



Title	The Influence of Burke and Carlyle on the Work of Inazo Nitobe
Author(s)	Nagao, Teruhiko
Citation	北海道大学文学研究科紀要, 106, 49-69
Issue Date	2002-02-28
Doc URL	http://hdl.handle.net/2115/34014
Type	bulletin (article)
File Information	106_PL49-69.pdf



[Instructions for use](#)

The Influence of Burke and Carlyle on the Work of Inazo Nitobe

Teruhiko Nagao

This essay is intended as a reassessment of Inazo Nitobe (1862-1933) and his world-wide best-seller *Bushido: The Soul of Japan* (1900), especially in reference to its historical significance. The ¥5000 bank note has his portrait printed on it, so everybody in Japan knows him. But his work is very little known even in Japan. He was Under-Secretary General in the Geneva Headquarters of the newly-founded League of Nations from 1920 to 1926. He especially contributed to the establishment of the International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation in 1922, the forerunner of the present UNESCO. And, as such, he appears in a biography of Einstein, *Einstein: The Life and Times* by Ronald W. Clark. It was at that time of Einstein's life when his attitude to the Committee wavered, quite naturally in the strongly anti-Semitic atmosphere of the post-war Germany in 1922:

Einstein wrote a brief letter to the League, brusquely stating that he felt it necessary to resign from the committee [International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation].... To Madame Curie Einstein wrote in more detail, explaining that he was resigning ... because of anti-Semitism in Berlin and his feeling that he was "no longer the right person for the job...."

While Madame Curie was writing to Einstein on a personal basis,

the officials of the League had been thrown into despair, and desperate efforts to retrieve the situation were being made by the Secretary of the committee. This was Nitobe, a Japanese Samurai, born with the right to wear two swords, whose philosophic journey was to lead him into the ranks of the Quakers. On receiving Einstein's resignation Nitobe had cabled to Gilbert Murray: "Einstein resigns giving no reasons stop important to have him stop fear his resignation will have bad effect stop grateful if you can use your influence." He also appealed to Bergson....¹⁾ (underline added)

There are many other documents still kept in the UN Library telling of Nitobe's activities during his Geneva days. Nitobe's house in Geneva beside Lake Lemman became a meeting place for such eminent scholars and scientists of those days as appear in the above quotation. The young Einstein often played fiddle there.

This seems to me a remarkable thing, for even today (and still less in his days) there are not many Japanese people who can play such an important role in international scenes. (In his days, Japan sent outstanding men as delegates to the League, but Nitobe himself observed at that time that "Reticent by training, and handicapped by the very meager linguistic talent given to them by nature, the Japanese cannot win the confidence of nations by word of mouth.")²⁾

The underlined part of the above quotation gives us, I think, something of Nitobe's characteristics as at once a nationalist and an internationalist. It is my purpose to bring into relief this dual quality of Nitobe.

Nitobe's book *Bushido* can be described as the first expression of the Japanese nationalism. What I call here the Japanese nationalism dates from 1890s and ends in 1945. Nowadays Japanese people don't like to talk about nationalism. Nationalistic symbols, such as the Japanese

Emperor, the national anthem and the national flag are rather looked upon with an eye of suspicion, because these things have long been associated in the mind of Japanese people with that disastrous Pacific war ended in the atomic bombs.

Indeed, it would be a depressing thing to suppose that the whole nation rushed into that war with a single mind, inflicting many sufferings on other Asian countries. But the truth is, a different nationalism characterized by nobler aspirations existed before that. Nitobe's achievement is a testimony. In other words, nationalism in Japan had two aspects, a bright side and a dark side, different in nature but closely related historically, almost mixed with each other.

I feel I must first explain this relatively late date of the Japanese nationalism, as compared with the Western nations that experienced the awakening of some kind or other of nationalism much earlier. For that purpose I will sketch the history of Japan briefly.

A.D. 300 The Imperial Court of "Yamato" (=ancestors of the present Emperor of Japan) sets out to unify the country.

794 Kyoto becomes the site of the Imperial Court till 1868.

Frequent intercourse with the Continent (China and Korea) until the end of the 10th Century.

After the 11th Century, a rise of nationalistic culture.

1192 [The Imperial Court continues to exist, but the ruling power is transferred to the head of the warrior-class, called "Shogun" (hereditary within each government)(until 1868)]

1192 **Kamakura Government** (until 1333)

1274; 1281 Abortive attempts of invasion of the Mongolians under Kubla Khan.

- 1333 Civil Wars (until 1338)
- 1338 **Muromachi Government** (until 1573)
- 1467 Civil Wars (until 1573)
- 1573 **Nobunaga** (House of Oda) (until 1582)
- 1582 **Hideyoshi** and House of Toyotomi (until 1603)
- 1592;1597-8 Attempts to conquer Korea, resulting in the debilitation of the House of Toyotomi.
- 1603 **Tokugawa Government** (until 1867)
- 1633 Ordinance pronounced closing the door to foreign influences.
- 1853 American commodore Perry knocks the closed door of Japan.
- 1867 Collapse of Tokugawa Government.

1868 “Restoration”: The ruling power restored to the Imperial Court.
=The end of Feudalism
=The beginning of Westernization (i.e., modernization or enlightenment)
=The beginning of international age for Japan.

Of course, Japanese history is hundredfold more complex and richer, but this skeleton of chronology will serve my purpose here. Comparing this with any Western country’s history, I think, two things stand quite unique.

One is the extreme scarcity of international relations. Until the 10th century, influence of the classical China was conspicuous. But after that, Japan began to develop its own culture on that basis. And Japan experienced a danger from outside only once. It was Kubla Khan’s attempted invasion in the 13th century. But his two consecutive attempts were

repelled by strong tempests on the sea. After all, his power was that of a horse people, not of Vikings or a sea-faring nation.

On the other hand, an attempt to invade into the Continent was made also only once, toward the end of the 16th century. But this attempt quite debilitated the government, and it gave a lesson to the next government, Tokugawa Government. And this leads me to another uniqueness of Japanese history.

That is the long interval of peace and stability, some two hundred and fifty years, from the beginning of the 17th century to the mid-19th century. No danger from outside, nor any big civil wars within. The government took to the isolation policy. They knew well that the import of effective weapons, for instance, will threaten their stability. Also they sensed something dangerous and subversive in the doctrine of Christianity. The firearm (or “matchlock” of those days) was first introduced to Japan in 1543 by shipwrecked Portugueses, and as it happened to be the time of big civil wars with dozens of feudal lords competing with each other for hegemony, this western weapon much influenced the warfare of the period. It is said that Japanese craftsmen soon mastered the technology, but during the peaceful time that came after, their technology was turned, not into more effective weapons, but into fireworks (“fire-flowers” as they are called in Japan), which became an important popular culture of Japan, and still now Japanese craftsmen pride themselves on their skill as the best in the world.

The uniqueness of this second point is quite obvious if we compare it with the history of Western countries during the same period, that is, from the 17th to the mid-19th century.

And the result is also quite unique. While Western countries were undergoing drastic social changes, Japan remained as a living fossil of feudalism. This fact was observed and recorded by Karl Marx. In the

first book of *Das Kapital* (published in 1867), he wrote that feudalism could now be seen in living form only in Japan.

Remaining a living fossil had demerits, of course. It kept Japan for a long time from modernization and enlightenment. When Japan opened its gate to the Western world, they felt themselves to be a country of pigmies, due to the backwardness of their civilization and of technology.

From a conservationist point of view, however, it has some merits or attractions. The sword, for example, remained to be the main weapon throughout the feudal age. And during the long period of peace of the Tokugawa Government, it was even detached from its original, practical purpose, and became a kind of symbol, and, as such, developed into an artistic craftsmanship. One can refer to Nitobe's description of it in Chapter 13. It is a craftsmanship unrivalled in the whole world.

It is during this period of long peace and stability that everything we now regard as peculiarly Japanese was formed. Everything tended to ceremony. Tea-drinking became a ceremony, fencing or swordsmanship became a ceremony. Japanese national sport is wrestling, "sumo" wrestling, and I think a foreigner will be bored to death to watch this wrestling. The fighting itself is done in half a minute, or in a second or two in some cases. Before the real thing starts, one must watch with patience a long preparation, which is a ceremony.

Even such a horrible thing as an execution (beheading) was turned into a ceremony. I mean *seppuku* or *hara-kiri*, Nitobe's topic in Chapter 12. We have only to call to mind the execution of Charles I or the hanging of the dead body of Oliver Cromwell. No ceremony, no artistic beauty in that.

Also the Noh plays were strictly preserved during this peaceful time and handed down safe to us. As a result, we can fairly assume that we are watching the same performance, the same action, the same speech,

the same tone that were heard some five hundred years ago — a situation quite different from that of Shakespeare's plays.

Let us now go back to the history of Japan.

The state of a living fossil came to an end in 1868 abruptly. The relatively minor feudal lords of distant counties revolted against the central government, and they tried to justify their rebellion by pledging allegiance to the long neglected Imperial Court. That is why this is called Restoration.

No matter how we define this event, this was the end of feudalism, and the beginning of Japan's rapid modernization. Also it was the opening of an international age for Japan. Before that, nationalism didn't have any place, because other nations didn't come into their consciousness. If any existed, it might be called a blind nationalism, or an absolute nationalism, but not that kind of nationalism we are assuming here (they called their own country, not Japan, but the world, "the place beneath Heaven").

For some twenty years after the Restoration, Japan was busy adopting the results of Western modernization. Japan was as good as a colony, not politically, but in terms of culture, state of mind and attitude. Everybody tried to imitate the Western style.

During those twenty years, two books became the Bible for the rising generation: (1) Yukichi Fukuzawa (1834-1901), *Encouragement of Learning* (1872-76), written in Japanese. Every Japanese knows by heart its opening words: "God didn't create man above man, nor below man..." which was in fact a free translation from the opening paragraph of the American Declaration of Independence, which was in its turn the fruit of the European Enlightenment. And (2) Masanao Nakamura (1832-91), *Success Stories in Western Countries* (1871), which is a Japanese translation of Samuel Smiles's *Self Help*.

The sudden change also affected the whole system of education in Japan. The traditional education founded on Chinese classics was suddenly discarded; foreign teachers were hired mainly from America, notwithstanding the huge amount of money the new Government must pay for it. It is during this period that Nitobe received his higher education. In his childhood he was educated in the traditional form both at home and in school. After that he was trained in this new Western style. By the way, we might say that up to the time of Nitobe, Japanese people had never tried to learn foreign languages. Japanese scholars were able to understand Chinese classics perfectly well. But their understanding of the language was entirely for the written form. The same is true with the Dutch language which a handful of people mastered during the Tokugawa period. Therefore, if we assume with Otto Jespersen, that the essence of any language consists in its spoken form, and not in its written form,³⁾ then we must say Japanese people had never learned foreign languages.

The situation was different with Nitobe, for he was taught entirely by living American and British teachers.

Now, after the twenty years of hectic imitation, there came a return wave, a rise of nationalism in Japan. And interestingly enough, it was younger people like Nitobe taught by foreigners who were to make this return wave of nationalism. With their command of English and other European languages, they began to assert the identity of the Japanese nation. Three authors are specially mentioned as “masters of English” in our history of English studies (mastery of English is regarded as such a rare feat in Japan):

- (1) Kanzo Uchimura (1861-1930), *How I Became a Christian: The Diary of a Japanese Convert* (Tokyo & Chicago, 1895), written in English.

- (2) Inazo Nitobe (1862-1933), *Bushido: The Soul of Japan* (Philadelphia, 1900), written in English.
- (3) Tenshin Okakura (1862-1913), *The Ideals of the East* (London, 1903); *The Awakening of Japan* (New York, 1904); *The Book of Tea* (New York, 1906), all written in English.

Of these three, Nitobe's *Bushido* is particularly worth reading and rewarding, due to its standing on both cultures like an amphibian. An interesting review was written by a Julian Hawthorne (who is the famous novelist's nephew) in 1905:

Inazo Nitobe has edited an essay, a little more than a hundred pages long, which must be studied as well as read: and since it is fascinating as it is important, that is no hardship. This English which the professor writes is so singularly pure, easy and effective that no one would imagine it to be the work of a foreigner — and of a foreigner so very foreign as a Japanese. But that is little: The author seems to be the master of all the knowledge proper to a learned man of the West, as well as of that Oriental lore of which Westerners know not much.... You may read the book through in a couple of hours, but you may return to it profitably for years.⁴⁾

Nitobe's method in this book is to compare the two cultures, Japan and the West. And his aim is always to emphasize, not the difference but the similarity, the common humanity. Let me quote one example:

The sorrow which overtook Antony and Octavius at the death of Brutus, has been the general experience of brave men. Kenshin [1531-78], who fought for fourteen years with Shingen [1520-73], when he heard of the latter's death wept aloud at the loss of "the best

of enemies.” It was this same Kenshin who had set a noble example for all time in his treatment of Shingen, whose provinces lay in a mountainous region quite away from the sea, and who had consequently depended upon the Hôjô provinces of the Tokaido for salt. The Hôjô prince [Hôjô Ujiyasu 1515-71] wishing to weaken him, although not openly at war with him, had cut off from Shingen all traffic in this important article. Kenshin, hearing of his enemy’s dilemma and able to obtain his salt from the coast of his own dominions, wrote Shingen that in his opinion the Hôjô lord had committed a very mean act, and that although he (Kenshin) was at war with him (Shingen) he had ordered his subjects to furnish him with plenty of salt — adding, “I do not fight with salt, but with the sword,” affording more than a parallel to the words of Camillus, “We Romans do not fight with gold, but with iron.” Nietzsche spoke for the Samurai heart when he wrote, “You are to be proud of your enemy; then the success of your enemy is your success also.”

(*Bushido*: Chapter 4) (underline added)

This is his usual method. He picks up a well-known episode in the Japanese history, and then refers to several similar episodes in the European culture including the classical Greece and Rome. For this reason this book is difficult for Japanese readers. Also I think it is challenging to European readers, for they will be tested in their knowledge of their own culture. Nitobe quoted freely from Western writers, but very often neglected to mention the sources.

It appears that this book was read by many people of the world. Nitobe reports as follows:

I have been more than gratified to feel that my little treatise has

found sympathetic readers in widely separated circles, showing that the subject-matter is of interest to the world at large. Exceedingly flattering is the news (which reaches me from a trustworthy source) that President Roosevelt has done me the honour of reading the treatise and of distributing copies among his friends.

(*Bushido*: Preface to the 1905 Edition)

In this book, Nitobe gave expression to that blind nationalism or speechless nationalism that must have existed in the feudal Japan, during the period of a living fossil. Even at his time it was rapidly receding into the past, but he believed that the past is not an absolute past, that it is still living in the present, subsumed in it, underlying Japanese people's mentality.

Here, we must note that Nitobe first became an ardent admirer of the Western culture. He studied in America for three years, and after that in Germany for another three years. On his way to Germany he visited Britain, went straightway to Edinburgh, the utopian city of his mind, then came down to London, and straightway visited the Carlyle House in Chelsea.

Nitobe's nationalism was born out of his study of the Western culture — oozed, as it were, out of it. I call it "romantic" partly because it is strongly influenced by Burke and Carlyle. In the first place, the influence of Burke is quite obvious in Nitobe's *Bushido*. The whole book is based and modelled on Burke's eulogy on chivalry in his *Reflections on the Revolution in France* where Burke remarked that the French Revolution was an outrage against the spirit of the ancient chivalry which was the glory of Europe.⁵⁾ However, Nitobe's book was far from a mere imitation. Although Burke's observation makes sense in hindsight and looks almost prophetic, yet to speak of "chivalry" in the late 18th-century

England must have sounded a little anachronistic. In the case of Nitobe, who was born to a samurai family, the spirit of Bushido belonged to his living past. Even if it, too, was disappearing, the memory was still fresh and green.

The continuous peace for 250 years from the 17th to the mid-19th century gives Japan a unique status in the history of the world. While it kept Japan long from the way to modernization and enlightenment, it prolonged the age of feudalism and, during that prolongation, crystallized the feudalistic values into an ethical and even aesthetic system. For instance, military weapons long since lost their practical purpose and, instead of developing into more effective and more destructive instruments, became a kind of spiritual symbol. Valour, too, became a virtue to be pursued for its own sake, rather than the one proved and exercised in real fields. In a word, everything became a “ceremony,” as I stated earlier. So much so that we can say that the feudalistic ideal has seen its ethical and aesthetic completion in Japan more than in any other part of the world. And this it was that Nitobe immortalized in his book. That is why his description of the Bushido precepts strikes us as a solid reality, while Burke’s eulogy on chivalry ends in a vague expression of nostalgic sentiments; after all, in Burke’s England, chivalry was a thing which existed only in the world of romance.

The influence of Carlyle is no less strong on Nitobe’s book. Not only his writing but also his whole character-building was permeated by Carlyle, as he himself confesses it. His first encounter with Carlyle was in the autumn of 1879, when, as a youth of seventeen, he read a brief passage by Carlyle quoted in an American magazine. In an instant he realized that this sage should be his spiritual guide. However, no book-seller in Japan in those days knew the name of Carlyle. After many difficulties, he managed to get a copy of *Sartor Resartus* from an Amer-

ican missionary, and he says he read through the book more than thirty times. Most certainly this was the first case of the reception of Carlyle in Japan. The people before him had been too much dazzled by the Western industrialism with its technological achievements to pay due attention to its severe critic.

Nitobe was not uncritical of Carlyle's definition of History and estimate of Heroes, but the whole contention running through *Bushido* — the contention that a nation's power consists not in its materialistic resources but in the spiritual — was surely a lesson he directly learned from Carlyle. Also his richly figurative language is the style he learned from, and even improved upon, Carlyle's.

Another important aspect of Carlyle's influence was the eulogy on George Fox in *Sartor Resartus*, Book III: Chapter 1. This initiated Nitobe at an early stage to Quakerism, which was to play an important part in Nitobe's subsequent career. Born to a samurai family, he became a devout Christian, a devout Quaker. Nitobe's *Bushido* is a strange hybrid-sort of book. Though written in English, it will be a difficult book for present-day Westerners, too, not because it tells of a distant Far-Eastern country, but because of its wide reference to the Western culture. It consists of a constant juxtaposition, or bringing together, of two distinct cultures, East and West, overlapping the Bushido ideals with the concepts of Christian gentleman, and Nitobe always emphasizes the common features of the two, not their disparities. Thus his *Bushido* was quite in keeping with his later activities in Geneva, his belief being that East and West can be reconciled, in spite of the famous and too often misquoted lines from Rudyard Kipling's poem.⁶⁾

Not only East and West, but also nationalism and internationalism blend into one in Nitobe's *Bushido*. Towards the end of his life, he often expressed his belief that nationalism is one and the same with internation-

alism. Nitobe's earlier book was an embodiment of this belief. Thus his nationalism is entitled to be called "romantic" again for its high and noble aspirations:

The antithesis of patriotism is not internationalism or even cosmopolitanism, but Chauvinism. Internationalism is the extension of patriotism. If you love your country, you must needs love other countries without which your own country cannot exist and loses its *raison d'être*. If you love the world, you must, perforce, love best that part of it which is nearest to you. (*The Osaka Mainichi*: June 7, 1930)

A good internationalist must be a good nationalist and *vice versa*. The very terms connote it. A man who is not faithful to his own country cannot be depended upon for faithfulness to a world principle. One can serve best the cause of internationalism by serving his country. On the other hand, a nationalist can best advance the interests and honour of his country by being internationally minded. (*The Osaka Mainichi*: May 16, 1933)

However, the time was to come when Nitobe's romantic nationalism proved fragile before a stern reality — here we note is another common feature of Romanticism. It was soon taken place of by another kind of nationalism, characterized by national pride and military power. Japan was to withdraw from the League of Nations. It was coincidentally Nitobe's last year, 1933. His speech at the time is so impressive, so touching that I am tempted to quote almost the whole of it, running the risk of a digression. His speech was made to an audience of more than 100 people, representing all nationalities, attending the luncheon of the

Tokyo Pan-Pacific Club at the Imperial Hotel, Tokyo, on Friday, April 7, 1933. And it was entitled "How Geneva Erred" when published as an article in *The Osaka Mainichi*, April 12 and 13, 1933.

...From the very kind words of introduction uttered by our chairman, I presume you expect me to say something about my latest trip to America. I left this country just about a year ago, and until then I was not at all disposed to cross the Pacific Ocean. In the presence of so many good American friends, I have to confess why I did not feel disposed to go.

I consider myself one of the greatest admirers of America. I spent a few years in Baltimore when I was a young man, where I distinguished myself not when I was a student but about 50 years later, as a classmate of Woodrow Wilson.

Then I went to Germany for five years, and my foreign education was chiefly acquired in Germany. But none the less, having been deeply impressed by the study, though not very profound I assure you, of English history and English literature, I was very partially inclined to Anglo-Saxon ideas, both in politics and in the general view of life — philosophy, you may call it.

So after leaving the Agricultural College in Sapporo, I came to Tokyo to continue my studies in agricultural economics in the university here. When I asked for admission to the university, I told the dean I would like to study agricultural economics and English literature....

When I told the dean of the university I wanted to take English literature for my minor subject, I said that I wished to be a bridge across the Pacific Ocean, a bridge across which western ideas could flow without obstacle or impediment to Japan, and over which

oriental ideas could find entrance to America.

However far I have wandered from my original plan of agricultural economics, I have not strayed very far from my avocation to be a bridge across the Pacific. I have never lost sight of it, though for more than eight years I consistently declined to go to America on account of the Exclusion Law, by which our people of course are excluded. I respect the American law so well and so conscientiously that I thought I would not do injustice to America by treading on its sacred soil. Not another Jap should land there.

That is why I declined about 10 invitations from universities and other institutions, and when I was in Geneva, though I had friends in America and my wife had relatives there, I always used the Indian Ocean route back to Japan, out of respect for that law which would not tolerate any inferior people to land.

But when last year the sentiment in America became so bad against Japan, my friends told me it was high time I should desecrate that soil with my feet, because the questions involved were more serious than the Exclusion Law, and after thinking much about it, I decided to go. I am very glad that I went. I, like an ordinary human being, like darkness more than light, and America was dark, so I went there.

In the same way I came back into darkness. I do not think the atmosphere in this country is very light. We have left the League of Nations. The League of Nations is an artificial institution formed by the consent and the will of the states members. Entrance into it is voluntary.

Now we have left it, and here let me say I am one of those inconsistent and self-contradictory people who believe that while Japan is justified at the present moment to leave the League, still

believe that the League is the greatest hope for the future welfare of the world. I still insist upon looking at the League as the greatest achievement of the human race, and it is a pity that we have had to leave it.

The League, being a human institution, errs. To err is human. I think the League has erred in its too rigid interpretation of the Covenant of the League. The founders of the League, be it Wilson, Clemenceau, Lloyd George, did not look upon the League as a tight compartment — in fact these three men once wrote an official letter to the effect that the articles of the Covenant of the League are not subject to a narrow and technical construction. They are to be interpreted in a broad and statesmanlike manner.

But the arguments which were waged in regard to the Manchuria question showed that many small powers have interpreted the Covenant not in a broad and statesmanlike manner, but like lawyers, in a cheap way. What a pity! None the less, there will come a time when the League itself will find it has committed a grave error.

At the same time, I believe Japan also has committed a grave error. We insisted that the League does not know sufficient of the causes and the reasons that underlie our action in Manchuria. We speak of the attitude of the League as being founded on ignorance, but who made the League ignorant? Are we not responsible for it? We have committed a grave error in being too reticent and uncommunicative, and I may say also unsociable, and the sooner we find out that error, the better for our future relations with the rest of the world.

Now we have left the League, which is an artificial institution, but we cannot leave the family of nations, which is a natural institution, and whatever rights we may have lost by our withdrawal from

the League, we must make good by further attention to the family of nations. Our relations with the rest of the world must now be largely controlled by the idea of our membership in the family of nations, the natural, instinctive, warm, and more or less emotional institution. It is by attention to the duties demanded by our membership in the family of nations that we should guide our diplomacy.

America is not a member of the League of Nations, but it is one of the greatest and at present perhaps the most powerful members of the family of nations, so our relations with that country must demand our deepest and most careful consideration. Therefore, though the clouds that hang over the Pacific at present are still quite dark, yet with an effort and a will to bring about better understanding, we shall, I hope, regain our position in the heart of the American people.

At present things look dark, but darkness will not last forever. The shouting and the tumult will die, and the captains and kings will depart. Then we shall regain cooler judgment, and I do not think the time is far distant when this cooler judgment will come back. Then we shall see that on both sides of the Pacific there are many earnestly interested in our good relationship — I see many represented here this afternoon.

I think we may look forward to such a time. May we not already congratulate ourselves in forming new ties! In such a gathering as this we are forming ties that will grow stronger, and that in the coming years will bring back the enjoyable and friendly relations which have been the tradition of the Pacific.

I thank you for this opportunity of greeting my friends, and I wish that this society may grow in importance and influence. We meet like ships in the night, but we rarely forget the ships that we pass in the night.

Probably, Nitobe in his last sentence alludes to Henry Wadsworth Longfellow's poem, and this explains the queerness of his expression. His style was literary to the last. Note that, two paragraphs above, he cited without inverted commas from Kipling's poem "Recessional": "The tumult and the shouting dies; The captains and the kings depart." Longfellow's poem he now refers to is *Wayside Inn III.Elizabeth IV*:

Ships that pass in the night, and speak each other in passing,
Only a signal shown and a distant voice in the darkness,
So on the ocean of life we pass and speak one another,
Only a look and a voice, then darkness again and a silence.

There might have been a better time for us to meet, Nitobe is saying, but, as it is, we are met in the dark, like "ships that pass in the night." However, such is the life, isn't it? Then, let us make much of this chance meeting; it will give an inspiration to a new age, when there will be enough of lightness and sweetness to realize our dreams. Here, we see the author of *Bushido* addressing himself, like a prophet, to all the internationalists of the world.

Around the same time he reported of his conversation with Roy W. Howard, then head of United Press, visiting Japan:

I met with the famous reporter, Howard..., he said to me, "Because your country left the League of Nations, it is going to collapse." "You should not say such things. I (Inazô) think that because of that the League of Nations will grow stronger. The League is at fault.... When they realize this, the League of Nations will be restructured and then your country, too, will become a member. Russia will join, and Japan, and the League will truly

become a League of Nations of the world.” “Do you really think so?” “Of course I do.” “You are an optimist.” “Is it possible to live on this small globe, filled with suffering, and not be an optimist?” “Yes I see what you mean,” he said, and we parted.⁷⁾

Now, going back to the original topic, I say the two nationalisms (romantic nationalism and military nationalism) are almost sheer opposites. But strangely the two were closely related in Nitobe's case. Nitobe's book became world-famous especially around 1905, the year of Japan's victory over Russia. Japan's victory attracted the world's attention to Japan, and with it to Nitobe's book. Also this great internationalist was lucky enough to get an important position in the Headquarters of the newly born League of Nations in 1920. Why? Again, it was Japan's growing power, military and economic, after the first World War.

After Nitobe's death, when the military authorities began gradually to usurp the government, his name and the title of his book “Bushido: the Soul of Japan” were made use of to raise the morale of soldiers. If they had read through the book, Nitobe's message for the world peace would have been obvious, but, as I said before, it was a difficult book for Japanese readers. As a result, only his title was taken up and changed into a warlike catch-phrase appealing to the national pride. What a misunderstanding! And that is why Nitobe was long neglected after the nightmare of the Pacific War. Nowadays there are not so many who misunderstand him, but then there are still very few who truly appreciate his achievements, which, if reconstructed in its true shape, will surely give us a valuable orientation for the new age of the true internationalism in this twenty-first century. That is what I in my feeble effort aimed at in this reassessment of Nitobe's *Bushido*.

NOTES:

- ¹⁾ Ronald W. Clark, *Einstein: The Life and Times* (New York: Avon Books, 1971; 1999), p.432.
- ²⁾ John F. Howes (ed.), *Nitobe Inazô: Japan's Bridge Across the Pacific* (Boulder & Oxford: Westview Press, 1955), p.189.
- ³⁾ Otto Jespersen, *Essentials of English Grammar* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1933), p.17.
- ⁴⁾ John F. Howes (ed.), pp.13-14.
- ⁵⁾ Edmund Burke, *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (1790; London: Penguin Books, 1986), pp.169-74 & *passim*.
- ⁶⁾ 'Oh, East is East, and West is West, and never the twain shall meet' ("The Ballad of East and West," l.1.)
- ⁷⁾ Uchikawa Eiichiro, *Nitobe Inazô: The Twilight Years* (Tokyo: Kyobunkan, 1985), p. 151.