

The Social Response of Buddhists to the Modernization of Japan

The Contrasting Lives of Two Sōtō Zen Monks

ISHIKAWA Rikizan

石川力山

What was the response of Sōtō Buddhist priests to the social situation facing Japan at the beginning of the twentieth century? What influence did their religious background have on their responses to the modernization of Japan? This article examines the lives and thought of two Japanese Sōtō Buddhist priests—Takeda Hanshi and Uchiyama Gudō—both with the same religious training and tradition, yet who chose diametrically opposite responses. Takeda Hanshi supported Japan's foreign policies, especially in Korea; Uchiyama opposed Japanese nationalism and militarism, and was executed for treason. What led them to such opposite responses, and what conclusions can be drawn concerning the influence of religious traditions on specific individual choices and activities?

THE MEIJI GOVERNMENT, having put an end to the Tokugawa *bakuhau*n system through military force and thus bringing about the Meiji Restoration, turned its efforts to catching up with the West. Among the measures it took to modernize and strengthen Japanese society were the establishment of a new system of education, the enactment of a new law regulating family registration, and the preparation of an entirely new legal system. It also reformed the industrial structure, forced the adoption of capitalism, expanded the reach of the military, and promoted the concept of a unified nation-state. At the same time the Meiji government, in a move that to some degree ran counter to

* This essay, 日本の近代化と仏教者の社会的対応—二人の曹洞禅僧の生き方を通して, was written by Ishikawa Rikizan for this special issue of the *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* shortly before his untimely death in the summer of 1997. It was translated into English by Paul L. Swanson. We would like to thank Kumamoto Eimin 熊本英人 of the Institute for Sōtō Zen Studies at Komazawa University for assisting us with proofreading the translation and checking the readings of proper names in the absence of the author.

the ideal of modernization, succeeded in reviving the ancient political system based on the unity of religion and state (祭政一致) and the autocratic sovereignty of the emperor. The combined forces of these initiatives resulted in, among other things, the development of State Shinto, the rise of ultranationalism, and the adoption of a policy of colonization. Heading down the road to imperialism and nationalism, Japan rushed into wars of aggression, another undeniable part of Japan's modernization.

The policy of the Meiji government with regard to religion began to take shape with the promulgation of the Edict for Distinguishing between Kami and Buddhas (*Shinbutsu hanzen rei* 神仏判然令) on 28 March 1868. The stormy and often violent movements to separate the kami and the buddhas (*shinbutsu bunri* 神仏分離) and to reject and destroy Buddhism in Japanese society (*haibutsu kishaku* 廃仏毀釈) that followed had a strong social and economic impact on Buddhist organizations that shook them to their foundations. Then came the Movement to Promulgate the Great Teaching (*Taikyō senpu undō* 大教宣布運動), which aimed to disseminate the Shinto teachings centered on the emperor, and the establishment of the Shinto-Buddhist Daikyō-in 大教院, the organ for teaching the Japanese people to respect the kami and love their country (*keishin aikoku* 敬神愛国), to learn the divine principles and way of humanity (*tenri jindō* 天理人道), and to learn to revere the emperor and obey the regime (*kōjō hōtai chōshi junshu* 皇上奉載朝旨遵守) as proclaimed in the Three Standards of Instruction (*Sanjō no kyōsoku* 三条ノ教則). The Buddhist world was buffeted and tossed about by the policies of the government. The Daikyō-in organization was abandoned in May of 1875, bringing an end to their promulgations, but the damage was done. The Buddhist world had experienced a sense of helplessness and defeat at the hands of a powerful state authority, and for a long time thereafter continued to be mesmerized by the imperial system.

The academic study of Buddhism in post-Tokugawa Japan quickly incorporated the textual studies and methods of Western Buddhology and made great strides in developing modern Buddhist research. The doctrinal and sectarian studies of the sectarian Buddhist organizations, however, continued to languish. During the fifteen years that Japan was at war, the teachings of the sectarian Buddhist organizations (sometimes called the “wartime doctrines” 戦時教学) were for the most part developed under the principles of the modern emperor system, best represented by an interpretation of the “two truths theory” (*shinzoku nitai ron* 真俗二諦論) which justified submission to the “imperial law” as an expression of the “Buddhist law.” Some famous examples of the pressure applied by the state are the prohibition of certain mandala

and other symbols of the Nichiren school, the incident concerning disrespectful remarks towards the emperor in Nichiren's writings (日蓮遺文), and the revision and deletion of parts of the writings of the founders in the canon of Jōdo Shinshū. This was part of the larger social movement for heightening respect for the emperor and country, and to instill into people the obligation to submit to and honor the emperor, and in fact played a significant role in advancing this goal. Thus the Buddhist organizations of modern Japan offered a Buddhism that was largely regulated by the ruling principles of the modern imperial system, and came to have qualities that were quite different from the features of the medieval or modern (Tokugawa) Buddhist organizations. And, it should be noted, the academic Buddhist scholars who established modern Buddhology on the basis of textual studies in Japan during this time offered little or no comment that would have resisted or opposed the development of this sort of state-regulated Buddhist doctrine.

The Ideas and Actions of Two Zen Monks

As we have seen, the Buddhist world in Japan, for better or worse, found itself thrown headlong into modern society. However, not all Buddhists responded in the same way to the currents of the times, nor was everyone swallowed up in the power structure of the state. One can make no blithe generalizations or offer easy answers to questions regarding the response of individual Buddhists in this situation. Given the tensions and currents of Japanese society at this time, there were not a few Buddhists who made difficult and anguished choices. Their positions and responses were varied and diverse. We should not forget that there were some Zen monks whose reputation has been reversed from their times to ours. There were people who were affiliated with the Sōtō sect but who, rather than restraining themselves with the fetters of the official Sōtō line, continued to make bold statements with regard to their contemporary social situation and acted sacrificially in accordance with their ideals. I am thinking of the two Zen monks who are the focus of my essay: Takeda Hanshi 武田範之 (1864–1911) and Uchiyama Gudō 内山愚童 (1874–1911).

Before we examine the lives and ideals of these two figures, let me say that as long as Buddhism is a religion offering salvation, one assumes that certainly the hope for peace is a basic ideal and teaching common to all Buddhist schools and traditions, and a goal sought by people and society as a whole. This should be true especially for the East Asian Buddhist tradition that extols the idea that “all sentient beings without exception have the Buddha-nature,” and teaches that

one should “save others before achieving one’s own salvation” (自未得度先度他). It is often argued that such Buddhist ideals should leave no room for the justification of persecuting and harming others. However, if I may jump ahead to my conclusions, the two Zen monks taken up in this essay were faced, willingly or not, with a conundrum within their social situation. By examining their respective responses, we are faced with the realization that the “absolute pacifism” of Buddhism is actually nothing more than an unverified ideal, even an illusion. In other words, the ideals of Buddhism carried the potential, and actually functioned, both as a justification for war and as a source of yearning for peace. This point has already been made with great force by Paul Demiéville, in his postscript to G. Renondeau’s *Histoire des moines guerriers du Japon*:

This study contains many remarks and information beyond the topic of warrior monks, including a point I would like to address here. Namely, is the militarization of Buddhism an exclusively Japanese phenomenon, or are there other examples to be found in the general history of Buddhism? Also, how was this militarization explained in light of its apparent deviation from a central doctrine and cardinal principle of Buddhist teachings, namely, the precept against taking life? What were the social, economic, and political motivations and causes of this militarization as an historical event? How did those who committed these offenses justify their actions?
(p. 347)

The Mahāyāna vinaya masters did not hesitate to make the following argument: “If sentient beings do not exist, then there is no offense of killing. If there is no offense of killing, then there is no such thing as upholding the precepts [that prohibits it].... There is no offense in killing a heap of five aggregates [that is essentially empty], for this is like killing an illusory dream or an image reflected in the mirror.”¹ It is striking that Mahāyāna Buddhism used such casuistry, and that Buddhists justified aberrant warlike behavior on the basis of this logic. *Hīnayāna Buddhism views life as full of iniquity, yet maintains a strict prohibition against taking life. In contrast, Mahāyāna Buddhism claims to revere life, yet allows room in its logic to excuse or even glorify the taking of life.* (pp. 352–53)

Later he writes specifically about the Zen tradition:

¹ Translator’s note: From the *Ta chih tu lun*, T 25.164a19–23. See the French translation in LAMOTTE 1949, p. 864.

Another sect that played an important role in the military history of Japan (just as its monks did in China) is the Zen sect. Although the members of this sect did not personally participate in the fighting, they made major contributions to the training of soldiers.... *The particular method for training people in the Zen sect—that is, the appeal to the direct response of instinct and to naked action that flows from the depths of the unconscious—fits remarkably well with military discipline.* Although judo and jujitsu (the art of the “supple”) developed from Taoism (from which Zen borrowed much), in Japan the military arts such as *kyūdō* (archery) and *kendo* (the way of the sword) are associated with Zen and its specific methods. There is even a manual compiled by a Zen monk to explain these arts in Buddhist terms (the *Fudōchi shinmyō roku* 不動智神妙録, by Takuan). During the Second World War, at a theater in Paris under German occupation, we were shown films about the Japanese military attack on Pearl Harbor that showed scenes of military training that clearly reflected the influence of Zen.

(emphasis added; DEMIÉVILLE 1957, pp. 374–75)

Thus Demiéville points out the complicity of Buddhism and the Zen tradition both doctrinally and historically in war, the greatest possible act of alienation and rejection. Certainly there is a strong conceit in the discourse of Zen monks that the results or attainments of their individual practice can be applied immediately and without any other precondition to actual social conditions. This conceit is repeated often in their assertions. Sawaki Kōdō 澤木興道 (1880–1965), for example, one of the most representative teachers of the modern Sōtō school, was a veteran of the Russo-Japanese war, honored for his wounds on the battlefield. In his memoirs he writes:

(1903, immediately after my discharge from military service, drafted again for service in the Russo-Japanese war.) When I realized that I had to serve in the military again, I despaired of my aspirations to cultivate the Buddhist path, and expressed my feelings in a poem.

Thinking that, for the sake of the Dharma,
I would reduce my body to powder;
Instead I will become a demon
To protect my country.

(SAWAKI 1984, p. 93)

“Advancing through a Rain of Bullets”

The thirty-seventh year of Meiji (1904). Along with the outbreak of the Russo-Japanese war, my outfit was incorporated as the third platoon, second company, thirty-third regiment,

third division of foot soldiers of the second army. We landed on the southern shores of the Liaotung Peninsula on 5 May. Until we met the enemy I was unsure of my own courage, and felt a strange emotion....

Once we started fighting, however, I felt that this was great. When my rifle would not work anymore due to overheating from continuous firing, I would shift my position and piss on it to cool it off. Then I would shoot some more. If the rifle would bend or break, I would exchange it with a good one from a dead soldier. “*Combat is easy,*” I thought. “*Until I came here, nothing I had experienced gave me such a feeling of freedom. There is no place better than this.*” At ordinary times, there’s always some sort of trouble, such as uniform inspections and so forth. But when you enter combat, there are no complications. You just do what you do in whatever position you like; you don’t have to follow a set pattern.... It was in combat that I first experienced the feeling of complete freedom.... I often heard people say in admiration, “Who is that guy?” “Ah, he’s a Zen monk.” “Now I understand. Leave it to the Zen monks; they’ve got guts.” I felt myself puff up with pride; it was a great feeling....

I killed a belly full of people in the Russo-Japanese war. There was one battle in particular during which we lured the enemy to fall into a pit and we picked them off like sitting ducks with great efficiency.

(SAWAKI 1984, pp. 96–100)

The memoirs continue in this vein. Here is an example of how the Buddhist ideal of “not taking life” had no effect whatsoever on the circumstances of a Buddhist’s experience of “freedom” and satori. There are not a few Buddhists who, even today, claim that capital punishment and killing during war—which no one can deny are the “taking of life”—are exceptions to the rule against taking life. Again, in the days before the Russo-Japanese war, the famous Sanskrit scholar Nanjō Bun’yū 南条文雄 raised the rallying cry “To die is bliss; kill them all!” (死[ぬ]るは極楽ヤツツケロ) in one of his speeches. This statement was severely criticized by Takagi Kenmyō 高木顕明 (1864–1914), a Shingon priest from Shingū who was implicated in the Taigyaku [Treason] Incident 大逆事件² along with Uchiyama Gudō and sentenced to life

² Translator’s note: The Taigyaku Incident of 1911 was sparked by an alleged conspiracy to assassinate the emperor. The government used the alleged conspiracy as an opportunity to arrest prominent socialists such as Kōtoku Shūsui and “agitators” such as Uchiyama Gudō, even though they had no direct involvement in the so-called conspiracy. Convicted for the crime of treason, twelve people (including Kōtoku and Uchiyama) were executed, and twelve sentenced to life imprisonment.

imprisonment. We must admit that even Nanjō, one of the founders and pioneers of modern Buddhology in Japan, was not able to avoid justifying the Russo-Japanese war as national policy.

Paul Demiéville points out that the logic of justifying murder can be found in Buddhism: “One can find other justifications for murder in the Buddhist literature that are more subtle. It is above all a ‘statistical’ justification: that murder is permitted if many can be saved by killing only one 一殺多生” (DEMIÉVILLE 1957, p. 379). This logic can be found in the statements and activities of people such as Inoue Nissō 井上日召 (1886–1967), of the Nichiren school, and Yamamoto Genpō 山本玄峰 (1865–1961).³

With the above comments as background for our discussion of these issues, let us now turn to a specific comparison of the lives of Takeda Hanshi and Uchiyama Gudō. I have prepared a chart showing the course of their two lives, along with another column that shows the developments within the various Buddhist organizations during this period, as well as major social and political events (see Appendix).

As we consider the lives of these two men, we can see that, although Takeda Hanshi was ten years older than Uchiyama Gudō, they both lived life to the fullest around the same time of the Meiji era, and both passed away in 1911 before the Meiji era came to an end. The two never met directly, and there was no occasion for them to be aware of each other. They both chose to become monks in the same Sōtō Zen sect after a period of spiritual wandering, and both spent some time experiencing traditional and orthodox training at a Zen monastery (*sōdō* 僧堂). From what can be gathered from memorials written by their friends, they shared the frank openness of a Zen monk. However, it is said that Takeda was considered for the honor of being elevated to a peerage in his later years, while Uchiyama suffered execution by hanging for his alleged involvement in the Taigyaku Incident. Again, Takeda was versed in the Chinese classics and skilled in the traditional Zen art of writing poetry, and a wholehearted supporter of the emperor, while Uchiyama was swayed by Western ways of thinking through publications such as *Yorozu chōhō* 萬朝報 and the *Heimin shinbun* 平民新聞 that awakened a sense of his mission, and embraced the goals of socialism and anarchism. As a result of their respective ideals, they ended up on opposite extremes, most clearly symbolized by their contrary attitudes toward the emperor. They breathed the same air of the same era, took the same Zen as their starting point, showed a similar interest in politics and international relations, refused to let their Buddhist ideals remain as abstract theories,

³ Ninth abbot of the Rinzaï Ryūtakū-ji monastery.

and tried to actualize their ideals in a concrete way in the society of their day. Their final horizons, however, were inexplicably opposite and inimicable. We must conclude that their respective ends were not the necessary results of their Buddhist ideals, but were the summary of their subjective attitudes that show how, as individuals, they responded—in thought and in deed—to the problems with which they were faced. In the remainder of this essay I will examine more closely the lives of these two men, what problems they encountered, and what choices they made.

The Life of Takeda Hanshi and Sōtō Missionary Activity in Korea

Takeda Hanshi (childhood name Hanji [半治 or 範治], religious name Kōchū 洪疇, posthumous name Zenrai 善来) was born on 23 November 1863, in the Kurume fief (present-day Fukuoka Prefecture), as the third son of a retainer named Sawa Shihei 沢四兵衛. His father was a devoted follower of the emperor, and was arrested for his involvement in the so-called “Meiji 4 Incident” (*Meishi jiken* 明四事件). Hanshi was then adopted by the medical doctor Takeda Sadasuke, and studied Japanese history and Chinese at a local private school (*juku*). However, he ran away from home at the age of nineteen and wandered from place to place, enjoying a wealth of experiences. Finally, when he was twenty-one years old, he became a monk under Nematsu Gendō of the Sōtō temple Kenshō-ji in Niigata.

Even after becoming a monk Hanshi was involved in political movements, such as the movement for freedom and people’s rights (*jiyū minken undō*), went to Tokyo, spent time as a police officer in Fukushima, and sometimes returned to a life of wandering, but for his whole life he always maintained contact with his home temple, Kenshō-ji. In his later years he became the official abbot of this temple, and also became involved in Sōtō sectarian politics as a representative of the Sōtō branch temples. In the meantime he also crossed the sea to Pusan, where he started a fishing business and became involved with a political association set up by a Japanese who had moved to Korea after not being able to make a living in Japan, the so-called *Chōsen rōnin* 朝鮮浪人. Thus his background as a Buddhist monk in the Sōtō tradition and his deep connections with Korea became the basis for Hanshi’s later activities.

It would not do to give a quick overview of Hanshi’s life without examining his ideals and way of thinking. The brief summary of his activities so far shows clearly that in the first half of his life—symbolized by his involvement in the assassination of Min-bi 閔妃—he showed a strong interest in the Korean situation and interference in its internal

affairs. In the second half of his life he showed a persistent concern with the missionary activity of the Sōtō sect in Korea, including the attempt to merge the Korean Wōn sect with Sōtō. In general, then, it would not be off the mark to say that he was deeply involved in the political and religious affairs of Korea. And if we compare his activities with the historical events of the day, including missionary activity in Korea and China by the Sōtō and other Japanese Buddhist sects, we can see that Hanshi was closely involved with modern Japan's foreign adventures, especially with regard to the Meiji government's policy of expansion into Korea and the mainland.

The Japanese advance into the mainland, especially its colonial intentions, became apparent in 1873 (Meiji 6) with the split between the political factions supporting the conquest of Korea (*seikan-ha* 征韓派) and that concerned with internal affairs (*naichi-ha* 内治派). Yoshida Shōin 吉田松陰, whose students were well represented among the figures who brought about the Meiji Restoration, indicated these intentions in his *Gokuzechō* 獄是帖 (1855):

Concerning the peace treaty concluded with Russia and the United States, they have broken the peace before us; we should not lose our faith because of the barbarians, but be more strict in our conditions and strengthen our faith in the face of adversity, nurture our national power, and cut off the easy-to-take Korea, Manchuria, and China. In negotiating with Russia and the United States we will give up some territory but be rewarded with Korea and Manchuria.

The same point is made by Hashimoto Sanai 橋本左内, influential during the Bakumatsu period with his advocacy of opening the country and politically merging the shogunate and the imperial family (*kōbu gattai* 公武合体), who wrote in his *Taigaisaku* 对外策 (1857):

Japan is in a position where it is difficult to be independent. In order for us to be independent, we need the areas of Manchuria and Korea. If we do not have territory like America or India, we cannot do as we wish.

I believe we could say that this "vision" of Asian conquest and even world conquest was common to the people who established the Meiji government, that is, the leaders such as Yoshida Shōin who developed their ideas during the Bakumatsu times. Saigō Takamori 西郷隆盛 is often singled out as being in the vanguard of the movement advocating the invasion of Korea, but it was actually a common idea that would have been put into practice sooner or later, and was an integral part of the blueprints of the Meiji government.

On the religious front, the various Japanese Buddhist organizations

(including the Sōtō sect), hoping to recover the responsibilities endangered by the early Meiji situation, all jumped on the bandwagon by starting missionary activity on the Asian continent. This was clearly in line with, and supportive of, the Meiji government's national policy; in retrospect it appears almost as if the Buddhist organizations were programmed by the Meiji government. Han Chōl-hi 韓哲曦 captures this situation accurately:

Backed by six warships, an unequal "friendship" treaty was signed by Japan and Korea in February 1876 (Meiji 9) that stipulated one-sided benefits for Japan alone, such as the opening of Pusan and two other ports along with extraterritoriality, the dropping of all tariffs on Japanese goods, the right to use Japanese currency, and extraterritoriality for Japanese residents in Korea....

In this way Japan succeeded in forcing open the stubborn Korean Peninsula, a feat that even the great powers of Europe and the United States had not accomplished. In addition, learning from the example of the West in sending forth Christian missionaries to accompany overpowering colonial aggression, and using religion as its advance guard, Japan planned a spiritual and cultural infiltration to embrace the unregistered masses, and used various political, economic, and diplomatic intrigue to control the ruling classes. This was part of a plan to carry out the policy of making Korea completely dependent on Japan. (HAN 1988, p. 13)

In addition, the various sects of Japanese Buddhism competed to get the most powerful Korean Buddhist temples to be their "branch temples." Hanshi decries this situation in his *Treatise on the Six Truths of the Wōn Sect* (*Enshū rokutairon* 円宗六諦論), but Han is not very sympathetic.

Takeda lamented the vulgar actions of Japanese priests who showed no sympathy for the feelings of the Korean people and scurried to plunder the Korean temples. However, he believed that merging all of Korean Buddhism was the only way "to bring back the glory of the Silla and Koguryō eras," and thus sought to merge Korean Buddhism within the Sōtō sect. It was Takeda who sought cooperation with the Isshinkai of Li Yōngku 李容九 and Song Kyum Joon 宋乘峻, and was the man who worked in the background with Uchida Ryōhei to promote the "merging of Japan and Korea." (HAN 1988, p. 63)

In contrast to this perspective, Takizawa Makoto claims that

Hanshi chose a form of Asianism as a source of salvation. At this time the position taken by Hanshi was to call for expelling

the White Man and maintaining solidarity with the Asian peoples. This ideal was directly related to the way of thinking inherited from his father and the pro-emperor stand of the Kurume fief. And Hanshi's Asianism was also influenced by the commune-like lifestyle he had experienced back in Kurume. This was the structure that informed his fishing venture near Pusan, and his involvement in the Isshinkai.

Along with Buddhism, belief in the emperor system was the backbone of Hanshi's faith.... When Hanshi's father was caught up in the whirlwind of political turmoil through the pro-emperor Meiji 4 Incident, his family was ruined; it would not be surprising if Hanshi had turned against and rejected emperor worship. In fact, however, through this experience of the Meiji 4 Incident and the hardship it brought upon him, Hanshi's pro-emperor sentiment seemed to become even stronger. (TAKIZAWA 1986, p. 276)

This perspective emphasizes Hanshi's Asianism and the attempt to expel the "White Man" as the basic principle behind Hanshi's actions. Some suppose that respect for the emperor, which had deep roots among the people in Kurume and was an attitude Hanshi had inherited from his father, formed the background of Hanshi's way of thinking. However, the idea that the conquest of Korea was a necessary condition for Japan to dominate Manchuria was surely a common topic among the intellectual followers of the movement for freedom and people's rights with whom Hanshi was acquainted, such as Seki Tsunekichi 関常吉 of the Kantō Jiyūtō (Freedom Party). People such as Itagaki Taisuke were without exception deeply committed to Japan's subjugation of Korea, as is evident from the promise he made with Saigō Takamori concerning the conquest of Korea. Furthermore they believed that Japan, having been forced by the great powers of the West to sign an unequal treaty, whether right or wrong would have to subjugate Korea in order to gain control over Manchuria. The Sino-Japanese war was fought in order to eliminate the conditions negotiated with China over Japan's aggression in Korea. And the causes for the Russo-Japanese war can be traced to Russia's southern move into Manchuria.

The actions taken by Takeda Hanshi with regard to Korea, as reflected in his appointment by the Sōtō sect administration to the role of superintendent of the Korean mission, were greatly welcomed by that organization. It is well known that Christian missionaries were dispatched as the vanguard for colonial policy by the great powers of the West, to carry out acts of spiritual and cultural aggression. It is not clear how much the strategy was consciously coordinated by the

respective organizations of the Meiji government and Japanese Buddhism. However, we do know that in 1877, just a year after the signing of the Japan-Korea “friendship” agreement (日朝修好条規 [江華頭条約]), Ōkubo Toshimichi 大久保利通 (Secretary of the Ministry of Internal Affairs) and Terashima Munenori 寺島宗則 (Secretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs) sent a letter to Gennyō 嚴如 (chief abbot of Hongan-ji) encouraging the sect to send missionaries to Korea. It is likely that similar contacts were made individually with each of the other Buddhist sects as well, which adds up to a concerted advance into Korea by a combined force of both the public and private sectors in Japan. Hanshi, as a member of the Sōtō sect, already had a number of encounters in Korea, albeit on a personal level, and his activities were well known by the sectarian headquarters. His appointment as a representative of the Sōtō branch temples in 1902, as an official missionary of the Sōtō sect to Korea in 1904, and his later promotion to the Sōtō sect council, indicate that the Sōtō organization approved of Hanshi’s activity.

The Life of Uchiyama Gudō and the Taigyaku Incident

Uchiyama Gudō, the second figure we will examine in this essay, was born on 17 May 1874 (Meiji 7) in the small town of Ojiya in Niigata Prefecture. His father’s name was Uchiyama Naokichi, his mother’s name was Kazu, and he was given the name Yoshikichi 慶吉. He was the eldest of four brothers. He entered elementary school on 1 July 1880 and studied there for five years, until 1885. He graduated at the top of his class, and it is said that he was such an exceptional student that he received a commendation from the governor, though no documented records remain of his graduation. Judging from his later intellectual activities, however, from his absorption of Western ideas after he became a socialist to his continuing academic work even while in jail, we can well imagine that he showed intellectual promise in his youth.

Gudō’s father, Naokichi, is said to have been a shrine carpenter, who later learned the techniques for large-scale production of cookies and cakes. Gudō was not allowed to advance in school beyond the elementary level, and instead helped his father and brothers in the family business, and stayed at home until he grew to be an adult. In his later years as a priest at Rinsen-ji he often carved Buddha images for the temple parishioners, and also made inkstones and vase stands by hand for socialist comrades such as Kōtoku Shūsui 幸徳秋水 and Morichika Unpei 森近運平. He seems to have been very skilled with his

hands, no doubt a result of helping with his father's work.

Naokichi passed away on 23 October of 1890 (Meiji 23), and Gudō took this occasion to act on his desire to pursue further studies. He left home and wandered from place to place around the country. He visited Tokyo when he was about twenty years old and it is said that he lived for a while in the home of Inoue Enryō 井上円了 (1858–1919), a distant relative of his mother, though once again we have no concrete evidence of this stay. Inoue Enryō was originally from a village near Uchiyama's home, and was a scholar and monk who contributed greatly to the modernization of Buddhism in Japan from Meiji to the Taishō eras. He was also the founder of the Tetsugakudō, the forerunner of Tōyō University. He was an innovative Buddhologist, and if in fact Uchiyama spent some time staying in Inoue's home, he would certainly have been greatly influenced by him. From the time Uchiyama became a monk, there is no trace of any easy escapism from current realities such as a fundamentalistic emphasis on "returning to the founder," but we can assume that his studies before he entered the priesthood had a great influence on his later development. Uchiyama's most representative work, *Ordinary Self-Awakening* (*Heibon no jikaku* 平凡の自覚), shows the germination of the idea of the "self" of "self-awakening," an idea that never really matured in modern Japan. This idea must have come from somewhere (perhaps from Inoue Enryō), and not just his fertile intellect.

Uchiyama took the tonsure as a Buddhist monk on 12 April 1897, at the temple Hōzō-ji in what is now Atsugi City in Kanagawa Prefecture, under the priest Sakatsume Kōdō 坂詰孝童. He took the Buddhist name Tenshitsu Gudō 天室愚童, and officially joined the ranks of the Sōtō sect. The course of events that led to Gudō becoming a Zen monk are completely unknown. Morinaga Eizaburō 森長英三郎 speculates that when Uchiyama left home he visited his uncle (on his mother's side) Aoyagi Kendō 青柳賢道, a priest of the nearby Seigen-in 清源院, who introduced him to Sakatsume Kōdō. In any case, from October of that year Uchiyama stayed in Kaizō-ji 海蔵寺 (in present-day Odawara City) and devoted himself to Zen Buddhist practice under the priest Satō Jitsuei 佐藤実英. It was not long before he entered the Sōtō sect Number 12 Middle School in September of 1898, and he graduated in February of 1899. From April 1899 until February 1902 he served as a priest of the Kaizō-ji. He passed the examination for certification as a preacher, and in the winter of 1900 was certified (*risshoku* 立職) under Wada Jusei 和田寿静 of Seigen-in. On 10 October of 1901 he became the follower and Dharma successor (嗣法) to Miyagi Jitsumyō 宮城実苗 of Jōsen-ji 常泉寺. On 7 July 1902 he received the robe of transmission at the Sōtō head temple of Eihei-ji.

In this way Uchiyama finished all the rituals that a Sōtō monk can fulfill in the short span of five years after his original taking of the tonsure, and completed the requirements for becoming a temple priest (*jūshoku* 住職). This is an unusually short time, and though I have yet to read anything that comments on this record, it may reflect Gudō's own ambitions. In fact, Uchiyama's curriculum vitae lists a reprimand from the Sōtō sect headquarters in January of 1904 as an "apology for breaking regulations; certified before completing sufficient Dharma seniority" (法臘未滿立身二付、違規懺謝).

In any case, Gudō had fulfilled all the requirements for a Sōtō priest, and when his teacher Jitsumyō passed away unexpectedly on 5 April 1903, he moved into the affiliated temple of Rinsen-ji 林泉寺 at Ōhira-dai in Hakone, officially becoming the chief priest there in February of 1904. The period during which Gudō was at Rinsen-ji coincides with the Russo-Japanese war, and was a time when the people in general suffered various hardships. There was no industry in Ōhira-dai, and the life of the villagers was one of extreme poverty. Gudō's experience with these conditions was undoubtedly a factor in his embrace of socialism. Gudō also visited and observed other villages in the surrounding area and prefecture. He witnessed firsthand the distressing plight of the tenant farmers, and these experiences were reflected in the contents of his secret publications that preached socialism and anarchism. There is some question as to when exactly Gudō began to advocate socialism, but in an article published in number 10 of the *Heimin shinbun*, Gudō wrote:

"How did I become a socialist?" by Uchiyama Gudō (Hakone).
I am a Buddhist preacher, and say "all sentient beings have Buddha-nature," "all dharmas are equal and none are higher or lower," and "all sentient beings are like my children." These are the golden rules that are the basis of our faith. I discovered that these ideals match exactly with the maxims of socialism, and so I became a believer in socialism.

It seems that Gudō was a conscious follower of socialism already from the time he became chief priest at Rinsen-ji. This statement by Gudō that the ideals of socialism and Buddhism are the same is reminiscent of the ideas of Ambedkar, who broke with Gandhi and converted to Buddhism in order to advocate the liberation of the untouchables in India. Ambedkar struggled to choose between Buddhism and Marxism as a theoretical basis for human liberation, and finally converted to Buddhism. It must be admitted that the Buddhism chosen by Ambedkar was that of "early" Buddhism 原始仏教, whose teachings are often not the same as the Mahāyāna Buddhism of Japan. However,

given that Buddhism often stops at an abstract idealism, we could say that Gudō was creative and original in embracing socialism, and then anarchism, as a means to actualize the ideals of Buddhism. There were a number of Buddhists among those who were involved in the Taigyaku Incident and were found guilty and sentenced to death: in addition to Uchiyama Gudō of the Sōtō sect, Takagi Kenmyō of the Jōdo Shin sect, Ōtani branch (first sentenced to death and later pardoned and given life imprisonment); Mineo Setsudō 峰尾節堂 of the Rinzaï sect, Myōshin-ji branch (also pardoned and given life imprisonment); and Sasaki Dōgen 佐々木道元 of the Jōdo Shin sect, Hongan-ji branch (also life imprisonment). Except for Takagi, the others (such as Mineo and Sasaki) did not make any theoretical identification between socialism and Buddhism.

In this way, through the *Heimin shinbun* and through the introductions of the doctor Katō Tokijirō 加藤時次郎, Gudō came to know and be in contact with fellow socialists such as Kōtoku Shūsui 幸徳秋水, Sakai Toshihiko 堺利彦, and Ishikawa Sanshirō 石川三四郎. His sympathies quickly shifted from socialism to anarchism. In June of 1908, on the occasion of the “Akahata [Red Flag] Incident” 赤旗事件, which involved government suppression of socialists and anarchists, Uchiyama decided to promote socialism through publications. He purchased equipment and secretly set up a printing press under the *shumidan* altar of Rinsen-ji. Here he also showed his skill in working with his hands as he published one secret document after another.

The first secret document that Uchiyama published was entitled *Nyūgoku kinen museifu kyōsan* 入獄記念無政府共產 (Anarchic communism in commemoration of imprisonment), a pamphlet of sixteen pages. He printed one thousand copies. The contents, as reflected in the subtitle *Kosakunin wa naze kurushiika* 小作人ハナゼ苦シイカ (Why do tenant farmers suffer?), argue for a way tenant farmers can be liberated from the suffering of their daily lives. He urged that “tenant farmers not deliver rice and not pay taxes.” His arguments became more and more radical, finally reaching the point where, in order to destroy the roots of the people’s suffering, he advocated the refusal of military conscription and the denial of the emperor system. The records of the preliminary hearings on the Taigyaku Incident call this publication “the most evil writing since the beginning of Japanese history.” In any case, Uchiyama sent a copy of this publication to sympathizers around the country. The acquisition of this pamphlet by Miyashita Takichi 宮下太吉, a worker in Aichi Prefecture, became the link for Uchiyama being implicated in the Taigyaku Incident.

There were three other publications printed secretly at Rinsen-ji: a Japanese translation by Ōsugi Sakae 大杉栄 of Hervé’s (1871–1944)

essays published in the French anarchist journal *L'Anarchie*; a reprint of an essay entitled "Advice to new soldiers" (*Shinpei shokun ni atau* 新兵諸君に与ふ), that had been published in the journal *Hikari* 光 (number 28), retitled "A motto for imperial soldiers to keep at their side" (*Teikoku gunjin zayū no mei* 帝国軍人座右之銘); and a Japanese translation (by Ōishi Seinosuke 大石誠之助, with an introduction) of a tract on Marxism and the denial of morality by a German anarchist.

The police began to follow Gudō from around the time he started these secret publications. He briefly visited Eihei-ji in April 1909, and also went to see friends in the Kansai area. He left to head home when he heard that Rinsen-ji had been searched, and was arrested when he got off the train at Kōzu 国府津 station. The criminal charges filed against him were for violation of the laws regulating explosives and of the law controlling publications. On 5 November of that year he was sentenced to seven years in prison by the Yokohama District court. It was on 21 June in this year that Gudō was expelled by the Sōtō sect.

This, however, was not the end of the case. On 25 May 1910, a conspiracy planned by Miyashita Takichi, Kanno Suga 菅野スガ, and others, to assassinate the emperor was discovered; this was the so-called Taigyaku Incident. Kōtoku Shūsui was arrested on 1 June. Since it was determined that Miyashita's decision to assassinate the emperor had been greatly influenced by the above-mentioned publication by Uchiyama, and that his other secret publications were replete with radical theories denying the legitimacy of the emperor system, Uchiyama was charged again. A total of eleven people, including Uchiyama and Kōtoku Shūsui, were given the death penalty. Gudō was executed at 11:23 on the morning of 24 January 1911. He was only thirty-six years and eight months old.

The trial on the Taigyaku Incident began on 1 December 1910, and reached its decision quickly on 18 January of the following year. The executions were carried out within a week. This "rush to judgement" was described by the lawyer Imamura Rikisaburō 今村力三郎 as "a trial like a runaway horse." Following the lead of the elder statesman Yamagata Aritomo 山県有朋 and others, the government and court acted as one in using this opportunity to eradicate the socialist movement, which indicates that this in turn was an unprecedented plot by the state. In addition, the fact that the trial ended in executions without hearing even one witness indicates that this was a frame-up of Kōtoku Shūsui as the main conspirator, because of his great social and intellectual influence. We can conclude that this was a national crime contrived by those in power to deal a single crushing blow to the socialist movement.

The response of the Sōtō sect headquarters to this incident was to

send a note to the Ministry of Internal Affairs and to the court stating that Uchiyama had already been removed from the rolls of the Sōtō sect, and apologizing for their negligence in controlling the situation. There was absolutely no attempt to question the authorities or see to the facts of the matter. On 30 March 1911, the Sōtō sect headquarters published “An Interpretation of a Blemish” (*Kunkai ippan* 訓誡一斑), a record of meetings sponsored by the sect concerning the Taigyaku Incident on 16 to 18 February, soon after Gudō’s execution. Over a hundred of the leaders and teachers of the Sōtō sect, including the presidents of the Sōtō schools, were gathered together at the sect headquarters for talks on the incident. Invited speakers included Shiba Junrokurō 斯波淳六郎, director of the Religions Department of the Ministry of Internal Affairs; Inoue Yūichi 井上友一, director of the Department of Shrines; Inoue Tetsujirō 井上哲次郎, professor of Tokyo Imperial University; and Koyama Atsushi 小山温, director of the Prisons Department of the Ministry of Justice. It records that the head priests of both Eihei-ji and Sōji-ji were reprimanded. It goes on to say that Japanese Buddhism is based on the idea of honoring the emperor and “protecting” the country 尊皇護国, that Buddhism is inseparable from the imperial family, and that this has not only been true historically but is also to be taken for granted as natural and right from the perspective of national polity. This offers a concise expression of the basic stance of Meiji-era Buddhists.

As for the Taigyaku Incident itself, the trial was carried out in a very calculated manner in which it was assumed that anyone claiming to be a socialist or anarchist was, ipso facto, guilty and thus subject to punishment for treason. The judgements were rendered as a form of punishment for a way of thinking. Most of the defendants were guilty of nothing more than lese majesty. Uchiyama Gudō himself was certainly falsely charged with treason. As for the other defendants, a claim for a retrial with regard to the Taigyaku Incident was filed in 1961, but this claim was rejected by the Supreme Court on 5 July 1967, thus closing forever the road for the defendants to legally recover their honor.

The Significance of Uchiyama Gudō

It is not my intention to reevaluate and idealize Uchiyama Gudō as an eminent and virtuous monk beyond his accomplishments. Rather, I wish to reexamine some important problems for modern Buddhism—such as the relationship between Buddhism and the emperor system—that cannot or should not be avoided. The thoughts and actions of Uchiyama Gudō, in many ways just an ordinary Sōtō Zen monk, serve as a good foil for such a reexamination.

The modernization of Buddhism in Japan started with a period of hardship, beginning with the movement to separate Buddhism and Shinto (*shinbutsu bunri*) and continuing with the establishment of the Daikyō-in to officially promote Shinto. There were those in leadership positions of the Buddhist sects or schools who made every effort to respond to this crisis, but for the most part there was almost no one in the official Buddhist organizations who raised questions about what would be appropriate Buddhist responses to war and politics in such a social situation, nor did they squarely face and debate the question of the social responsibility of Buddhism. The Taigyaku Incident contained in a condensed form the various problems faced by Buddhism in modern Japan. The figure of Uchiyama Gudō, in particular, plainly reflects the most important issues.

The claims made by Uchiyama are, from a theoretical perspective, still intellectually undeveloped. People often point out a certain immaturity in his thought. However, he revealed a sensitivity toward the weak members of society, and his direct way of expression has a moving appeal. Take, for example, the letter “to a soldier’s mother” that he sent to the journal *Muga no ai* (published on 21 February 1904):

On the train I seem to hear the voices of the soldiers’ mothers. “Yes, we are truly grateful. We are pleased to hear that we will be of service, and that it is an honor, but this is surely a mixed blessing. With my son gone, my daughter-in-law and grandchildren and I are helpless. If we are lucky and my son returns, by that time we will have all starved to death. I don’t understand the logic that dying is a sign of loyalty. Why is it that people with strong children are the ones who must die?” When I heard this I could not stop the tears from flowing down my cheeks, and realized that all soldiers’ mothers must feel the same.

(KASHIWAGI 1986, p. 49)

Uchiyama’s pamphlet *Nyūgoku kinen* can be summarized in three points: denying the emperor (or admitting that the emperor is not divine), the liberation of tenant farmers, and rejection of military conscription. These points are developed in a clear and rational form that was almost unique for his time. While admitting the practical difficulty of actualizing these abstract ideals, I feel we have no grounds to dismiss these points as “immature.” When we consider that this was written in the midst of an era when fascism was already raising its head, and when even the idea of the emperor as merely an organ of government was denounced as unacceptable, the liberating ideas of Uchiyama present many suggestions that provide a connection between modern and contemporary Buddhism.

Conclusion

On 20 November 1992 the Sōtō sect published an official apology for the organization's ingratiation with the political powers before and during the war, for "taking actions that harmed the pride and dignity of people" in Asian countries, and for evading until this time any recognition of responsibility for these events (*Sōtōshūhō* no. 688 [Jan. 1992]). Soon thereafter, in February of 1993, the Sōtō Sect Assembly (*Sōtōshū shūgikai*) passed a resolution for restoring the honor of Uchiyama Gudō, who had been expelled from the sect. The executive committee acted on this resolution and, on 13 April, resolved that the expulsion of Uchiyama Gudō, former head priest of Rinsen-ji, be revoked. A letter to this effect was sent out on 6 May to the head of the Kanagawa Prefecture Sōtō sect headquarters, all the temples in the district, and to Gudō's former temple Rinsen-ji (*Sōtōshūhō* no. 694 [July 1993]). This resolution and letter was in response to a request for the restoration of Gudō's honor (restoration of his status as a monk) submitted by the current head priest of Rinsen-ji. Through this action the Sōtō sect gave recognition that their reprimand of Uchiyama at the time of the Taigyaku Incident was a mistake and that they had swallowed whole the oppressive policies of the government. This action was reported extensively in the nationwide news in Japan, with headlines such as "Honor Restored to Monk Executed for Taigyaku Incident Eighty-three Years Ago" and "Sōtō Sect Reexamines Reprimand" (*Mainichi shinbun*, 12 August 1993). The Kansai edition of the same paper included a huge headline in its "society" section reading "Honor Restored after Eighty-three Years."

More than eighty years have passed since these events occurred, and none of the people involved in this incident are still alive. The legal appeal for a retrial to restore their honor has been rejected, and there are no options left to legally remove the stain of being found guilty of "treason." However, in this day when Buddhists are faced with how to deal with issues of "human rights" and "peace," and when religionists are questioning their social responsibilities and what it means to have a modern sensibility, it is important to look back and see that there were Buddhists and other religionists who, in the midst of a whirlwind of oppression, came forward as Buddhists [or religionists] and desperately tried to change society. At the same time, the fact that each and every one of the Buddhist organizations responded to the religious policies of the government by completely surrendering their own autonomy and judgement, allowing themselves to be completely manipulated, is a source of great regret that calls for deep reflection and repentance.

How are we to understand and interpret today the ideas and actions of Takeda Hanshi who, although his specific plans failed, sympathized with the government policy of annexing Korea and attempted to swallow up Korean Buddhism within the Sôtō sect, thus promoting, even leading, this religious policy?

The horizons reached by Takeda and Uchiyama were so different as to defy rationale. What were the causes for them to arrive at such opposite positions? To discuss this in terms of the categories of inherent good or evil is too easy and simplistic, and to fall back on talk of “orthodox” or right Buddhism is merely to avoid responsibility. We cannot rely just on the teachings of the Buddhist sutras or sayings from the Zen tradition to provide an opening to solutions to contemporary problems such as human rights and discrimination, since, as Demiéville pointed out in his article and as the real-life examples of Takeda and Uchiyama reveal, the same doctrinal and historical basis can lead to diametrically opposed conclusions.

Uchiyama Gudō’s actions led to arrest, imprisonment, and finally to execution by hanging. In the meantime he suffered expulsion by his chosen religious sect. Thus, in his time he suffered criticism, blame, and censure from all sectors of society, including his own religious order. Nevertheless, reflecting the wider reevaluation of Uchiyama in recent years, the Sôtō sect has revoked Gudō’s expulsion. What should be heeded here is that, rather than making easy judgments concerning individuals in terms of inherent goodness or evil, we should look at the situation in which an individual finds himself or herself. The environment and conditions that one meets throughout one’s life are certainly different for each person, but I would like to emphasize here the different conclusions reached through the subjective choices of these two figures who shared the common foundational experience of the modern period and who reacted, each in his own way, to the new winds of rationalism. We are also in a situation where we are personally faced with choices with regard to current problems, from welfare policies that abandon the weakest members of society, to the corruption of the political world, to problems of our environment. In a sense we are in a similar situation to that of Uchiyama and Takeda, and are reproducing their choices.

REFERENCES

AKAMATSU Tesshin 赤松徹真

- 1975 Kindai tennōsei kokka to Bukkyō: “Taigyaku jiken” ni renza shita sōryo o megutte 近代天皇制国家と仏教—「大逆事件」に連座した僧侶をめぐる。 *Bukkyō-shi kenkyū* 8.

AKIYAMA Goan 秋山悟庵, ed.

1952 *Honei-san Kenshō-ji shi* 保寧山顯聖寺史. Niigata: Kenshō-ji.

DEMIÉVILLE, Paul

1957 Le bouddhisme et la guerre. Post-scriptum à l'*Histoire des moines guerriers du Japon*, In RENONDEAU 1957, pp. 347–85.

FUKUSHIMA Kanryū 福嶋寛隆, ed.

1988 *Senji kyōiku to Shinshū* 戦時教育と真宗. 3 volumes. Kyoto: Nagata Bunshōdō.

HAN Chul-hi 韓 哲曦

1988 *Nihon no Chōsen shihai to shūkyō seisaku* 日本の朝鮮支配と宗教政策. Tokyo: Miraisha.

Han Kyo-ok 韓 桂王

1996 “*Seikanron*” no keifu 「征韓論」の系譜. Tokyo: San'ichi Shobō.

INAGAKI Masami 稲垣真美

1975 *Kindai Bukkyō no henkakusha* 近代仏教の変革者. Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan.

INOUE Tasuku 井上 右

1942 *Kōa fūun dan* 興亜風雲譚. Tokyo: Heibonsha.

ISHIKAWA Rikizan 石川力山

1985 Uchiyama Gudō 内山愚童. *Nihon Bukkyō shigaku* 20.

1992 Uchiyama Gudō to kindai Zen shisō: Sensō, sabetsu, jinken ni taisuru Bukkyōsha no shiza o megutte 内山愚童と近代禅思想—戦争・差別・人権に対する仏教者の視座をめぐって. *Shūgaku kenkyū* 34.

1993 Kindai Bukkyōshi ni okeru Uchiyama Gudō no ichi 近代仏教史における内山愚童の位置. *Shūgaku kenkyū* 35.

1994 *Uchiyama Gudō to Takeda Hanshi: Kindai Bukkyōsha no shisō to kōdō; tai-sensōkan; Chōsen kaikyō mondai tō o megutte* 内山愚童と武田範之—近代仏教者の思想と行動・対戦争観・朝鮮開教問題等をめぐって. *Shūgaku kenkyū* 36.

1995 “*Taigyaku jiken*” to Bukkyō: Uchiyama Gudō no jiken renza to Sōtōshū no taiō 「大逆事件」と仏教—内山愚童の事件連座と曹洞宗の対応. *Shindō: Dōwa suishin honbu kiyō* 14.

1996 Zensō no shakai ishiki ni tsuite: Kindai Bukkyōshi ni okeru Takeda Hanshi, Uchiyama Gudō no ichizuke o megutte 禅僧の社会意識について—近代仏教史における武田範之・内山愚童の位置づけをめぐって. *Nihon bukkuyōgakkai nenpō* 61.

ISHIKAWA Rikizan, ed.

1982 *Uchiyama Gudō shū* 内山愚童集. Sōtōshū Sensho 6. Kyoto: Dōhōsha Shuppan.

IWASAKI Shōjun 岩崎正純

1973a *Uchiyama Gudō oboegaki* 内山愚童覚書. In *Kanagawa ken-shi kenkyū* 神奈川県史研究 20.

- 1973b Meiji makki no shakaishugi undō 明治末期の社会主義運動. In *Kanagawa ken-shi, Kakuronhen 1, Seiji-gyōsei* 神奈川県史, 各論編一, 政治・行政, Kanagawa: Kanagawa Prefectural Government.
- KANG Bōm-yang 姜範錫
1990 *Seikanron seihen* 征韓論政変. Tokyo: Saimaru Shuppankai.
- KASHIWAGI Ryūhō 柏木隆法
1979 *Taigyaku jiken to Uchiyama Gudō* 大逆事件と内山愚童. Tokyo: JCA Shuppan.
1986 *Itō Shōshin to sono shūhen* 伊藤証信とその周辺. Tokyo: Fuji Shuppan.
- KINEFUCHI Nobuo 杵淵信雄
1992 *Nichikan kōshōshi* 日韓交渉史. Tokyo: Sairyūsha.
- KOJIMA Masaru 小島勝 and Kiba Akeshi 木場明志, ed.
1992 *Ajia no kaikyō to kyōiku* アジアの開教と教育. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.
- LAMOTTE, Étienne, trans.
1949 *Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse*. Tome II. Leuven: Bibliothèque du Muséon.
- MORINAGA Eizaburō 森長英三郎
1984 *Uchiyama Gudō* 内山愚童. Tokyo: Ronsōsha.
- MORIYAMA Shigenori 森山茂徳
1992 *Nikkan heigō* 日韓併合. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.
- NAKATSUKA Akira 中塚明
1993 *Kindai Nihon no Chōsen ninshiki* 近代日本の朝鮮認識. Tokyo: Kenbun Shuppan.
- RENONDEAU, G.
1957 Histoire des moines guerriers du Japon. *Bibliothèque de l'Institut des Hautes études chinoises* XI: 159-346.
- SAWAKI Kōdō 澤木興道
1984 *Sawaki Kōdō kikigaki* 澤木興道聞き書き. Tokyo: Kōdansha (Gakujutsu Bunko).
- SERIKAWA Hiromichi 芹川博道
1982 Uchiyama Gudō: Sono museifushugi no shisō 内山愚童—その無政府主義の思想. In *Kindai Nihon no shisō to Bukkyō* 近代日本の思想と仏教, Mineshima Hideo 峰島旭雄, ed., Tokyo: Tōkyō Shokan.
- TAKEDA Hanshi 武田範之
1901 *Gōkai kōgen* 鰲海鉤玄. Niigata: Kenshō-ji.
- TAKIZAWA Makoto 滝沢誠
1986 *Takeda Hanshi to sono jidai* 武田範之とその時代. Tokyo: Sanrei Shobō.

TSUNODA Fusako 角田房子

1988 *Binhī ansatsu* 閔妃暗殺. Tokyo: Shinchōsha.

UCHIDA Ryōhei

n.d. *Nikkan gōhō hiji* 日韓合邦秘事. Keshō-ji temple records.

1908 *Ryūki kaigen hiji* 隆熙改元秘事. Keshō-ji temple records.

YAMABE Kentarō 山部健太郎

1966 *Nikkan heigō shōshi* 日韓併合小史. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

YAMAGISHI Takemi 山岸健巳

1990 *Senzen no Nikkan Bukkyō teikei undō ni tsuite* 戦前の日韓
仏教提携運動について. *Komazawa Daigaku Daigakuin Bukkyōgaku
kenkyūkai nenpō* 23.

YOSHIDA Kyūichi 吉田久一

1959a *Nihon kindai Bukkyō-shi kenkyū* 日本近代仏教史研究. Tokyo:
Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

1959b Uchiyama Gudō to Takagi Kenmyō no chosaku 内山愚童と
高木賢明の著作. *Nihon rekishi* 131 (May).

Appendix: Chronology of the Lives of Takeda Hanshi and Uchiyama Gudō, with Major Historical Events

	Takeda Hanshi (1864–1911)	Uchiyama Gudō (1874–1911)	Major Historical Events; Sōtō Sect and Other Buddhist Events
1864	Born on 2 January as the third son of Sawa Yukitaka 沢之高, a retainer of the Kurume domain		Third month. Government promulgates the Edict for Distinguishing between Kami and Buddhas; movements to destroy the influence and images of Buddhism spring up in various locales
1868			
1869			Sixth month. Founding of the Tokyo Shōkon-sha 招魂社 (shrine to the war dead; later Yasukuni Jinja)
1870			First month. Imperial proclamation to “Promulgate the Great Teaching” (<i>Daikyō senpu</i> 大教宣布)
1871	(9) Father arrested for involvement in plan to overthrow Meiji gov’t		Fourth month. Promulgation of the “Three Standards of Instruction” (<i>Sanjō no kyōsoku</i> 三条ノ教則)
1872			
1873	(11) Adopted into the family of Takeda Sadasuke 武田貞祐, a medical doctor		February. Founding of the Daikyō-in 大教院; Eihei-ji publishes “Defense of the Three Standards” (<i>Sanjō benge</i> 三条弁解); October, resignation of the “invade Korea” faction
1874		Born on 17 May as the eldest son of Uchiyama Naokichi 内山直吉 in Ojiya in Niigata Prefecture	January. Itagaki Taisuke 板垣退助 organizes the Patriotic Party 愛国党

- 1875
1879 (17) Enters the school (*juku* 塾) of
1880s Ezaki Son'an 江崎巽庵
1881 (19) Rebellious against the plans of
his foster father, he abandons home
and wanders from Kumamoto to
Osaka and Kōriyama, finally stopping
to study at the *juku* of Kanbara Seiji
神原精二 at Zōjō-ji 増上寺 in Tokyo
- 1882 (20) Meets Yamaoka Tesshū
山岡鉄舟 at the *juku*, quits the *juku* to
travel to Mt. Hida and Mt. Akagi, reads
Buddhist texts at Hōkai-ji 宝海寺 in
Niigata
- 1883 (21) Enters the Buddhist priest-
1884 hood (出家) under Nematsu Gendō
根松玄道 of Kenshō-ji 顯聖寺 in Niigata;
everyone is surprised by his diligence
in reading Buddhist texts
- 1885 (23) Hearing of the situation in
Korea, he visits Tokyo. He learns of
the Tenshin Treaty 天津条約, returns to
his temple, and then becomes a police
officer in Fukushima Prefecture
- 1886
- 1888 (26) Enters the Kashiwazaki Sōtō
sect branch school, joins the other
- After graduating from elementary
school, helps in the family business of
manufacturing cookie molds
- May. Disbanding of the Daikyō-in
November. Dōgen given the post-
humous title Jōyō Daishi 承陽大師
- October. Itagaki founds Freedom
Party (Jiyū-tō 自由党), becomes Prime
Minister
- Change of government in Korea;
Japan tries to remove Chinese influ-
ence from Korea but fails
- The Sōtō sect determines its “sectar-
ian rules” 宗制
- April. Signing of the Tenshin Treaty
天津条約 by China and Japan calling for
the withdrawal of both Chinese and
Japanese troops from Korea
- Daidō Chōan 大道長安 founds the
Kannon Guzekyō 観音救世教
- Ōuchi Seiran 大内青巒 founds the
Sonnō Hōbutsu Daidōdan 尊皇奉仏大同団

- students in forming an association of “those who skip lectures” (Fujukō Dōmei 不受講同盟); becomes an elder (*chōrō* 長老)
- 1889 (27) Leaves Kenshō-ji; wanders from place to place
- 1890 (30) Attempts a fishing business in Pusan but fails; begins relationship with the Japanese political association Gen'yōsha 玄洋社 (Black Ocean Society); involved in obscure activities related to the start of the war with Manchuria
- 1892 (32) Joins the military for the war with Manchuria; becomes ill; remains at Pusan and later returns to Japan and his home temple
- 1894 (33) October. Goes to Korea again; is arrested for his involvement in the assassination of the Korean queen Min-bi 閔妃暗殺事件; imprisoned in Hiroshima but later released
- 1895 (34) January. Acquitted in a preliminary hearing
- 1896 (35) Gains the status of abbot (*jūshoku* 住職) (*ten'e* 転衣) from Sōji-ji; joins the staff of Tōrin-ji 東林寺; offers help to Japanese workers in Korea; commemorates the third anniversary of Min-bi's (閔妃) death
- 1897 (24) April. Takes the tonsure at Hōzō-ji 宝増寺 in Kanagawa, receiving the name Tenshitsu Gudō 天室愚童. Begins practice at Kaizō-ji 海蔵寺 in Odawara.
- 1898 (25) September. Enters the Sōtō
- December. The *Shushōgi* 修証義 proclaimed as the standard teachings for Sōtō sect propagation
- August. Outbreak of war between Japan and China
- April. Japan and China sign peace treaty

- 1900 (38) May. Head of Kenshō-ji passes away, and appoints Takeda as his successor on his death bed; Takeda composes a revolutionary manifesto for Sun Wen 孫文
- 1901 (39) August. Begins official tenure (晋山) at Kenshō-ji; joins Uchida Ryōhei's 内田良平 Kokuryūkai 黒竜会 (Amur River Society)
- 1902 (40) Becomes a representative of the branch groups for the Sōtō sect
- 1904 (42) Appointed missionary/teacher to Korea by the Sōtō sect; becomes member of the Sōtō sect council (宗會議員)
- 1905 (43) Writes the poem *Ryojun kan-raku shi* 旅順陥落詩
- 1906 (44) Goes to Korea at the invitation of Uchida Ryōhei
- sect Number 12 middle school (第十二中学)
- (27) October. Nominated abbot 立職 at Seigen-in 清源院 in Aikō, Kanagawa Prefecture
- (28) October. Becomes follower and Dharma successor 嗣法 to Miyagi Jitsumyō 宮城実苗 at Hōju-in 宝珠院
- (29) July. Receives the robe of transmission at Eihei-ji 永平寺
- (31) January. Writes article on “How I Became a Socialist” for *Heimin shinbun* 平民新聞; begins to attend meetings at Itō Shōshin's 伊藤証信 Muga-en 無我苑; February, submits essay on “The Soldier's Mother” to the bulletin *Muga no ai* 無我の愛; becomes abbot (*jūshoku* 住職) of Rinsen-ji 林泉寺
- Muramatsu Ryōkan 村松良寛 plans to establish missionary center in Pusan
- Six hundredth anniversary of Dōgen's death; Dōgen receives honorary title Jōyō 承陽 by imperial proclamation
- January. The Sōtō sect provides grants for overseas missionaries; Matsumoto is officially appointed missionary to Korea; February, outbreak of Russo-Japanese war
- Yabe Kiyoshi 矢部喜好, member of the Japanese Seventh-day Adventists 末世福音教会, pleads conscientious objection to military service, is sentenced to two months in prison, after discharge from prison serves in the medical corps; February, Itō Hirobumi 伊藤博文 assumes office of commander in Korea; September, end of Russo-Japanese war

1907 January. Meets with Li Yong-ku 李容九, chairman of the Isshin-kai 一進会; becomes an advisor for this group, and later an official consultant to the headquarters of the Wōn sect 円宗

1908 (46) Goes to Korea. Appointed supervisor of the Sōtō sect missionary activity in Korea

1909

1910 (48) Hanshi schemes with Li Hoi-gang 李晦光, chairman of the Korean Buddhist Research Association 朝鮮仏教研究会, to negotiate with Ishikawa Sodō 石川素童, chief abbot of the Sōtō sect, to merge the Korean

(35) begins to have inclinations toward anarchism; Kōtoku Shūsui 幸徳秋水 visits Rinsen-ji; August, purchases printing press; October, secretly publishes “Anarchic communism in commemoration of imprisonment: Why tenant farmers suffer”; December, secretly publishes a Japanese translation of a tract by a German anarchist

(36) Begins to be followed by the authorities; arrested while returning to Rinsen-ji from Eihei-ji; sentenced to twelve years imprisonment for violating the law against unauthorized publications and explosives; sentence reduced to seven years after appeal; October, rearrested for involvement in the Taigyaku Incident

(37) June. Expelled from the Sōtō sect on the basis of the Sōtō Sect Disciplinary Rules *Sōtōshū chōkai hō* 曹洞宗懲戒法

December. Distribution of Sōtō Sect Regulations for Missionary Activity in Korea (*Sōtoshu Kankoku kaikyō kitei* 曹洞宗韓国開教規程)

Establishment of the Wōn Sect Headquarters (円宗宗務院) as the organ for unifying Korean Buddhism

September. Keizan Jōkin 瑩山紹瑾 given the posthumous title Jōsai Daishi 常濟大師; October, Itō Hirobumi assassinated; Korea forced to sign treaty calling for “merger” of Japan and Korea

August. Japan annexes Korea, begins colonial rule

Wōn sect with the Japanese Sōtō sect. Word of this plan leaks out and incites opposition. Hanshi returns to Japan, rests with his sister at a hot springs resort in Andai, Nagano Prefecture.

1911

(49) Travels to Tokyo to receive medical treatment, but passes away on 23 June

January 18. Death penalty handed down to Kōtoku Shūsui and twenty-four co-conspirators; twelve of these members pardoned with reduced sentence on 19 January; Kōtoku, Uchiyama, and others executed on 24 January; Kanno 菅野 executed on 25 January

January. Morita Goyū 森田悟由, chief abbot of the Sōtō sect, and Ishikawa Sodō 石川素童, head priest of Sōji-ji, send letter of apology to Minister of the Imperial Household; Sōtō teachers and the president of the Sōtō sect schools are gathered together to meet from 16 to 18 February to discuss the Uchiyama incident; the head priests of Eihei-ji and Sōji-ji are admonished and reprimanded, and it is emphasized that all members are to respect the emperor and honor the country, and that the sect is inseparable and one body with the emperor; Tanaka Chigaku 田中智学, a Nichiren-school activist, advocates the study of the “Japanese national polity.”