” Oyabe as a Japanese man brags that he is like, or even superior to, a brave white man because, unlike Robinson Crusoe, Oyabe overcomes hardship for a mighty purpose, acquiring Western knowledge, particularly theology. Oyabe focused on his romanticized mission in the world, which also translated into a Japanese holy mission in international society.

Although the general tone of the book encapsulates the romanticization of Oyabe’s hardship and masculine adventure, there are a few places where his critiques of American civilization, based on his racial experiences in the United States, surfaced. Specifically, Chapter 12 (“Darkest America”) describes his first arrival in New York City and his early days in America. Both Oyabe and Robinson suffered much and attempted different ways for “deliverance.” However, Oyabe insists that his hardship is far more intense than that of Robinson. Oyabe writes:

The old Robinson Crusoe was cast upon an uninhabited island of the sea, but nature had abundantly provided him with food; the climate was always warm, so that a man would not suffer though he had no house or clothing.

But, I the poor stranger, was now landed in a thickly inhabited and most civilized and thriving city [New York]. My heart was not at ease, for my situation was more dangerous than in a bare island where far more difficulties than Robinson had, for though there were all sorts of things in the market, and homes and restaurants were plentiful, yet nobody would welcome me unless I had my pockets full of the almighty dollar, which seemed the only deity which many of these people worshipped. Without it I was not allowed to take either fruit of flower, both of which were offered to Robinson Crusoe by nature.

Still, like the other Robinson Crusoe, "I walked about one the shore, lifting up my hands; and my whole being, as I may say, wrapped up in contemplation of my deliverance, making a thousand gestures and motions, which I cannot describe."³¹⁸

This statement describes Oyabe's financial situation upon his arrival in New York City. It wasn't only his financial situation that made him "precarious" in the city, however; his race was an additional element that created hardship for him. For example, he was almost refused a hair cut because he looked Chinese. Convinced that he was not Japanese, the shop person believed that Oyabe was "Javanese," and deceived him by giving him back fake coins.³¹⁹ After relating his bad impressions of the city and people there, he shows huge disappointment in the United States as a Christian country by pointing out people's rudeness, lack of education, and "race prejudice:" "I thought America was the land of Christian civilization and general education, but I soon lost my confidence in her, for the language was imperfect, the man was knavish and with a strong race prejudice, much stronger than in China, a pagan kingdom, so called by the Christian missionaries."³²⁰ Although he strongly criticizes negative developments in "American civilization," in the end, he concludes

³¹⁸ Ibid., 115.

³¹⁹ Ibid., 116.

³²⁰ Ibid., 116-117.

that his New York experience was the result of observing the “low-class people”³²¹ in American society. He also mentions slavery and black-white relations. However, instead of examining his experience and observations in the city, he concludes the chapter with a general and abstract saying. Because of that, his racial experiences and disappointment in America were not fully articulated and clearly verbalized. The following is the ending of the chapter with the general statement, which avoids descriptions of racial dynamics. : “‘Look not upon one’s outward appearance,’ was a very applicable word for the Yankee society. And at last I will advocate her right with one word: Judge not the honeycomb by its look, for the honey cannot be found on the outside.”³²²

Oyabe’s memoir might not discuss explicit details about his failure or experiences of being disheartened by the West, but when his later publications are examined, his reinterpretation of the Japanese past and identity becomes more explicit like other Christians’ writings and autobiographies. Oyabe came back to Tokyo from Hokkaido in 1909 after he quit his position as a principal of the Abuta School (see Chapter 2 about his life in Hokkaido). He published a book, *Gin Gisu Kan wa Minamoto Yoshitsune nari* (1924), claiming that Genghis Khan was actually Minamoto Yoshitsune. Oyabe’s later arguments and publications look strange and almost suspicious to many contemporary readers. Some categorize his later publications as *tondemo* (outrageous), which cannot be proven based on scientific evidence. However, these books have the same function as Nitobe’s *Bushidō*. Oyabe’s eclectic writings, especially his Yoshitsune survival legends and the claim that the

³²¹ Ibid., 121.

³²² Ibid., 121.

Japanese (*Nihon oyobi nihonkokuminno kigen*) are a lost tribe of Israel, attempt to connect the Japanese past to another great world civilization, such as Chinese and Western civilizations, by reworking historical myths. By reworking the myths of a historical hero, Yoshitsune, as well as the origin of Japan as a nation of *kami* (*shinkoku*), Oyabe legitimized Japanese myths, which he believed were crucial in constructing modern Japanese identity. Oyabe drew the concept of myth, which is also central to biblical understanding of Christianity, and applied it to the Japanese context in order to legitimize the Japanese past, thus universalizing and modernizing Japanese historical myths to construct Japanese identity. His peculiar arguments show a way of reconsidering the Japanese past, trying to overcome Japan's inferior positionality in the international context, and using Christianity or theology as a practical framework to rework the Japanese past and identity.

In his *Nihon oyobi nihon kokumin no kigen (Origin of Japan and the Japanese People, 1929)*, Oyabe specifically argues that the Japanese were one of the lost tribes of Israel because of similarities in phonetics, various rituals, and serious devotion to religion. He writes:

It is well-known to Biblical scholars in the West and the world over that approximately three hundred years before the enthronement of the Emperor Jimmu [in 600 B.C.E] two tribes of the Hebrews—Gad, the most valiant, and Manasseh, who were descended from the eldest son of the patriarch—fled eastward carrying the Hebrew's sacred treasures, and to this day their whereabouts remain unknown. A close study of the ancient Hebrews as they are described in the Jewish scriptures reveals an extraordinary number of similarities between our two peoples. The Japanese and the Hebrews are virtually identical, particularly in regard to the pious way in which we observe our religious festivals. These exact correspondences convince me that we are in fact one race.³²³

³²³ Oyabe translated by Goodman and Miyazawa in *Jews in the Japanese Mind*, 66.

The central question in the discussion of the origin of Japan and the Japanese people is about the historical explanation of imperial lineage and the mythical presence of emperors, who are considered direct descendants of Sun goddess, Amaterasu. Oyabe reinterpreted the Japanese ancient founding myths and the Japanese imperial line, which appear in *Kojiki* and *Nihonshoki* with the stories found in the Old Testament. A Japanese emperor, called *mikado* derived from *mi* (the honorific prefix) and *Gado* (as Gad, a son of Jacob and forebear of one of the tribes of Israel, is pronounced in Japanese),³²⁴ is therefore a part of the Israel tribes that fled eastward. *Takamanohara* (高天原), where Susano-o produced various deities and was governed by Amaterasu, is considered the birth place of the Japanese nation according to *Kojiki*, Oyabe argued, and was where the story of Noah's Ark was staged in Genesis 8:4. He pointed out the phonetic similarity between *Takamanohara* and Tagara, Hara, where Noah's Ark came to rest at Mount Ararat after the great flood was located: Tagara, and its capital called Hara.³²⁵

Compared with a nation like the United States, which consists of "individual" immigrants, Oyabe claims that Japan is a divine nation that bears a holy mission to serve. In the following statement, he both challenged the Shinto version of Japan's founding myth as primitive and illegitimate ("the unbroken line of Japan did not just emerge from the sea one day") but simultaneously underlined the Japanese myth by rearranging it with the universal understanding of Christianity. In other words,

³²⁴ Ibid., 66 (aa in footnotes).

³²⁵ Oyabe, *Nihon oyobi nihon kokumin no kigen*, 25-29.

Japanese Shinto's understanding of Japan as a divine nation (*shinkoku*) was reinterpreted with theology, the Christian notion of God. He writes:

The unbroken line of Japan[ese emperors] did not just emerge from the sea one day. In ancient times, the northeastern corner of the East Asian continent sank into the sea because of a major upheaval. The area was inundated and became part of the ocean. The land that remained, supported by massive roots, became islands. Ever since, numerous people have dreamed their days away in this peaceful ocean basin, making no contribution to civilization whatsoever. *However, our ancestors, with three thousand years of culture behind them and blessed by God with a divine mission, migrated to this land and by dint of zealous efforts established the Imperial nation of Japan.* Unlike the people of the United States in North America, whose ancestors immigrated individually and separately, our ancestors arrived as a mass with a longstanding tradition of fealty to their sovereign and in possession of sacred treasures that were the sign of the ever-lasting covenant that existed between them and their Divine Lord. The nation that was created through the toil shared by sovereign and subject was none other than this Divine Nation, Japan.³²⁶

The final phase of Oyabe's life was devoted to reforming Shinto, which he believed contributes to the Japanese future. As Goodman and Miyazaki claim, "Oyabe's theory of Japanese-Jewish common ancestry was thus part of an explicitly syncretic theology that regarded Shinto as the Japanese national expression of Christianity. His goal in studying Christianity was, he says, to enhance Shinto so that it might better serve the Japanese nation."³²⁷ Looking back at his own life, Oyabe believed that all of his hardship—including studying Christianity in America, educating the Ainu in Hokkaido, his research trip to Mongolia to study the Yoshitsune legends—was for reforming "archaic" Shinto to be able to "keep pace with world progress." He writes in the preface of the book as follows:

Despite my poor ability, I wanted to make a profound study of why our Japan is a holy nation, so I spent years collecting materials. I returned from the

³²⁶ Emphasis mine. Ibid.

³²⁷ Ibid., 69.

culturally resplendent West and immediately immersed myself in a desolate Ainu village. I dedicate the prime of my life to the education of these aborigines. As I was doing so, I researched the details of their language and customs, searched for remnants of their primitive cave dwellings, and furthered my research by excavating many ancient stone tools and earthen vessels. *In order to validate my theory that the doctrine of Christianity is the same as our Shinto, I studied theology in the United States; and, desiring to explore the heart of Shinto, I became a lecture at the Institute of Japanese Classics, Kokugakuin University, and others of the best institutions dedicated to the study of Shinto.* I also went to Southern China, Korea, the Ryūkyū, Chishima, as well as Siberia, Manchuria, and Mongolia to search for and to observe any trace of our people from ancient times. All of these experiences have been put to use in this book.

...Through all these hardships, I came to realize the need to teach the Japanese people Shinto so that they might nurture their faith. However, Shinto as it existed was bound by archaic customs and was unable to keep pace with world progress. I therefore sought to reform Shinto and make it an institution that would benefit both public affairs and private morals.³²⁸

Although it would not be a mistake to identify him as a Christian, what these statements show is that Oyabe's Christianity was combined with Shinto, or, more accurately, he utilized Christianity in order to develop and modernize Shinto.

Oyabe's argument for the origin of the Japanese nation—particularly that Japanese people shared the same origin as other races, commonly called *minzoku dōsoron*—was an important part of intellectual discussions from the end of the Tokugawa period to the end of World War II. The main focus of the theory was on the Japanese polity, particularly regarding the nation's self-understanding, or *kokutai*, which envisions the Japanese nation as a patriarchal family that centers on the emperor.³²⁹ This legal understanding that Japanese sovereignty lies with the

³²⁸ Ibid., 68 Emphasis mine.

³²⁹ Oguma, *Eiji Oguma, A genealogy of 'Japanese' self-images, English ed., Japanese society series*. Oguma delineates the intellectual discussions of the origin of the Japanese nation from the end of the Tokugawa period to the present. He starts with the debate on mixed residence in the interior in the late-nineteenth century, which centered on whether Japan should allow foreigners to live with the Japanese. He focuses on the debates that occurred

emperor was secured in the Meiji constitution in 1889. It became a dominant national discourse through the intellectual discussions, politics, as well as education encapsulated in for example, the Imperial Rescript on Education, which required school children to memorize and recite the Rescript at school every day in support of the emperor family system.

However, the critical turning points occurred during the national polity discussions when Japan colonized foreign places as Hokkaido in 1873,³³⁰ Okinawa in 1879,³³¹ Taiwan in 1895, Korea in 1910, and Manchuria in 1932 and embraced different ethnicities to establish and expand Japanese empire. The question that national polity theorists and other intellectuals had to deal with was how to explain the newly formed Japanese empire consisting of multiple ethnicities that were not historically families of the emperor. In order to rework the interpretation of the national polity, Japanese intellectuals, such as historians and anthropologists, actively researched the origin of the Japanese in order to legitimize the multi-ethnic conditions resulting from Japanese imperialism. The *minzoku dōshoron* (the theory that the Japanese share origins with other ethnicities) discussions were also part of this intellectual effort.

between Taguchi Ukichi (1855-1905), a historian and economist who favored the allowance of mixed residence, and Inoue Tesujirō (1856-1944), a philosopher who opposed mixed residence because of his belief that the Japanese are racially inferior and cannot compete with other races and cultures.

³³⁰ The Meiji government established the *Hokkaido kaitaku shi* in 1873, and Ezo was renamed Hokkaido and incorporated into the Japanese political system.

³³¹ Ryūkyū first became a ryūkyū *han*, then incorporated into Kagoshima-ken; it was renamed Okinawa in 1879 (Taira, "Troubled National Identity: the Ryukyuans/Okinawans," 153-157). The Ainu and Okinawans through the process of *haihanchiken* were incorporated into the Japanese political system, and they all became Japanese subjects in the early Meiji period.

Christian intellectuals usually believed the mixed nature of national polity, and so opposed the alleged national polity theorists.³³² However, under the colonization processes, the idea that encompassed different ethnicities in the national polity matched the principles of Japanese imperialism. Therefore, it was quite natural that Oyabe as a Christian intellectual supported *minzoku* in 1929, advocating the universality of the Japanese race and civilization.

However, an interesting part of Oyabe's argument was that the Japanese shared origins with the Jews. Furthermore, Oyabe acknowledged the indigenous group of the Ainu, who have lived with the Yamato in Japan throughout history, which I should add, was a common understanding of Japanese anthropologists of the time, such as Tsuboi Shōgorō. I will further explain these two aspects.

In the book, following the phonetic similarities of the various terms, Oyabe explains that Japanese people can be divided into two ethnicities: the indigenous people and the *tenson jinshu* (the people who are depicted as the descendants of Japanese founding deities appear in *Kojiki* and *Nihonshoki*). The indigenous people Oyabe categorizes are not exactly the Ainu people, but the pre-Ainu people called *corpokkur*, who allegedly dwelled in caves. This idea of *corpokkur* was proposed by Tsuboi Shōgorō, the first anthropologist at the University of Tokyo. Tsuboi, as I have shown in Chapter 2, was an important member of *Hokkaido Kyūdojin kyūikukai* (Hokkaido Association of Saving the Ex-Primitives), which closely worked with Oyabe in order to establish a school for the Ainu. These *corpokkur* people, according

³³² Oguma discusses the Meiji Christians' opposition to national polity theorists, particularly from 1895, from the cession of Taiwan, to the annexation of Korea in 1910 (See Chapter 3 of his book, *Oguma, A genealogy of 'Japanese' self-images*).

to Oyabe, are also described in the Old Testament as the Jebus in current Elis (Greece). After wandering for a while, these people become the Tungus. They started calling themselves “Ietta,” —the “eta” people who are now the ancestors of the Japanese. They were descendants of Kushi/Cushi, the oldest son of Ham, whose father was Noah. These pre-Ainu people are the descendants of the Izumo people who, according to the *Kojiki* and *Nihonshoki*, were taken over by the Yamato people. The Esau in the Edom region of Palestine, together with an indigenous group of Ebusu in Jerusalem, escaped to freedom in the Japanese archipelago. These Esau and Ebusu people are the ancestors of the Japanese people.

This implausible theory claiming that the Japanese share origins with Jews was not of Japanese origin, but served to affirm the superiority of the ethnicity in a similar vein as a minority ethnicity such as blacks claiming the Black Hebrews. In *Jews in the Japanese Mind*, Goodman and Miyazaki refer to Oyabe and other Japanese theologians, such as Nakada Jūji (1870-1939) and Saeki Yoshirō (1871-1965), and explain the functionality of this shared-origin argument:

When they [the Japanese] identify with the Jews, their distinctive racial identity ceases to be a liability and becomes a mark of superiority that they believe even white Christians must respect. They express contempt for white culture by rejecting what it holds most sacred; they assert their independence of whites by scorning their moral and religious principles even as they lay claim to these principles for themselves. These are precisely the characteristics and goals of Japanese theories of common ancestry with the Jews.³³³

Oyabe’s fantastical argument using both Old Testament and Japanese mythology shows his efforts to universalize the Shinto religion and culture and, ultimately, claim new Japanese positionality in an international context. Oyabe recreated

³³³ Goodman and Miyazawa, *Jews in the Japanese Mind*, 63-64.

Japanese identity by reworking the Japanese past. In his memoir, he was silent about the racial dynamics and his own experience of being a Japanese man in America. His imaginative works only show his disheartening experiences.

Katayama Sen (1859-1933)

Katayama Sen, the son of a farmer, was born in 1859 in Mimasakano-kuni (currently Okayama prefecture). Despite his poor background, he became one of the key leaders of Japanese radical socialist and labor movements in the 1920s. Due to his extensive experience living in the United States for thirteen years, his political achievements can be recognized not only domestically but also internationally in the United States and Russia. In this section, I examine Katayama's religious trajectory, as written in his autobiographies. I argue that American religious experience—translated at a distance from both the faith of the intellectuals and racial discrimination, in other words, the experience of being disheartened by the West—shaped Katayama's own faith and identity as a Japanese socialist Christian.

He studied Christianity and social problems in various educational institutions, including Grinnell College, Andover Theological Seminary, and Yale Divinity School. Katayama was an acquaintance of Oyabe Zenichirō when he was studying at Yale Divinity School. In *Jiden*, one of his autobiographies, Katayama recalls his Japanese classmates who were studying together to compare with himself: "At that time at Yale, there were Yokoi Tokio, Kimura Shunkichi, Sugita Kinnosuke, Oyabe Zenichirō, who were heroically eccentric, or a non-Christian, or a law scholar. Tsunajima Kakichi was there, too. I had lean budget and did not spend

much money, but I was trying hard to acquire the Yale spirit (エールスピリット). My thesis was on urban problems in the West. I recall that my one year spent at Yale was the most meaningful year for me.”³³⁴ The photograph of the Yale Divinity School Class of 1895 shows Oyabe, who grandiosely sits in the first row, and Katayama in the third row, standing second from right.³³⁵

Katayama’s autobiographies and his writing and publication processes also demonstrate the complex and cosmopolitan nature of his life and identity. There are three versions of Katayama’s autobiographies available.³³⁶ According to the information in “Hajimeni” in *Wagakaisho, Jiden*, was first serialized in the journal *Kaizō sha* in 1922 and reprinted by Iwanami shoten after the war. *Aruitekitamichi* was first published in Russian in 1930 in the literary journal *Oktyabr*, and it covers a similar historical time that *Jiden* covers. The last of Katayama’s autobiographies is *Waga kaisho*, which Katayama started writing in 1929 and finished in 1932, a year before his death. The manuscript was originally written under a publishing contract with the national publishing center in the Soviet Union, but the plan was to publish it in German. Katayama translated the book into German himself, but the manuscript remained undiscovered for many years due to the rise of Nazism and the war

³³⁴ Katayama, *Jiden*, 277.

³³⁵ Cushing, “Yale Divinity School Class of 1895” Rose Pastor Stokes Papers, 1900-1993 (inclusive) Manuscripts & Archives, Yale University. <http://images.library.yale.edu/madid/oneItem.aspx?id=1777385&q=&q1=&q2=&qc1=&qc2=&qf1=&qf2=&qn=&qo=&qm=&qs=&sid=599391348&qx=> accessed on January 2, 2013. This photograph is also discussed in a newspaper series that features on Oyabe’s life, see No.17 Watanabe Seiichirō, “Oyabe Zen’ichirō den” in *Akita sakigake shinpō* (March 5, 1993) Evening version. The series consists of 38 articles published from February 16, 1993 to April 6, 1993.

³³⁶ Tomonari, *Constructing Subjectivities*, 109. Katayama Sen denki kankōkai, “Hajimeni” in *Waga kaisho*.

between Germany and the Soviet Union. This “lost” manuscript was published in Russian in 1964 and translated into Japanese in 1969.

Jiden is one of his three autobiographies published in 1922 after serialization in the journal called *Kaizō*.³³⁷ According to Ishigaki (his short introduction appears at the beginning of Katayama’s *Jiden*), the partial original manuscripts, were written under police surveillance when Katayama was incarcerated in Ichigaya prison in 1921 (Meiji 45) because he was leading strikes for the workers of the Tokyo Railway (*Tokyo densha*)³³⁸ at the time.³³⁹ He narrates his life from his birth in 1859 to 1899: from his childhood in Mimasaka through his study abroad in the United States to his return to Japan, including his early activism as a socialist Christian establishing the *kingusurē* (Kingsley) center for social reform in Misakichō in Tokyo.

It is important to analyze *Jiden* because it reflects Katayama’s conversion path to Christianity and his belief in socialist Christianity. He was strongly influenced by the life of Jesus as a real human figure, not as the son of God. He starts his conversion story with childhood memories of his family. His family’s faith tradition was the Tendai sect of Buddhism,³⁴⁰ which was a strong influence on the young Katayama, and he describes the religion during this time as a combination of Buddhism and Shintoism. He points out that religion was extremely important to the

³³⁷ In total, there are three versions of Kataya’s autobiographies. In addition to *Jiden*, “*Aruite kita michi*” and *Waga kaisho* are available for Japanese readers. The second version, which is “*Aruite kita michi*” was originally published in a Russian journal during 1930-1931. Tomonari, *Constructing Subjectivities*, 124.

³³⁸ Ishigaki, “*Jiden wo sokoku ni okuru ni tsuki*” in *Jiden*, 1

³³⁹ In prison, he was allowed to write only two pages (800 words) per day. A stamp of Shinoda is inscribed in each of these manuscripts, which shows that a prison guard named “Shimoda” was reading Katayama’s writings. *Ibid.*

³⁴⁰ Katayama, *Jiden*, 103.

families of farmers. Another strong external influence came from the Buddhist book, *Sanzesō (Three Worlds)*, which explains relations of cause and effect occurred among the three words: the past, present, and future. He frequently borrowed the book from the house next door and got lessons from his mother and great-grandmother.³⁴¹ This Buddhist book significantly influenced Katayama's construction of religious faith. He confesses,

This *Sanzesō* influenced me to a great extent for my religious thoughts. These are originally Buddhist superstitions; however, they became the source of my prejudice. Even now, some of the superstitions are difficult to get rid of. All of these came from the book. Especially, when it comes to judgment of dream, knowing that it is a superstition, it is almost impossible to ignore it.³⁴²

Katayama's faith in Christianity is better understood from the perspective of social Christianity and particularly manifested through praxis in the socialist and labor movements.³⁴³ He identified as a Christian but was not explicitly passionate in a religious sense. In *Jiden*, he frequently expressed discomfort when seeing other religiously devoted Christians and ministers.

Katayama first encountered the Christian sermon delivered by Westerners and Japanese in Okayama en route to Tokyo in 1882. He remembers: "I was extremely impressed."³⁴⁴ After he arrived in Tokyo, he studied *kangaku* (Chinese learning) at Kōgyokusha and Oka juku (Oka Rokumon) while working in a printing factory. *Kangaku* was not what he wanted to study; he instead wanted to study Western "learning."³⁴⁵ When he was in Tokyo, there was a large public lecture by Christians

³⁴¹ Ibid., 103.

³⁴² Ibid., 104.

³⁴³ Crump, *The Origins of Socialist Thought in Japan*, 90.

³⁴⁴ Ibid., 123.

³⁴⁵ Ibid., 141.

such as Miyakawa Tsuneharu, who Katayama describes as an “eloquent speaker who impressed the audience” at Shintomiza.³⁴⁶ Although he attended this lecture and was impressed by it, he concludes his remembrance with his “strange feeling.” He writes: “I have not listened to Christian sermons since I was in Okayama. Every day, the venue was full of audience. There were some people who did not like it, but the ministers were all passionate at that time. Ozaki Hiromichi, Muemura Masahisa, and Ibuka Kajinosuke were actively preaching. Since those ministers at that time were persecuted by people, they sincerely lived in their faith. Thirty years later, of course, the situation has changed, but it is impossible to listen to those powerful, lively, and faithful sermons. I was once impressed by the sermons delivered by Kanamori Tsūkan, and I was also extremely moved at this time. But, I was not that moved to actively seek Christianity. Instead, I strongly felt strange.”³⁴⁷

Katayama’s thirteen years of studying and working in the United States, as well as a visit to the UK, constructed his belief in socialist Christianity. In particular, his exposure to socialism as well as his disheartening experience as a Japanese observing and experiencing racial problems in America prompted him to establish a new relation with himself and with his sense of identity.

Given a letter from his colleague, Iwasaki Seikichi, who was also studying at Oka juku and Keiō gijyuku, he made his decision of going to the United States. The letter says, “America is a place where you can study even if you are poor” by referring to Chiba, another colleague who gained tremendous success after his hard work and study in San Francisco. For Katayama, who was born in a farmer’s son, it

³⁴⁶ Ibid., 175.

³⁴⁷ Ibid., 177.

was quite encouraging because samurai were still considered a qualified and capable class for engaging in intellectual activities and tradition. He then left Yokohama in 1884 for San Francisco.

The memory of living in Alameda, California, which marked his earliest stay in the United States, is especially important for Katayama. He writes, “My memory in Alameda is one of my fond and old memories. Alameda is a place where I got a first lesson as a cook, learned English, and found *yaso* 耶蘇(Jesus) at a corner of *ten* 天. Alameda is also place where I realized my desire for various religious knowledge.”³⁴⁸This statement is important because it shows that his religious awakening or faith is not simply or explicitly religious but embedded in other racial and social experiences. Katayama refrained from explicitly expressing a connection between the two—religious and racial experience—but the absence of explicit verbalization nevertheless enables us to find his discomfort and experience of being disheartened by the West.

Because Katayama treats Alameda as his special place in terms of his religious experience, the reader expects dramatic enlightenment about Christianity there. What he discusses, however, are his ambivalent feelings about Christianity and the experience of being discriminated against by other classmates at one of the mission schools in Alameda. He writes:

When it comes to my belonging to church, it is natural to go to the Presbyterian Church by order, but I preferred the Congregational church. Under this sect, there were many schools and many scholars who also belonged to the Congregational Church. With the recommendation from Kanda Saichirō, I belonged to the First Congregational Church. Even after I became a

³⁴⁸ Ibid., 204.

Christian, I had never been passionate or distanced. When I was studying at Andover Theological Seminary, I intensely studied it. But, I did not have significantly different feelings about Jesus. This might be because from the beginning, I did not think that Jesus was God. Nonetheless, the life of Jesus is giving me tremendous power and inspiration.³⁴⁹

Katayama's words illustrate his ambivalence to Christianity. He understands Jesus in a practical and realistic way, as a powerful figure—a perspective that likely differs from conventional understandings of divinity. The gap between these differing religious perspectives becomes translated into his discomfort with Christianity.

Another memory that Katayama describes about life in this important city was the experience of being racially discriminated against by his classmates due to his lack of language proficiency at Hopkins Academy in Oakland, which is located close to Alameda. His classmates called him *ketē* (“kitty”), a name he intensely disliked, as if he were innocent and skittish as a cat. He was isolated by their rudeness and derision. The angrier he became, the more they called him “kitty.” With his lack of fluency in English, he was not able to argue back at them on equal footing. Although Katayama resorted to physically fighting those who taunted him, their insistent discrimination continued. He had no choice but to leave the school. This episode clearly illustrates his sense of defeat and of being disheartened by the West. Instead of hiding these racial experiences like Oyabe, Katayama records the incidents and articulates his emotions. When Katayama first arrived in America, he recalls, “my circumstance of the time was truly precarious.” Since he had no money, he had to work as a domestic worker being transferred from one home to another. His poor financial condition was caused by his status as a new immigrant and inability to

³⁴⁹ Ibid., 205.

speak English fluently. He also documents being yelled at by the wives in the families who employed him when he did not cook well or work efficiently.

Katamaya also documents examples of American ignorance about Japan and its culture. After Katayama left the Hopkins Academy in Oakland, he studied at Maryville College in Tennessee. Upon arrival, he stayed at a professor's home, where he was asked the following question:

After the meal, a professor pulled out an encyclopedia which was published more than twenty years ago looking at the section of Japan. He asked me various kinds of questions. I told him that there is a quite difference in the speed of development compared with Japan twenty years ago. I am the first Japanese who came to Maryville. Therefore, people there asked me various kinds of questions. Among them, there were silly questions like 'until when, were the Japanese were cannibals?'³⁵⁰

Katayama not only narrates his experience of feeling uncomfortable as a Japanese person but also during his encounters with whites and blacks in Tennessee. He writes, for example, that "Maryville is a small and extremely remote village in one of the slaves states. I saw that people were not active and their manners (behaviors) looked dull compared with the people in San Francisco. Their practices are narrow-minded, and when it comes to hatred of blacks, I even wonder if it is their innate nature."³⁵¹ He also describes another discriminatory incident at Maryville and singles it out as the reason he again left school: "Although this university was established for blacks and poor whites, I always felt uncomfortable for people, including professors and students, treating black students unfairly. As I have already described, the level of education is not high and work that I have to do is less, but I always feel difficulty about living. This is why I decided to transfer." Both incidents

³⁵⁰ Ibid., 212.

³⁵¹ Ibid.

illustrate what it was like for Katayama as a Japanese man in the United States, and he was extremely dissatisfied with the discriminatory system and attitudes toward Asians and blacks. While Oyabe repressed his experience, Katayama voiced his experience with racial discrimination in the United States.

Nitobe Inazō (1862-1933): Reinvention of *Bushidō*

Nitobe Inazō was born in 1862 in a samurai family, the third son of Nitobe Jūjirō, a samurai of the Nambu-han. Nitobe studied at Sapporo Agricultural College in Hokkaido with Uchimura Kanzō. There, both men were baptized by an American Methodist Episcopal missionary Bishop, M.C. Harris. Nitobe had extensive international experience, especially in the United States. He studied at John Hopkins University. Feeling discomfort with the culture of the American church, he started to visit Quaker meetings in Baltimore, Maryland. He was married to Mary Elkinton, a Quaker woman whom he met through the institution. He also obtained his doctoral degree at Halle University in Germany. His contributions in various fields were well acknowledged in Japan; his figure appeared on a five thousand yen bill. After he returned to Japan in 1891, he held various positions, including colonial administrator in Taiwan (1901-1903); a professor at Imperial University of Kyoto (1904) and Imperial University of Tokyo (1906); and president of Tokyo Women's University (1918). He was appointed as Under-Secretary-General of the League of Nations in 1920 and moved to Geneva, Switzerland, as well as other places in Europe.³⁵²

³⁵² "Nitobe Inazō, *Kokushi dai jiten: Japan Knowledge*" Accessed March 7, 2013. <http://www.jkn21.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/body/display/>

Nitobe published *Bushido: The Soul of Japan* in 1900, which he wrote in English. This book was translated into many different languages—especially during the Russo-Japanese War in 1905—including German, Polish, Norwegian, Spanish, Russian, Italian, Bohemian and even Maariari in India.³⁵³ As a Japanese book, it is an exceptionally popular internationally. It played a major role in recreating modern images of *bushido* and morality in Japan.

Nitobe's *Bushido* is an early version of *nihonjiron* (Theory of Japaneseness), a strong reaction to Western racial discourse. From the Meiji period, the domination of Western knowledge and its perceived superiority to Japanese culture catalyzed a search for the “essence” of Japanese culture as a way to make the country compatible to or competitive with Western cultures. John Lie asserts that “[t]he search for a Japanese essence was in large part a reaction to the Westernization of Japan.” Since *nihonjinron* essentializes Japanese culture, and people regard it as evidence of Japanese superiority, Harumi Befu claims that it is the self-representation of national identity.³⁵⁴ Although *Bushido* was not written explicitly as Nitobe's autobiography, it reflects his search for Japanese identity and flexible masculinity. Michele Mason writes, “He [Nitobe] expected that *Bushidō: The Soul of Japan* might function not as a mere interpretation of Japanese society, but more

³⁵³ The German translation was published in 1901, the Polish version in 1904, the Norwegian in 1905, the Spanish, the Russian, Italian, Bohemian, and Maarari in India in 1909. Four versions of Japanese translation are available, which illustrates its persistent popularity there. The first one was published by Teibi shuppan'sha in 1908, translated by Sakurai Ōson. The second one was published by Keibundō shoten in 1935, translated by Kondō Shunsoku. The third one was translated by Yanaihara Tadao in 1938 by Iwanami shoten. In 1968, the last version of *Bushido* was published by Nihon sono sabisu sentā, translated by Nawa Kazuo. “Kaidai” in *Nitobe Inazō zenshū dai 1 kan*, 411.

³⁵⁴ Befu, *Hegemony of Homogeneity*, 2.

critically as a rebuttal to the condescending Western discourse that depicted Japanese as childish, backwards, devious, and politically inept.”³⁵⁵ Therefore, it is appropriate to analyze the book in order to understand how Nitobe tried to establish new relations with his Japanese culture.

On the one hand, Nitobe reconstructs *bushidō* as an idiosyncratic development of Japan; on the other hand, he succeeds in connecting *bushidō* with universal ethics of Christianity. Nitobe foremost attempts to illustrate the moral construction of Japan, in which he analyzes *bushidō* ethics and locates them at its core. He argues that *bushidō* cannot be reducible to a single text or source, but rather it has developed organically in society. It compounds the teachings and philosophies of Buddhism, Shintoism, Confucius, and Mencius. Nitobe considers that *bushidō* is the representation of the nation. His analyses extend to its symbolic elements and associated images such as “spring,” “flower,” “root,” and “psychology” of Japan. After establishing *bushidō* as Japan’s own development, Nitobe interestingly universalizes *bushidō* by locating it in the discourse of Western thoughts and civilization. He argues that *bushidō* is compatible with the development of Western thoughts. What this signifies is that Japanese history is never an isolated development but always a part of Western development and civilization. The historical connections established between Japanese culture and Western civilization enables Nitobe to explain that Christianity can be blended naturally into Japanese society as a “graft

³⁵⁵ Mason, “Empowering the Would-be Warrior,” 72.

on bushidō stock.”³⁵⁶ And, the humanistic ethic of love, which Christianity provides, leads Japan toward a new, and more complete, nation.

In addition to connections between *bushidō* and Christianity, he also establishes historical continuity between the Japanese past and the present by arguing that bushidō is an “animating spirit and motor force of our country”³⁵⁷, therefore it will never be old and extinct. He claims, “Bushidō, the maker and product of Old Japan, is still the guiding principle of the transition and will prove the formative force of the new era.”³⁵⁸ He also adamantly confirms that various transformations through the Meiji Restoration happened not because of the efforts of Western missionaries but because of the people’s motivations to change and learn, which he again argues based on the *bushidō* spirits. He writes:

Some writers³⁵⁹ have lately tried to prove that the Christian missionaries contributed an appreciable quota to the making of New Japan. I would fain render honor to whom honor is due: but this honor can hardly be accorded to the good missionaries.... For myself, I believe that Christian missionaries are doing great things for Japan—in the domain of education, and especially of moral education—only, the mysterious though not the less certain working of the Spirit is still hidden in divine secrecy. Whatever they do is still of indirect effect. No, as yet Christian missions have effected but little visible in moulding the character of New Japan. No, it was Bushidō, pure and simple, that urged us on for weal or woe. Open the biographies of the makers of Modern Japan—of Sakuma, of Saigo, of Okubo, of Kido, not to mention the reminiscences of living men such as Ito, Okuma, Itagaki, etc.: —and you will find that it was under the impetus of samuraihood that they thought and wrought.³⁶⁰

³⁵⁶ Nitobe, *Bushidō, the Soul of Japan*, 61. Kindle edition.

³⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 58.

³⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 58.

³⁵⁹ Nitobe footnotes here (number 1) by mentioning the following scholarships: “Speer: Missions and Politics in Asia, Lectures IV., pp.189-192; Dennis: Christian Missions and Social Progress, Vol. i., 32, Vol. ii., 70, etc.” Nitobe, *Bushidō*, 58 (Kindle edition).

³⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 58-59.

Nitobe denies European influences, particularly teachings of Christianity, on the Meiji Restoration and Japan's modernization processes. What he finds critical is the spirit of *bushidō*, "the sense of honour which cannot bear being looked down upon as an inferior power, —that was the strongest of motives."³⁶¹ New Japan was created by the continuous spirit of *bushidō*, that is still influential in Japanese society.

Nitobe's *Bushidō* should be interpreted as a new articulation of Japanese identity. Nitobe acknowledges the failure of the Western missionary, unable to find the connections and continuities from its indigenous culture and history. For Nitobe, the way in which he attempted to overcome Japanese racial inferiority was to fully acknowledge his own history and the past and consequently to carefully consider how Western culture can be absolved in the old "stock" of Japanese society. He states,

One cause of the failure of mission work is that most of the missionaries are grossly ignorant of our history—"What do we care for heathen records?" some say—and consequently estrange their religion from the habits of thought we and our forefathers have been accustomed to for centuries past. Mocking a nation's history! —as though the career of any people—even of the lowest African savages possessing no record—were not a page in the general history of mankind, written by the hand of God himself.... To be philosophic and pious mind, the races themselves are marks of Divine chirography clearly traced in black and white as on their skin; and if this simile holds good, the yellow race forms a precious page inscribed in hieroglyphics of gold! Ignoring the past career of a people, missionaries claim that Christianity is a new religion, whereas, to my mind, it is an "old, old story," which if presented in the vocabulary familiar in the moral development of a people—will find easy lodgment in their hearts, irrespective of race or nationality.³⁶²

For Nitobe, reconnecting between the teachings of *bushidō* and Christianity as well as between the Japanese past to the present through the articulation of *bushidō* was

³⁶¹ Ibid., 59.

³⁶² Ibid., 60-61.

the major affirmation of his new Japanese identity. As this statement shows, his recognition of the positionality of the Japanese as a less civilized race in an international context was his racial vulnerability. He attempted to conquer this sense of inferiority in his autobiography, *Bushidō*. Like Oyabe, Nitobe may not have discussed his own experience. In a similar way, however, he attempted to rework his Japanese past and identity by universalizing Bushidō and making it equivalent to the European notion of morality and ethics.

Uchimura Kanzo (1861-1930): Resistance as a Heathen Origin Christian

As a member of the Meiji Christian intelligentsia, Uchimura's two representative books also focus on Japan and Japanese identity. He published *Japan and the Japanese* in 1894 in English and revised the title as *Representative Men of Japan* in 1908. His autobiographical essay, "*Yo wa ikanishite kirisuto shinto to narishika*" ("How I Became a Christian") was published in 1895—first in Japanese then as a translation, also known as "Uchimura's Diary." The essay was published in the same year in the United States.

Uchimura describes his conversion process to Christianity from being a "heathen" Japanese, avoiding the question of "why" he converted. He wrote the book because he was often asked to talk about it in church in the United States, often for only fifteen minutes, which prevented his comments from disturbing other lectures by more important people. He may not have been able to answer the question of why he became a Christian because his conversion path overrode the conventional narratives and understanding of what Christianity means. For Uchimura, Christianity or conversion does not mean that "heathens" become Westerners.

Instead, it means that a “heathen,” including Uchimura as a Japanese, practices Christianity. The rejection of conventional conversion helped him rediscover Japan and the Japanese as a “new” space and identity within which he could practice his Christianity.

Uchimura’s rejection of conventional conversion came from his disheartening experiences of American race relations. He writes, “in no other respect, however, did Christendom appear to me more like heathendom than in a strong race prejudice still existing among its people.”³⁶³ He describes prevailing racial prejudices against blacks, Native Americans, and Asians in American society. Uchimura draws special attention to the treatment of the Chinese; he spends two pages (73-76) harshly criticizing racial discrimination against them. He lists and addresses three kinds of bias against the Chinese: “1. *The Chinese carry away all their savings to their home, and thus impoverish the land....*2. *The Chinese with their stubborn adherence to their national ways and customs, bring indecencies upon the Christian community....*3. *The Chinese by their low wages do injury to the American laborer.*”³⁶⁴ He explains how the assumptions and reasoning underlying these prejudices are morally wrong.

Among various racial experiences, his own experience, as an object of “religious shows,” well illustrates his disheartening experience in the United States. The “show” that Uchimura discusses is a missionary meeting that attempts to demonstrate the dramatic effects of Christian foreign missionaries on converts using

³⁶³ Uchimura, *How I Became a Christian*, 97. E-book.

http://books.google.com/books?id=tdMYAAAAYAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false

³⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 73-76.

real-life examples. He sees it as the “noblest and divinest,” yet he also finds it to be the best example to highlight the painful, problematic, and controversial aspects of missionary work, which upholds Christian faith as superior to others. He vividly describes these meetings:

Soon after my settlement in the college, I was taken by the President to attend one of great missionary meetings. Indeed, nothing is more indicative of the Christianness of Christendom than these meetings. Heathendom has no such things; for we care nothing about other people’s souls. The mere fact that ten thousand intelligent men and women should fill three or four spacious halls to overflowing to hear about how they can make other nations taste the goodness of Gospel, is by itself impressive enough. Granted that many do come to see *shows*, and that many others come to be such *shows*, *the fact remains clear that to these people the mission work among heathens is worth to be made a show; and it is doubtless the noblest and divinest of all religious shows*. But when this Mission-show is partaken by the toughest and coolest of the nation’s heads, and men and women deadly earnest about it appear upon the stage, and with scars and wrinkles upon their foreheads, tell of their moral warfare with the Kaffirs and the Hottentotts, then the show ceases to be a show, and we too get fired by it. I advise any one of my non-Christian countrymen to be in one of these Mission-shows whenever he finds such an opportunity in Christendom; and I can assure him that he will not repent of doing so. *The show is worth seeing all respects*. He may see in it the reason of Christendom’s greatness, and the same time, that of his country’s smallness. He may thus cease to speak loud about “the brutality of Christians.” I tell you, these Mission-shows are inspiring.³⁶⁵

Then, he continues discussing the most problematic aspect of the show, which brings in actual converts as testimonies and has each one speak about their conversion, which emphasizes a dramatic transformation from an “animal” to a “man.” In nineteenth-century America, this kind of show was popular. Race was commonly exhibited for entertainment and anthropological purposes.³⁶⁶ Uchimura

³⁶⁵ Emphasis mine.

³⁶⁶ There is a great deal of scholarship available on the exhibition of race in the nineteenth century. For example, John Kuo Wei Tchen’s *New York Before Chinatown*, Rachel Adams’ *Sideshow U.S.A.*, and Benjamin Reiss’s *Benjamin Reiss, The showman and the Slave : Race, Death, and Memory in Barnum’s America*.

not only criticizes the show-elements of foreign missionaries' meetings but also questions the fundamental arrogance underlying the discourse of "heathen" conversion and foreign missionaries. He refuses to be what he describes as a "rhinoceros." He ultimately finds the "pity" that Christians show toward the heathens is the problematic sentiment of foreign missionaries. What Uchimura argues for, as a fundamental and necessary attitude of the missionaries, is self-reflection; he considers heathenism as their own thing, especially as their own failure. He describes a scene in which a convert has been invited to speak on the stage and used as a testimony to prove of the superiority of Christian discourse:

But the worst lot in these shows falls to some specimens of converted heathens who happen to be there. They are sure to be made good use of, as circus-men make use of tamed rhinoceroses. They are fetched up for shows; and such wonderful shows! Till but recently bowing before wood and stones, but now owning the same God as that of these white people! "O just tell us how you were converted," they clamour[sic]; "but in fifteen minutes and no more, as we are going to hear from the great Reverend Doctor So-and-So about the ways and means and *rationale* of the mission." The tamed rhinoceros is a living illustration; not a blackboard illustration, but the veriest[sic] specimen from the veriest[sic] field. And *those rhinoceroses who like to be seen and petted gladly obey the behest of these people, and in the most awkward manner, tell them how they ceased to be animals and began to live like men. But there are other rhinoceroses who do not like to be so used. They do not like to be robbed of their internal peace by being made show to the people, all of whom cannot comprehend through what tortuous and painful processes were they made to give up the rhinoceros-life. They like to be left alone, and walk silently in God's green field away from the sight of man.* But the circus-men do not usually like such rhinoceroses. So they sometimes bring some wild specimens from the Indian jungles for this special purpose, (usually very young ones,) and take them through the land, show them to the Sunday school children, fetch them upon pulpits, and make them sing rhinoceros songs, and get people interested in mission work in that way.

Now, I, a regenerate rhinoceros, advise the mission circus-men to be more considerate in this matter. On one hand, they spoil the tamed rhinoceroses, and also induce the untamed ones to simulate the tamed, for that they find the easiest possible way of getting things good for their rhinoceros-flesh. On the other hand, I believe you give false conceptions of what the Christian mission really is to the people whom you like to get

interested in your work in that way....I do not value those contributions raised by making a Hindoo youth in his native attire sing Toplady in his own Paoli, any more than I do money raised by showing tamed ourangtangs. O do not call that a Mission-work that appeals to people's Pharisaic pride, and showing them that they are better than heathens, urges "the Christians at home" to "pity them." The best of missionaries are always upholders of the cause and dignity of the people to whom they are sent, and they are as sensitive as the patriotic natives themselves to expose the idolatries and other degradations before the so-called Christian public....

*I sincerely believe that the Christian mission based upon no higher motive than "pity for heathens" may have its support entirely withdrawn, without much detriment either to the sender or to the sent.*³⁶⁷

His critique extends to the question of the foreign mission's purpose and the relations between Christians and heathens. He argues that both relations are necessary and interdependent. Without the existence of heathens, Christians are not able to prove their identity and make further progress. He also claims that the interdependency of both Christians and heathen results in both finding their true humanity, which reflects what Judith Butler discusses the concept of "vulnerability" as the basis for humanity. Uchimura writes:

You cannot make yourself perfect without making others perfect. An idea of a perfect Christendom in midst of encircling heathenism is impossible. *In Christianizing other peoples, you Christianize yourself.* This is a philosophy abundantly illustrated by actual experiences.... What they failed to revive within them by spending themselves upon themselves, they now wee returning to them by spending themselves upon other than themselves. *You converted heathens, and heathens now re-convert you. Such is humanity, so intimately are you connected with the whole race. Pity the heathens? Do you pity your own brother in wretchedness? Are you not ashamed of him and blame yourself for his wretched state?* I believe this is the true philosophy of Christian mission; and missions started on any other basis than this are shows, plays, things to be criticized by their enemies, and disregarded by the very heathens to whom they are sent.³⁶⁸

³⁶⁷ Emphasis mine. Ibid., 136-138.

³⁶⁸ Ibid., 190-192.

By subverting Western discourse about the relations between Christians and heathens, Uchimura provides a way to give voice to so-called heathens. His Christianity starts by rejecting the Japanese position as heathens—the very people who are regarded as pitiable according to the discourse of Western missionaries. His critical shift in the epistemology of heathens reconfirms a new relation between Japan and the West—a move that is representative of the Meiji Christian intelligentsia. In the final chapter (Chapter 10), he appreciates his locationality of being a heathen. It shows his new understanding of Japanese identity: “ Never have I entertained any wish whatever of becoming an American or an Englishman; but I rather reckoned my heathen relationship a special privilege of my own, and thanked God once and again for having brought me out into this world as a ‘heathen,’ and not as a Christian.”³⁶⁹ Uchimura’s disheartening experience made him critical about American missionary culture and Christians in general. For him, his “heathen” or Japanese past became a privileged foundation on which he could become an authentic and ideal Christian. Uchimura discussed his disheartening experience. He also attempted to overcome the experience by disassociating from the West. He did not necessarily connect the Japanese past to some other great civilization as Oyabe had; rather, he privileged a relatively isolated Japanese past and treated it as Japan’s strength, with which he claimed a special mission and responsibility in the international community.

Conclusion

³⁶⁹ Ibid., 174.

Christianity was a symbolic progressive idea and philosophy that represented Westernization processes in Meiji Japan. Many Japanese intellectuals studied in the West, including Germany, U.K., and the United States. For the first time, the Japanese were able to travel to other countries freely and were able to practice the faith and master Western languages and philosophy. We tend to consider them so close to Western subjects, as they could embody philosophy and language as Christian converts. However, it is too easy to assume that these intellectuals all became strong advocates of westernization and modernization. The Meiji intellectuals such as Oyabe Zen'ichirō, Katayama Sen, Nitobe Inazō and Uchimura Kanzō were disheartened by the West because of their race. Specifically, the Meiji Christian converts romanticized those difficult and disheartening experiences as challenges to prove their faith. The Meiji intelligentsia challenged Western discourse and attempted to establish new relations with their own Japanese past and identity through these disheartening experiences. The narratives of the Meiji intellectuals exemplify a new formation of Japanese identity.

Epilogue

Oyabe Zen'ichirō is not a well-known historical figure; various essays bear fragmentary traces of him. However, examining his life has allowed us to critically engage important intellectual issues in the United States as well as Japan at the turn of the twentieth century. His American experiences studying at the Hampton Norman and Agricultural Institute, Howard University, and Yale University drew Oyabe into the racial discourse of the time. Like many other Meiji intellectuals, he acquired proficiency in spoken and written English, travelled extensively, and converted to Christianity. These experiences and habits made him look American and “civilized” to people such as Samuel Chapman Armstrong (a founder of Hampton University) and Jeremiah Eames Rankin of Howard University. However, American racial discourse consigned Oyabe to the category of “semi-civilized” or not “civilized,” along with African Americans, and Native Americans.

After returning to Japan in 1898, Oyabe emulated his Anglo-Saxon philanthropist mentors, and established a school for the underprivileged, the *Hokkaido Kyūdojin Kyūikukai* (Hokkaido Association for Saving the Ex-primitives). The goal was to educate the Ainu, who at that time were regarded as Japan's “primitive” race. Here, Oyabe exemplified a tension in Meiji intellectual life: the struggle to create a new way of being Japanese that made them all civilized within the international context. Like his cohort, he knew Japan was “not quite white” but sought to establish Japan's international reputation as a civilized nation.

My dissertation as a whole constructs his life; however, each chapter can be read separately, as each highlights a different intellectual issue in relation to Oyabe.

In Chapter 1, I examined the competing racial discourses in the United States and Japan. First, the international racial discourse of the time positioned the Japanese as a “semi-civilized” race, which shaped Oyabe’s American experience as a Japanese man. However, recognition of such a discourse was a difficult process for him. Because Oyabe did not talk about his disheartening racial experience in his memoir, the silence around it shows us the difficulties and struggles of his own perplexing experiences. Furthermore, racial discourse around the Ainu was also complex. For a person like Oyabe and for most of the Japanese at that time, the Ainu were considered Japan’s primitives who needed to be “elevated” racially. However, for European and American anthropologists, they were regarded as the decedents of the white race, and some even criticized the way that the Japanese treated the Ainu.

Oyabe brought this American racial discourse to Japan and reproduced it in relation to the Ainu. He established a school to educate them, using the model of the Hampton Institute, which provided vocation-oriented training to Native Americans and African Americans. In Chapter 2, I discussed Oyabe’s life between 1898 and 1909, after he returned to Japan, particularly focusing on his “activism” and education to the Ainu. Compared with other Ainu educators, such as Yoshida Iwao and Izumi Munehiro, what Oyabe emphasized was the idea of *jitsugyō*, practical and industrial training and teaching, comparable to American and Japanese trends at the turn of the twentieth century.

After spending time as an Ainu educator, Oyabe became a prolific writer. In Chapter 3, I have particularly focused on his publications about Minamoto no Yoshitsune legends, which provoked fevered discussions among intellectuals in the

1920s. By analyzing the nature of the discussions, I identified that his claims about history were tied to his efforts to create a new way, his own way, of being modern and Japanese. First, in order to make the Japanese historical myths internationally acceptable and civilized, he connected them to two great civilizations: the Yoshitsune myth to the Mongolian civilization and the origin of the Japanese to Jewish civilization. In this way, the Japanese past would be elevated to “the civilized” in international society, as with European civilization. Second, by establishing “unscientific” methodologies, such as historical myths, oral tradition, and physical observation, as legitimately “scientific,” he also challenged his contemporaries’ narrow empiricism as the sole legitimate methodology of historical research. These were Oyabe’s challenges and negotiations with the existing European discourses such as science, empiricism, and civilization.

Finally, in Chapter 4, I located Oyabe among other Meiji Christian intellectuals such as Katayama Sen, Uchimaura Kanzō and Nitobe Inazō. Oyabe’s effort to internationalize Japanese identity was common among them. So was being disheartened and disillusioned by the West. Their experience of Western knowledge and practices turned them into modern and civilized subjects. On the other hand, because of their disheartening experiences, they also became obsessed with their Japanese past and identity, finding ways to overcome a sense of inferiority by reshaping a new form of Japanese identity that could be redefined in the international context. Also, these intellectuals’ autobiographies and memoirs help us to analyze the mediating processes of the shifts.

From his studies in America to his work as an Ainu educator and as an author of historical myths, Oyabe was active in the formation and creation of Japanese modern identity. Japanese modern identity was demarcated through its unbalanced relations with the West (particularly the United States) and via its relations to the domestic Other. His identity was mediated by disheartening experiences and shaped by attempts to fit into international racial discourse.

Oyabe died of cardiac failure on March 12, 1941 when he was seventy-five years old. He did not see the Japanese defeat in World War II nor the subsequent Japanese economic miracle in the 1970s. During these postwar years of rapid economic growth, homogeneity in Japanese society was constructed as self-representation of Japan. During this period, the Japanese government barely acknowledged the Ainu people as one of the ethnic minorities of Japan. In 1986, however, Prime Minister Nakasone Yasuhiro publicly declared that Japan was mono-ethnic. After his statement, the entire nation participated in the discussion of whether Japan truly consists of one single ethnicity of *Yamato minzoku*. Of course, various ethnic minorities in Japan, including the Ainu and ethnic Koreans, supported by left-wing intellectuals, furiously opposed the ideology of mono-ethnicity in Japanese society. Oyabe could not have imagined that the Ainu Protection Law that he helped to implement in 1899 would remain in Japanese law until 1997. The recent revision, or the New Law, finally eliminated the term "*kyūdojin*" ("ex-primitives" is a derogatory term to describe the indigenous populations) from Japanese discourse. The New Law, Law for the Promotion of the Ainu Culture and for Dissemination and Advocacy for the Traditions of the Ainu and the Ainu Culture

(*Ainu bunka shinkō hō*), aimed to support the survival of the Ainu culture and tradition and replaced the notorious Ainu Protection Law.

Cotemporary understanding of the locationality of the Ainu, and as a consequence the Japanese nation-state, is charged with the memory of Japanese colonial policies in the Meiji period. The turning point in the history of the Ainu occurred in 2008. The Japanese government officially acknowledged the Ainu as “the indigenous population of Japan.” Many newspaper articles described this significant event as “victory” for the Ainu and featured the history of discrimination and severe conditions stemming from Japanese colonial and assimilation policies during the Meiji period. The particular rhetoric of defining the locationality of the Ainu emphasizes the group’s “indigeneity” in Japanese nationhood. I support the activism to strategically use the political status of the indigenous population of Japan to push various causes. How will it change the postcolonial situation that developed after the Ainu gained the official status of “indigenous” people? Oyabe’s assimilation policies toward the Ainu established a particular avenue for the Ainu as Japan’s “savages” and as subjects who needed to be civilized in order to participate in Japanese society. The Ainu’s indigeneity in postcolonial Japan highlights this unresolved and unbalanced relation and continues to shape Japanese identity as monolithic and advanced. The relations between the Japanese and the Ainu still play a key role in defining Japanese identity in the twenty-first century.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Hampton University Archive, Hampton University, Virginia, the United States
Bacon, Alice M. "General Armstrong and Hampton Institute " *The Commercial Travelers' Home Magazine* 4, no. 5 (1895): 629-49.

Multi-Media and Socio-Information Studies Archives, The University of Tokyo
Interfaculty Initiative in Information Studies Graduate School of Interdisciplinary
Information Studies, Tokyo, Japan

Tsuboi Shōgorō Archives

"Ainu kyūikujo sekkeisho" ("The Design of the Ainu Kyūikujo"), (No.4125, 11-9-10)

"Hokkaido kyūdojin kyūikukai nyūkai mōshikomisho" ("Membership Application
Form for the Kyūikukai), (No. 4952~4959, ID: TSAG05286~TSAG05292; 11-9-9-1
~11-9-9-7)

"Hokkaido kyūdojin kyūikukai shui," (No. 4960, ID: TSAG 05293, 11-9-10).

Obihiro Library Archive, Obihiro, Hokkaido, Japan

Yoshida Iwao Archives (Yoshida Iwao ikō shiryō)

"Ā, Sakanoue Tamuramaro shōgun."

On-line Archives

Rose Pastor Stokes Papers, 1900-1993 (inclusive) Manuscripts & Archives, Yale
University.

<http://images.library.yale.edu/madid/oneItem.aspx?id=1777385&q=&q1=&q2=&qc1=&qc2=&qf1=&qf2=&qn=&qo=&qm=&qs=&sid=599391348&qx=>

Newspapers and Magazines

Bryce, T. T. "Right and Duties of Citizens. Education " *Southern Workman* 1 (1878).

"Dojin kyōiku ni kansuru chōsa." *Hokkaido kyōiku zasshi* 85 (1900): 42-44.

Gilmore, Melvin. "Among the Ainu People---a Very Peculiar White Race in Japan: An
Enigma to Anthropologists, They Are Believed to Be Our White Brothers." *The
Omaha World Herald*, May 21, 1905 1905, 22.

"Hokkaido dojin kyūikukai hakkai shiki." *Yomiuri Shinbun*, May 28 1900.

Hokkaidō kyūdojin kyūikukai abuta gakuen. *Abuta gakuen hō*. No.1 (January, 1910)
and No. 2 (February 1910) Vol. 4, (April, 1910).

Houston Chronicle, November 5, 2001. Accessed May 16, 2011. *Houston Chronicle*
Archives http://www.chron.com/CDA/arcives/archive.mpl?id=2000_3255943

Johnson, Anna H. "Social Life of the Indians." *Southern Workman* xviii, No. 9 (1889).

Katz, Adria. "Borneo to Philadelphia." *Expedition*, 1988, 65-72.

Oyabe, Zen'ichirō. "Ainu buraku tanken 1." *Hokkaido mainichi shinbun*, August 22, 1900.

———. "Ainu buraku tanken 5." *Hokkaido mainichi shinbun*, August 31, 1900, 2.

———. "Ainu buraku tanken 7." *Hokkaido mainichi shinbun*, September 8, 1900, 4.

"Peace of History: Cemetery a Poignant Reminder of Bygone Days." *The Houston Chronicle* November 1, 2001.

Watanabe, Seiichirō. "Oyabe Zen'ichirō den No.17." Akita: *Akita sakigake shinpō*, March 5, 1993.

"Zatsuroku: Hokkaido kyūdojin kyūikukai enkaku oyobi hōkoku." *Hokkaido kyōiku zasshi*, No.159 (April 25, 1906).

Reports

Hokkaido kaitaku kinenkan [Historical Museum of Hokkaido]. *Kindai no hajimari [The Early Modern Era]: Hokkaido Kaitaku Kinenkan Jōsetu tenji kaisetsu sho 4*, 2000.

Kikuchi, Isao. "Kita nihon chiiki ni okeru Tamuramaro-Yoshitsune densetsu no kinseiteki tenkai." In *Kagaku kenkyūhi hojokin-kibankenkyū (C) kenkyūseika hōkokusho*. Sendai, Japan: Miyagi Gakuin Women's University 2011.

Otaru Kyūikukai. "Oyabe Tetsugakuhakase No Enzetsu." In *Otaru kyōikukai hōkokusho*. Otaru, Hokkaido, 1901.

"The Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute. Annual Reports for Year Ending June 30, 1890."

Secondary Sources

Abe, Toshio. "A Study of Hokkaido Takes (No.5) Hokkaido no Yoshitsune densetsu no kōsatsu." *Hokuseigakuen daigaku bungakubu hokuseironshū* 45, No. 2 (2008): 218-198.

Adams, Rachel. *Sideshow U.S.A: Freaks and the American Cultural Imagination*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.

Aihara, Shigeki. "Konoe Atsumaro no Hokkaido ron: Ajia shugi tonon rinri teki kanren." *Nihon bunka kankyōron kōza kiyō* 1 (1999): 1-21.

Anderson, Benedict R. O'G. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Rev. ed. New York: Verso, 2006.

Azuma, Eiichiro. *Between Two Empires: Race, History, and Transnationalism in Japanese America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Baker, Lee D. *From Savage to Negro: Anthropology and the Construction of Race, 1896-1954*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

Bederman, Gail. *Manliness & Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917*, *Women in Culture and Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

———. *Manliness & Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917*, *Women in Culture and Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Befu, Harumi. *Hegemony of Homogeneity: An Anthropological Analysis of "Nihonjinron,"* Japanese Society Series. Portland Or: Trans Pacific Press, 2001.

Benfey, Christopher E. G. *The Great Wave: Gilded Age Misfits, Japanese Eccentrics, and the Opening of Old Japan*. First ed. New York: Random House, 2003.

Berlin, Isaiah, Henry Hardy, and Aileen Kelly. *Russian Thinkers*. New York: Penguin Books, 1979.

Breitbart, Eric. *A World on Display: Photographs from the St. Louis World's Fair, 1904*. First ed. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1997.

Brownlee, John. *Japanese Historians and the National Myths: 1600-1945: The Age of the Gods and Emperor Jimmu* Vancouver: UBC Press 1997.

Buffalohead, Roger and Paulette. "A Nucleus of Civilization': American Indian Families at Hampton Institute in the Late Nineteenth Century." *Journal of American Indian Education* 35, no. 3 (1996): 59-94.

Burns, Susan L., and ebrary Inc. "Before the Nation Kokugaku and the Imagining of Community in Early Modern Japan." Durham N.C.: Duke University Press, 2003. Kindle-edition.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, *Thinking Gender*. New York: Routledge, 1990.

———. *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence*. London; New York: Verso, 2004.

- Chickering, F.E. . "Social Life." In *The Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute Annual Reports for Year Ending June 30, 1890*, 47-53. Hampton, VA, 1890.
- Crump, John. *The Origins of Socialist Thought in Japan*. New York: Croom Helm; St. Martin's Press, 1983.
- Davidann, Jon Thares. "The American YMCA in Meiji Japan: God's Work Gone Away." *Journal of World History* 6, no. 1 (1995): 107-25.
- Denoon, Donald, and Gavan McCormack. *Multicultural Japan: Palaeolithic to Post-Modern*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Doi, Zen'ichirō. *Yoshitsune densetsu wo tukutta otoko: Yoshitsune Jingisu Kan setsu wo tonaeta kikotsu no hito·Oyabe Zen'ichrō den*. Tokyo: Kōjin sha 2005.
- Dorsey, James, and Douglas Slaymaker. *Literary Mischief: Sakaguchi Ango, Culture, and the War*, New Studies of Modern Japan. Lanham, Md.: Lexington Books, 2010.
- Ega, Torazō. "Nikki 4: Abuta Gakuen Nisshi." In *Obihiro shōshō* Vol.37. Obihiro, Hokkaido, Japan, 1996.
- Eng, David L. *Racial Castration: Managing Masculinity in Asian America*, Perverse Modernities. Durham N.C.: Duke University Press, 2001.
- Engs, Robert Francis. *Educating the Disfranchised and Disinherited: Samuel Chapman Armstrong and Hampton Institute, 1839-1893*. First ed. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1999.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Order of Things: Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. New York: Vintage Books, 1973.
- . "Technologies of the Self." In *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault*. Edited by Huck Gutman Luther H. Martin, and Patrick H. Hutton 16-49. Boston: The Universtiy of Massachusetts Press, 1988.
- Freud, Sigmund, and Joan Riviere. *The Ego and the Id*, The International Psychoanalytical Library, Edited by Ernest Jones. London: Hogarth press, and the Institute of Psychoanalysis, 1927.
- Freud, Sigmund, Joseph Sandler, Ethel Spector Person, and Peter Fonagy. *Freud's "on Narcissism--an Introduction," Contemporary Freud*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991.
- Furukawa, Hiromi and Tetsushi Furukawa. *Nihonjin to Africakei America jin: Nichibei kankeishi ni okeru sono shoshō*. Tokyo: Akashi-shoten, 2004.

Fuss, Diana. *Identification Papers*. New York: Routledge, 1995.

Gahō kindai hyakunen shi. Edited by Nihon kindai shi kenkyūkai. *Gahō kindai hyakunen shi*, Vol. 5. Tokyo: Nihon tosho sentā, 1989.

“Gakumon no jiyūni taisuru danatsu” in *Gahō kindai hyakunen shi 5*, edited by Nihon kindai shi kenkyūkai, 1206-1207. Tokyo: Nihon tosho sentā, 2004.

Gluck, Carol. *Japan's Modern Myths: Ideology in the Late Meiji Period* Princeton, New Jersey Princeton University Press, 1985.

Goodman, David G., and Masanori Miyazawa. *Jews in the Japanese Mind: The History and Uses of a Cultural Stereotype*. New York: Free Press, 1995.

Gotō, Yasushi “Jiyū to minken no shisō.” In *Nihon rekishi kindai 3*, edited by Saburō Ienaga, 148-85. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1962.

Halberstam, Judith. *Female Masculinity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998.

Hannaford, Ivan. *Race: The History of an Idea in the West*. Washington, D.C. Baltimore, Md.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press; Order from the Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.

Harootunian, Harry D. *Overcome by Modernity: History, Culture, and Community in Interwar Japan*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2000.

———. “Rekishi no aregori ka: Marukusu shugi, Hani Gorō, soshite genzaikara no yōsei.” In *Marukusu shugi to iu keiken*, edited by Jun'ichi Isomae and Harry Harootunian, 227-60. Tokyo: Aoki shoten, 2008.

Hatate, Isao. “Nihon shihon shugi to Hokkaido kaitaku.” In *Nihon rekishi kindai* edited by Saburō Ienaga, 315-56. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1962.

Hoganson, Kristin L. *Fighting for American Manhood: How Gender Politics Provoked the Spanish-American and Philippine-American Wars*, Yale Historical Publications. New Haven Conn.: Yale University Press, 1998.

“Hokkaido kyūdojin kyūikukai Abuta gakuen enkaku” in *Hokkaido kyūdojin kyūikukai abuta gakuen hō* Vol. 4, April 1910.

Horie, Kōji. “Nihon igaku toshokan: Kanda surugadai shūhen to Meiji 35nen ikō no 'nihon igaku toshokan.’” *Igaku toshikan*, no. 3 (1985), <http://www015.upp.so-net.ne.jp/reposit-horie/Nihon-igaku2.pdf#search='コンドル%20東京青年'>.

Horsman, Reginald. *Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1981.

Howell, David. *Geographies of Identity in Nineteenth-Century Japan*. Berkley University of California, 2005.

———. “Proto-Industrial Origins of Japanese Capitalis.” *The Journal of Asia Studies* 51, no. 2 (1992): 269-86.

Howes, John F. *Japan's Modern Prophet: Uchimura Kanzō, 1861-1930*, Asian Religions and Society Series. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2005.

Howland, Douglas. “Society Reified: Herbert Spencer and Political Theory in Early Meiji Japan.” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 42, no. 1 (2000): 67-86.

Ikeda, Katsunobu “Yoshitsune=Gingisukan densetsu wo tsukutta otoko Oyabe Zen'ichirō wo ou” *Rekishi kenkyū* 51, no. 1.2 (2009): 120-30.

Ikeda, Yoshimasa. *Nihon shakai fukushi shi*. Kyoto: Hōritsubunkasha, 1986.

Ikuta, Toshihiko. “Oyabe Zen'ichirō to iu hito: Risō no genjitsu ni maishin shita fukutsu no shōgai.” In *Japanī zū Robinson Crusō, 237-49*. Tokyo: Kaibi sha, 1991.

Inazō, Nitobe. “Bushidō: The Soul of Japan.” Amazon Digital Services, Inc., 1908.

Ishigaki, Ētarō. “'Jiden' wo sokoku ni okuru ni tsuki.” In *Jiden*, 1-2. Tokyo: Kaizō sha, 1923.

Iwai, Eitarō. “Kyūdojin kyōiku dan.” *Hokkaido Kyōiku zasshi* 9 (1903): 34-37.

Iwai, Tadakuma. “Nihon Kindaishigaku No Keisei.” In *Iwanami kōza nihonrekishi 22 bekkān 1* edited by Naohiro Asao, 59-103. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1963.

Izumi, Munehiro. “Yosegaki: Oyabe shi no kyōiku bikō wo yomu.” *Hokkaido kyōiku zasshi* 163 (1906): 57-60.

Jacobson, Matthew Frye. *Barbarian Virtues: The United States Encounters Foreign Peoples at Home and Abroad, 1876-1917*. Fired. New York: Hill and Wang, 2000.

Katayama, Sen. *Jiden*. Tokyo: Kaizōsha 1923.

Katayama Sen Denki Kankōkai. “Hajimeni” in Katayama Sen's *Waga Kaisō*. Tokyo: Tokumashoten, 1967.

Ketelaar, Edward James. *Of Heretics and Martyrs in Meiji Japan: Buddhism and Its Persecution* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1990.

Kikuchi, Isao. "Ezo seibatsu' to chiiki shi ninshiki: Tsugaru chihō no Tamuramaro densetsu wo chūshin ni." In *Retto shi no minami to kita: Kinsei chiiki shi fōramu*, 241-64. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2006.

Kindaichi, Kyōsuke "Ainu kenkyū no mondai oyobi hōhō." In *Kindaichi Kyōsuke zenshū: Ainu bunka minzokugaku* edited by Kindaichi Kyōsuke zenshū henshū iinkai, 21-34. Tokyo: Sanseidō, 1993.

———. "Eiyū fushi densetsu no kenchi kara." In *Kindaichi Kyōsuke zenshū dai 12 Kan: Ainu bunka minzokugaku*. Tokyo: Sanshō dō, 1992.

Kobayashi, Shinji. "Kaze hakase ron': Oyabe Zen'ichirō no gigaka wo megutte." *Nihon kindai bungaku* 59 (1998): 126-37.

Kokuni Yoshihiro. "Ainu kyōiku ni okeru kokuminka to minzokuka: Yoshida Iwao no 'kyūdojin kyōiku' jissen ni sokushite." *Minzokugaku kenkyūjo kiyō* 24 (2000): 77-104.

Koschmann, J. Victor. *The Mito Ideology: Discourse Reform, and Insurrection in Late Tokugawa Japan*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.

Lie, John. *Multiethnic Japan*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Lindsey, Donal F. *Indians at Hampton Institute, 1877-1923, Blacks in the New World*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1995.

Logan, Rayford Whittingham. *The Betrayal of the Negro: From Rutherford B. Hayes to Woodrow Wilson*. First Da Capo Press ed. New York: Da Capo Press, 1997.

Lowe, Lisa. *Immigrant Acts: On Asian American Cultural Politics*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1996.

Mason, Michele. "Empowering the Would-Be Warrior: Bushidō and the Gendered Bodies of the Japanese Nation." In *Recreating Japanese Men*, edited by Sabine Frühstück and Anne Walthall, 68-90. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011.

Miyachi Masato, Sasaki Takashi, Kinoshita Naonori, and Suzuki Jun. *Bijyuaru waidō Meiji Jidaikan*. Tokyo: Shōgakkan, 2005.

Morita, Toshio. "Meiji minken shisō ni tatsu Ainu kyōikuron: Uketsugarubeki isa no hitotsu." *Kokumin kyōiku* 26, no. 11 (1975): 165-84.

Moritani, Shūichiro. *Abuta son shi*. Tokyo: Nakagai Insatsu kōgyō kakushikigaisha, 1919.

- Morris, Ivan. *The Nobility of Failure: Tragic Heroes in the History of Japan*. First ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975.
- Morris-Suzuki, Tessa. *Re-Inventing Japan: Time, Space, Nation, Japan in the Modern World*. Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe, 1998.
- Mullins, Mark. *Christianity Made in Japan: A Study of Indigenous Movements*, Nanzan Library of Asian Religion and Culture. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1998.
- Naganuma, Hideaki. "Kindai nihon no 'jitsugyō' gainen: Hōtoku undō no saikentō no shitsuyōsei." *Jiyugaoka Sanno College Bulletin* 41 (2008): 83-93.
- Nakajima, Riichirō. "Minamoto no Yoshitsune ha Jingisu Kan ni arazu." *Chūō shidan* 10, no. 2 (1925): 69-93.
- Nitobe, Inazō and Nitobe Inazō zenshū henshū iinkai. *Nitobe Inazō zenshū*. 16 Vols. Tokyo: Kyōbunkan, 1969.
- Ogawa, Masahito. *Kindai Ainu kyōiku seido shi kenkyū*. Hokkaido: Hokkaido daigakutosho kankōkai, 1999.
- Oguma, Eiji. *A Genealogy of 'Japanese' Self-Images*. English ed, Japanese Society Series. Melbourne: Trans Pacific Press, 2002.
- . *"Nihonjin" no kyōkai: Okinawa, Ainu, Taiwan, Chōsen, shokuminchi shihai kara fukki undō made*. Tokyo: Shinyōsha, 1998.
- . *Tan'itsu minzoku shinwa no kigen: "Nihonjin" no jigazō no keifu = the Myth of the Homogeneous Nation*. First ed. Tokyo: Shinyōsha, 1995.
- Oppenheim, Robert "Consistencies and Contradictions: Anthropological Anti-Imperialism and Frederick Starr's Letter to Baron Ishii." In *Histories of Anthropology Annual*, edited by Regna Darnell and Frederic W. Gleach, 1-26. Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press, 2005.
- Oyabe, Jenichiro. *A Japanese Robinson Crusoe*. Boston, Chicago: The Pilgrim Press, 1898.
- . "Zatsuroku: Hokkaido kyūdojin kyūiku kai enkaku oyobi hōkoku." *Hokkaido kyōiku zasshi* 159 (1906): 25-29.
- . "Yosegaki oyobi tūshin: Izumi kun no tosegaki wo yomite." *Hokkaido kyōiku zasshi* 164 (1906): 49-52.
- . *Jingisu Kan wa Minamoto no Yoshitsune nari*. Tokyo: Tomiyama bō, 1924.

- . *Jingisu Kan wa Minamoto no Yoshitsune nari: Chojutsu no dōki to sairon*. Tokyo: Tomiyama bō, 1925.
- . *Nihon oyobi nihonkokuminno kigen*. Tokyo: Kōseikaku, 1929.
- . *Shizukagozen no shōgai*. Tokyo: Kōseikaku, 1930.
- . *Manshū to Minamotokurō Yoshitsune*. Tokyo: Kōseikaku, 1933.
- . *Jyun nihon fujin no omokage*. Tokyo: Kōseikaku shoshi, 1938.
- . *A Japanese Robinson Crusoe*, Asian and Pacific American Transcultural Studies. Honolulu, University of Hawai'i Press; Asian American Studies Center, 2009.
- Peabody, Francis Greenwood. *Education for Life; the Story of Hampton Institute, Told in Connection with the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Foundation of the School*. College Park, Md.: McGrath Pub. Co., 1969.
- Reiss, Benjamin. *The Showman and the Slave : Race, Death, and Memory in Barnum's America*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Robinson, Greg and Yujin Yaguchi. "Introduction" in *A Japanese Robinson Crusoe*, 1-30. Hawai'i: University of Hawai'i Press, 2009.
- Saeki, Shōichi. "The Autobiography in Japan." *Journal of Japanese Studies* 11, no. 2 (1985): 357-68.
- Sakaguchi, Ango. "Kaze hakase." In *Nihon gendai bungaku zenshū 90: Ishikawa Jun and Sakaguchi Ango Shū*, edited by Kamei, Ito, Nakamura, Hirano, Yamamoto, 232-235. Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1980.
- Said, Edward W. "Travelling Theory." in *The World the Text and the Critics*, 226-247. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983.
- Scheiner, Irwin. *Christian Converts and Social Protest in Meiji Japan*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970.
- Sakano, T.. "Jinshu • minzoku • nihonjin: senzen nihon no jinruigaku to jinshu gainen." In *Is Race a Universal Idea? Transcending the Western Paradigm*, edited by Y. Takezawa, 229-254. Kyoto: Jinbun shoin, 2005.
- Scott, Joan Wallach. "Experience." In *Feminists Theorize the Political*, 22-40. New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky, Adam Frank, and ebrary Inc. "Touching Feeling Affect,

- Pedagogy, Performativity.” In *Series Q*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2003. Kindle-edition.
- Shigeno, Yasutsugu. “Rekishi kenkyū hō.” In *Shigeno hakase shigaku ronbunshū Jōkan*, edited by Satsuhanshi kenkyūkai: Ōkubo Toshiaki, 66-68. Tokyo: Ōsankaku 1938.
- . “Minamoto no Yoritomo.” In *Shigeno hakase shigaku ronbunshū gekan*, edited by Satsuhanshi kenkyūkai: Ōkubo Toshiaki, 521-42. Tokyo: Ōsankaku, 1938.
- Shimazu, Hisamoto. *Yoshitsune densetsu to bungaku*. Tokyo: Meiji shoin 1935.
- Shin Sapporo shi shi*. Edited by Sapporo shi kyōiku iinkai. Vol. 3 (tsū shi 3). Sapporo, Hokkaido 1994.
- Singh, Nikhil Pal. *Black Is a Country: Race and the Unfinished Struggle for Democracy*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Sinha, Mrinalini. *Gender and Nation, Women's and Gender History in Global Perspective*. Washington, DC: American Historical Association, 2006.
- Smedley, Audrey. *Race in North America: Origin and Evolution of a Worldview*. 2nd ed. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1999.
- Starr, Frederick. *The Ainu Group at the Saint Louis Exposition*. Chicago: The Open court publishing company, 1904.
- Strong, Josiah, and Congregational Home Missionary Society. *Our Country: Its Possible Future and Its Present Crisis*. Rev. ed. New York: The Baker & Taylor Co. for the American Home Missionary Society, 1891.
- Taira, Koji. “Troubled National Identity: The Ryukyuans/Okinawans.” In *Japan's Minorities: The Illusion of Homogeneity* edited by M. Weiner, 140-77. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Takakuwa, Komakichi. “Jingisu Kan wa Minamoto no Yoshitune ni arazu.” *Chūō shidan* 10, no. 2 (1925): 144-54.
- Tanaka, Stefan. *Japan's Orient: Rendering Pasts into History*. Berkeley University of California Press, 1993.
- Tchen, John Kuo Wei. *New York before Chinatown: Orientalism and the Shaping of American Culture, 1776-1882*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.
- Tomita, Torao. “Hokkaido jyūdojin hogohō to dōzu hō: Hikaku shi teki kenkyū no kokoromi.” *Sapporo gakuin daigaku jinbun gakkai kiyō* 45 (1989): 5-21.

———. “Hokkaido kyūdojin hogo to dōzu hō: John Batchelor, Shirani Takeshi, Parapita, Sanrotte.” *Sapporo gakuin daigaku jinbun gakkai kiyō* 48 (1990): 1-22.

Tomonari, Noboru. *Constructing Subjectivities: Autobiographies in Modern Japan*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2008.

Trachtenberg, Alan. *The Incorporation of America: Culture and Society in the Gilded Age*. 25th anniversary ed. New York: Hill and Wang, 2007.

Turner, Frederick Jackson. *The Frontier in American History*. New York: H. Holt, 1921.

Uchimura, Kanzō. *How I Became a Christian: Out of My Diary*. Tokyo: Keiseisha, 1895. http://books.google.com/books?id=tdMYAAAAAYAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false

Vanstone, James W. “The Ainu Group at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition, 1904.” *Arctic Anthropology* 30, No. 2: 77-91.

Walker, Brett L. *The Conquest of Ainu Lands: Ecology and Culture in Japanese Expansion, 1590-1800*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.

Walthall, Anne. “The Family Ideology of the Rural Entrepreneurs in Nineteenth Century Japan.” *Journal of Social History* 23, No. 3 (1990): 463-83.

Watson, C. W. *Of Self and Nation: Autobiography and the Representation of Modern Indonesia*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2000.

Weiner, Michael. *Japan's Minorities: The Illusion of Homogeneity*, Sheffield Centre for Japanese Studies/Routledge Series. London; New York: Routledge, 1997.

William, Berge. “Voices for Imperialism: Josiah Strong and the Protestant Clergy.” *Journal of Kentucky-Tennessee American Studies Association* 1 (1973). <http://spider.georgetowncollege.edu/htallant/border/bs1/berge.htm>

Woodruff, Nan Elizabeth. *American Congo: The African American Freedom Struggle in the Delta*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Yaguchi, Yujin. “The Ainu in U.S.-Japan Relations.” PhD diss., The College of William and Mary, 1991.

Yamamoto, Shin. *Shūhen bunmeiron: Ōka to dochaku*. Tokyo: Tōsui shobō, 1985.

Yamane, Ryūichi. "Sakaguchi Ango 'Kaze hakase' ron: Fukumoto Izumu·Oyabe Zen'ichirō·Romanteki eiyūshugi no naizai hihan." In *Nihon kindai bungaku 77* (2007): 61-75.

Yoshida, Iwao. "Ainu chōsa sho furoku sono ichi" (in the section entitled as "Hokkaido kyū dojin kyūiku kai abuta gakuen enkaku") in *Obihiro Sōsho* No.66. Edited by Kobayashi Masao. Obihiro: Hokkaido, Obihiroshi Kyōiku Iinkai, 2014 (forthcoming).

———. "Ainu ni kansuru zatuwa." In *Obihiro shi shakai kyōiku shōsho* Vol.4: *Aikyōshōshi, tōhokuhokkaido Ainu koji fūdo shiryō*, edited by Obihiroshi shakai kyōiku sōsho henshū iinkai, 31-35. Obihiro, Hokkaido: Obihiro City Library, 1958.

———. "Danchōroku." In *Aikyō sōshi: Obihiroshi shakai kyōiku sōsho*, edited by Obihiroshi shakai kyōiku sōsho henshū iinkai, 21-26. Obihiro, Hokkaido: Obihiro City Library, 1960.

———. "Hokkaido senjyūmin ni tsuite." In *Obihiro shi shakai kyōiku shōsho* Vol.4: *Aikyōshōshi, tōhokuhokkaido Ainu koji fūdo shiryō*, edited by Obihiroshi shakai kyōiku sōsho henshū iinkai, 21-26. Obihiro, Hokkaido: Obihiro City Library, 1958.

———. *Kokoro no ishibumi*. Sapporo, Hokkaido: Hokkai shuppan, 1935.

———. "Sentesu wo kataru (Seikō udoku shō)." In *Aikyō sōshi: Obihiroshi shakai kyōiku sōsho* No.6. Edited by Obihiroshi shakai kyōiku sōsho henshū iinkai, 26-48. Obihiro: Obihiro City Library, 1960.

———. *Yoshida Iwao nikki dai 4: Obihiro sōsho* No.23. Edited by Kobayashi Masao. Obihiro: Hokkaido, Obihiroshi kyōiku iinkai, 1981.

———. *Yoshida Iwao nikki dai 5: Obihiro sōsho* No.24. Edited by Kobayashi Masao. Obihiro: Hokkaido, Obihiroshi kyōiku iinkai, 1982.

Yoshihara, Mari. *Embracing the East: White Women and American Orientalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

On-line Databases

Research Navi, The National Diet Library

Encyclopedia of Japan accessed through Japan Knowledge

Kokushi dai jiten accessed through Japan Knowledge

Nihon kokugo jiten accessed through Japan Knowledge

Nihon jinmei dai jiten, accessed through Japan knowledge