Although the term "internationalism" appears almost constantly in late twentieth-century Japan, it is not at all a new concept. By the beginning of World War II, Japan had established itself as a respected member of the international community. Within Japanese society of the time, Christians played a much more important role in the country's international contacts with other nations than they do at present. These contacts set them more apart from their parochial compatriots than is the case with Christians in the late twentieth century. For the most part, this is because all Japanese have now become so international. As Japanese Christians consider internationalism in the late twentieth century, it is thus well to keep in mind the works of pioneer Christians who contributed significantly to Japanese understanding of the phenomenon.

Historians recognize the tremendous expansion of European power and influence during the second half of the nineteenth century as extremely important. This expansion rested on new means of transportation and communication which eased contact between countries. The expansion of Christianity, particularly Protestantism, accompanied the invention of steam locomotion and the telegraph. The history of this expansion is usually told from the point of view of Western Christians who sent missionaries as part of the general Western expansion.

This emphasis on Western expansion ignores the web of relations between societies which had existed before the Europeans and Americans roamed about so easily. What differentiated the late nineteenth century from earlier eras was the weakening of the traditional web of relations in Asia. As a result, Europeans discovered that they could not trade without taking increasing responsibility for domestic politics in the lands to which they went.

The two most outstanding examples of this European intervention boded ill for Japan. India slowly lost its independence between the mid-eighteenth and mid-nineteenth centuries. Western powers increasingly subjugated China as the nineteenth century went on. China's inability to govern its own affairs seemed to rest on a moral torpor growing out of its traditions, which Western critics lumped together as ''Confucianism.''' The Japanese, heirs to the same traditions, felt it necessary to distance themselves from what seemed an infectious disease.

The fearsome prospect facing Japan of losing its independence was balanced by the internationalism of the Christian message the missionaries brought. The Christian concept of the kinship of all believers promised a moral basis for independence since Japanese could become spiritual kin of Westerners and as such would enjoy the benefits of this kinship.
There were two major reactions to the invasive internationalism of Western gunboats throughout the world. One way was to accommodate it by developing strength to maneuver within it. The other was to join the white man's club by taking on the white man's ways. Of course, individuals everywhere who became Christians each brought with them the particularities of their personal search for faith. In addition, individuals in Japan who became Christian had their own concern for national independence to an extent that had few if any parallels.

TWO WAYS OF COPING

The lives of two Japanese Christians who died as the Pacific War was starting seem to personify two ways of coping with international relations within their faith. An introduction of the similarities in the careers of the two precedes a description of the differences which developed between them.

Uchimura Kanzō (1861-1930)1 and Nitobe Inazō (1862-1933)2 both came from provincial samurai families which held high positions in local government. The parents of both encouraged the boys to develop their linguistic talents through the study of English, which seemed to them the language of the future. Their mutual interest brought the boys together in Tokyo. There they both sought contacts with English-speaking foreigners to develop their own ability.

Largely because of this language skill, both were selected to attend a school in Sapporo to train young men to develop Hokkaido. The Japanese considered the conditions of Hokkaido similar to frontier conditions in the United States and looked to an American model for training. The American instructors evangelized their young charges so that all the leaders of the first classes, including Nitobe and Uchimura, became Christian. Within a short time after the college had graduated them in 1881, they moved from Hokkaido to the United States for further education. Here their paths diverged as Nitobe chose further training in agricultural economics and Uchimura decided to evangelize his fellow Japanese. Though they continued as close friends, their subsequent careers varied greatly.

Before we take up these two examples in detail, it would be well to generalize about the differing attitudes toward internationalism which characterized the mature Nitobe and Uchimura. Nitobe went on to encourage accommodation to the culture of Western nations. Western culture, including its Christianity, seemed a package. Its concept of international relations, its foods, clothing, etiquette and underlying concepts about individuals, their relations to the past and future, and Christianity seemed to form a unit. To adopt one part of the unit, the individual must take on the other interlinked elements. Objective indications led to the conclusion that the various elements of Western civilization, including its religion, would become the norm for the world of the future. An individual or nation wishing to join this developing world should move quickly to prepare for it. Only with these changes could individuals or their societies make their way in the developing world civilization. The Japanese who felt this way were seen as Westernizers; they included Nitobe.

Only since the changes brought about by World War II, have leaders in various young Christian communities throughout the world turned to examine how the Gospel brought by the West fits into the realities of their own culture before its contact with the West. This concern, known in Japanese as dochakka or inculturation, usually arises from a conviction that the Gospel cannot spread widely in what have been non-Christian societies until the universal message of Christianity can be presented in
terms consonant with those of individuals in the various cultures to which Christianity has recently gone. Uchimura provided the best example of concern for how Christianity ought to fit within Japanese tradition. His concern manifested itself in a stubborn demand for respect for himself and his compatriots. He did not urge accommodation of his own people to the ways of others as much as he demanded respect for Japanese traditions from the people of the world’s leading nations.

Uchimura’s demand for respect rested on his understanding of the universality of the Christian message. A photograph taken after a large meeting of young Christians in 1883 typifies Christian internationalism as the young converts saw it. While the Japanese and missionaries all wear Western suits, a Korean, in the garments of a Korean official, stands in the center of the front row. A recent convert, he demonstrates the kinship of believers which crosses national boundaries. As Uchimura developed, he took the ideal of Christian kinship symbolized by this photograph as his model. First, he told Christians how it hurt to shift one’s loyalty away from Japanese tradition to Christianity and then he went on to demand that those in Christian lands respect him and his people as brothers and sisters in the faith.

NITobe inazō and accommodation
In October 1884, Nitobe went to study at the new Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore. There he gained admittance to what was probably the most innovative American training in what would later become the social sciences. Nitobe’s slow progress in the highest reaches of Western education began with that training.

It was partly to find relief from his demanding studies that Nitobe began his spiritual search. He was attracted to the Quakers, perhaps because of their emphasis on plain dress and speech, and joined their Baltimore meeting. In Philadelphia, he met a leading Quaker woman, Mary Elkinton, whom he later married.

After three years in Baltimore, Nitobe was appointed assistant professor at Sapporo Agricultural College, his alma mater, on the condition that he study further in Germany, where he went in 1887. After study at a number of institutions there, he published a doctoral dissertation in German.

Returning to the United States, he prepared his Johns Hopkins graduation thesis for publication and married Mary Elkinton. When he returned to Sapporo with his bride, he was not yet thirty but had published a book in German and another in English. These seven years in the West provided the basic assumptions which would govern the remainder of his life.

Nitobe’s career as a teacher in Sapporo was characterized by three elements. The first was specialized training in what would now be called “developmental economics.” This focused on how to get the most out of new lands brought under cultivation and, along with the more narrowly specialized curricula of increasing crop yield, emphasized the social and political matrix within which such change occurs. This field developed into “colonial policy,” a specialty in which Nitobe held a chair at Tokyo University at the peak of his academic career. In addition to training students in his own specialty, Nitobe also held classes at home for those interested in the great authors of English nineteenth-century literature in which he became a proficient amateur. Finally, his concern for his students included care for their inner personal development. He started by managing the dormitories at Sapporo and then moved on to write regularly in magazines for young men and women seeking advice for their own futures. By the end of his teaching career Nitobe was regularly counseling.
many individuals who hoped, like him, to become international people.

His frenetic activities cost him his health, and Nitobe resigned from the Agricultural College in 1897 to recuperate in Monterey, California. Here he wrote a book which made him one of the foremost interpreters of Japanese culture. His *Bushido, the Soul of Japan: An Exposition of Japanese Thought*, was first published at the turn of the century. It became a best-seller after Japan's victory in the Russo-Japanese War. Even now, almost one hundred years later, frequent republication and translation continue to make it the first book read by many who want to learn about Japan.

In 1901 Nitobe took responsibility for the economic development of Japan's newly acquired colony, Taiwan. Two years later he became a professor at Kyoto University. Subsequently, he accepted the headship of Number One High School (Dai Ichii Kōtō Gakkō), the preparatory school for Tokyo University, and a professorship at Tokyo University. In his final years at Tokyo University he also acted as the first president of Tokyo Women's Christian College (Tokyo Joshi Daigaku). During these numerous changes he continued to teach and counsel young people to become international Japanese.

His career as a university professor ended in 1919 when Nitobe became an undersecretary of the new League of Nations. Here, as the lone non-European among the leaders of the League, he represented the rest of the world's peoples. He served the League well, earning the respect of other members of the Secretariat and starting what would later become the United Nations Economic and Scientific Organization (UNESCO). He resigned this position at the end of 1926 to return to Japan. Among a welter of other assignments, Nitobe then accepted a position as a columnist for an English-language paper in the Kansai area and the chairmanship of the Japanese branch of the Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR). This non-governmental organization had been formed in 1925 by businessmen, scholars and missionary leaders concerned for peace in the Pacific. A central administration in New York coordinated the activities of national branches in the countries of North America and Asia. Though none of their publications said so, the organization existed because of the increasing threat posed by Japanese military strength in the Pacific. The IPR became the most important scholarly organization dealing with the Pacific area before World War II, and its international conferences, held in 1927, 1929, 1931, and 1933, were important milestones in attempts to prevent World War II in the Pacific through rational discussion of differences. As chairman of the Japan branch of the Institute, Nitobe organized the immensely successful 1929 conference in Kyoto. He also led the Japanese delegates to the 1931 Shanghai Conference and the 1933 conference in Banff, Canada.

Developments in connection with these last two conferences cost Nitobe his health and cast aspersions on whether he was in fact an internationalist. The Japanese army seized most of what was then known as Manchuria a few weeks before the Shanghai Conference of the IPR. The facts which demonstrated that the Japanese army had plotted and executed the whole affair did not come to light until after World War II. At the time, Nitobe could only accept his nation's official evaluation of the situation and try to demonstrate how Japanese control of Manchuria's great resources would benefit both the Chinese and the Japanese because Japan would administer them much more efficiently than China. Between the Shanghai and Banff Conferences, the Japanese conducted research which supported their position, but continuing moves by the Japanese army into adjacent parts of China.
made clear that Japan wanted all of China. At the Banff Conference, Nitobe failed to persuade the delegates to accept the Japanese position. Tired and dejected, he collapsed and died less than two months after the Conference. Newspapers throughout the world headlined his death, and over three thousand people attended his funeral in Tokyo.

Throughout his career, Nitobe attempted to use his superior command of English and his specialized training to make Japan a respected member of the international community. Though he considered himself as embodying Japan's interests and was seen as doing so by people of other nations, Nitobe never had any direct influence over Japan's foreign policy. The one peripheral influence he had must have affected his actions in his final years. Because of his career in the League of Nations, he had the opportunity to lecture the young Showa Emperor on several occasions. He would have realized that to oppose openly the Imperial Army's actions in Asia would have caused them to pressure the Imperial Household Agency to cut off further contact between the Emperor and himself. In any case, Nitobe did not openly and clearly oppose army policy in Asia. The only materials from which to determine more precisely his own attitudes toward peace are his meticulous English-language diaries. His family members have so far refused to open them to researchers.

The events of Nitobe's childhood, as he recalls them, incline the researcher to conclude that his family position determined Inazo's ambition to seek a career through established authority. His grandfather and father had both served their local daimyo with distinction, a fact which became very clear at the time of the Meiji Restoration in 1868 when Inazo was five. His father had by that time already died, leaving his mother to bring up seven children with the help of her husband's father. The grandfather died when Inazo was nine. He was the youngest of his mother's brood, and she died while he was studying in Sapporo. He later had the thirteen letters which were all that remained of her legacy mounted into a scroll. Each year, on the anniversary of her death, he spent the day with the letters in contemplation of her life and contribution to him. The letters urged him to greater study and fame in place of her, "a feeble old woman," who could not aspire to such accomplishments (Howes 1995, 34). It was a heavy load to place on a teenager, but her meaning was clear: make an important career for yourself as your forebears did, through the machinery of government. Nitobe's own memoirs of youthful ambition indicate how well he had internalized these hopes.

This upbringing inclined Nitobe toward an adulthood in which he would see his own success in terms of the attitudes of others. His one great aberration from this path was his marriage to Mary which was hotly opposed by members of both families. Yet once accomplished, his otherwise innate conservatism inclined him to assure, for her safety, that he did not invite the wrath of those in power. As a result, he was predisposed to accommodation.

This innate sense in addition to his linguistic and comparative cultural abilities, in which Mary was a decided asset, meant that he always tried to do what appeared possible given the objective facts around him. The one recorded instance when he stated reservations about army policy in China in 1932 led to immediate problems which can only have confirmed his misapprehensions. Thus, he only worked within the limits of what at any given moment seemed possible.

UCHIMURA KANZO AND THE DEMAND FOR FRATERNAL RESPECT

Though for Nitobe faith was a very important part of his private life, Uchimura's faith was
the core of his being. He took his Christianity seriously, and his attempt to lead the Christian life cost him two promising careers in modern secular Japan before he turned to professional evangelism. The activities which would lead to this career path date from shortly after both he and Nitobe moved to the United States in 1884. The story of his internationalism, what one might term “Christian internationalism,” starts with his experience in the United States. 

Uchimura went to the United States in a deeply depressed state and was immediately introduced to a Quaker physician who ran a school for mentally retarded children. Here Uchimura could ponder his own future while looking after a number of individuals in far worse condition than himself. A precipitous marriage in which he had become convinced of the infidelity of his wife and sent her back to her family had cost him the respect of his Christian friends and his own self-confidence. In 1886 he left the school for children and spent two weeks on Cape Cod in Massachusetts. There he wrote an article in English which dealt with the terrible effects of conversion on the converted, and alludes specifically to the marriage ceremony of the Japanese Christian Church. Writing the article appears to have provided final release from Uchimura’s terrible sense of guilt. He went on to Amherst College where he met teachers who remained in his memory as the best in American culture. He then returned home after a short period at Andover Theological Seminary.

Back in Japan in May 1888, he took a job as headmaster in a provincial higher school. His decision to invite a Nichiren priest to talk to the students about Japanese religion before Uchimura started to talk of Christianity earned him the ire of American missionaries who had been hired to teach English. He resigned and returned to Tokyo where he found a job with the Dai Ichikō Gakkō, the same school which Nitobe led with such distinction two decades later. Here, early in 1891, Uchimura was asked to perform an obeisance before a document signed by Emperor Meiji. Hesitating, he said, “I took a safer course for my Christian conscience, ...took my stand and did not bow!” If he had acted differently, he would probably have been teaching at the school when Nitobe became principal. As it is, Uchimura by his hesitant refusal provided history with the most outspoken objection by any Japanese to the increasing demands for conformity made by the modern Japanese state before 1945. His act exemplified unprincipled egoism to Japanese historians before World War II and the living embodiment of the citizen’s duty to his conscience to postwar historians.

Immediately after his action, Uchimura had ample opportunity to contemplate its results. He came down with influenza and listened through the haze of his fever as his friends and wife discussed what to do. Uchimura’s action had attracted attention throughout the country as proof that Christians had a loyalty above the state. His friends sought some way to lessen the damage he had caused. He resigned, and a friend made the ceremonial bow in his place. Uchimura then took temporary teaching and translating jobs until a sympathetic publisher in Kyoto offered advances against future royalties while Uchimura started to write professionally. In the space of less than four years, he wrote nine books and four major articles. Two of the books were in English: How I Became a Christian and Japan and the Japanese, subsequently republished as Representative Men of Japan. In general these works dealt with four themes: lamentation, justification, exhortation and disillusionment. Some lament the pain which Christian conversion brings to the convert. They plead the case of the man misunderstood by his compatriots.
Others justify the faith of the believer and exhort others to join him, while still other works seem to reflect disillusionment with Christianity.

Among these works, two deserve mention. How I Became a Christian remains one of the best works anywhere on the effects of changing one’s faith. It provides most of the evidence for what has been said about Uchimura’s life up to his return from the United States, with the exception of his divorce. As a result, it provides little insight into the real motivation for Uchimura’s trip to the United States and deep depression when he arrived there.

The second important work was an extremely effective attack on the pretensions as opposed to the realities of Japanese policy toward China. When the Sino-Japanese War broke out in 1894, Uchimura hastened to assure foreigners who took for granted that Japan would join the scramble to cut up China that this was not the case. What Japan wanted and would help bring about in China is “free government, free education, free religion, and free commerce for 60,000,000 souls that live on this side of the globe. In the war that carries such significant results as these, what friend of humanity will not wish God-speed to Japan and her cause[sic]” (3:45-46). His enthusiasm turned to shame when Japan’s demands after the war demonstrated that Japan wanted a considerable piece of the Chinese melon for itself. It obtained Taiwan and the entry to eventual control of Korea. Uchimura, feeling that his government had betrayed his honorable defense of their pretensions, attacked its leaders with a stinging article in Japanese. “When the war is over all the people busy themselves in the celebration of victory: they go bottoms up with tens of thousands of bottles of beer, slaughter hundreds of cattle and think of killing Chinese soldiers in terms of a wild boar hunt...If the Japanese are men of benevolence and righteousness, why do they not respect the honor of the Chinese? Why do they not devote themselves to the leadership of Korea?...No one criticizes their action;” there is no one like a Jewish prophet (3:233). Uchimura’s words found a ready audience. Shortly after the article appeared, he was invited to Tokyo to join what became under his editorship the largest newspaper in Japan, the Yorozu Chôhô. The capable writers he gathered under him criticized foreign and Japanese governments alike, imparting a new sense of responsibility into the confused morass of Japanese politics.

It was as editor of the Yorozu Chôhô that Uchimura made the second move which preserves his name in Japanese history. In 1903, it became clear that the Japanese government planned to attack Russia because of Russia’s increasing involvement in China. Uchimura led the Yorozu in criticism of emerging government policy. The paper’s owner appears to have been pressured by authorities to change the newspaper’s policy to support the buildup toward the war. Hostilities in fact started a few months later, but by this time Uchimura, along with all the staff of the brilliant editorial team he had assembled, had resigned in protest. This act of conscience lives on as the second most important among very few acts of such independence before 1945.

Three years earlier, in 1900, Uchimura had started what would in fact become his major source of income for the remaining three decades of his life. This was a monthly magazine, Seisho no kenkyû (Biblical Studies), devoted to the study of the Bible. Sunday Bible study meetings, at first in his home and then in larger halls as increasing numbers of individuals came, complemented the magazine. Students of Nitobe whom he introduced to Uchimura formed the core of those who came to the Sunday meetings. These young men, who owed their careers and their faith to Nitobe and Uchimura respectively, acted with great distinction as
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Uchimura’s work during these three decades differed greatly from that of his stormy early years. He seldom left the house from which he dispatched manuscripts and numerous letters in both Japanese and English. As Nitobe moved on to positions of increasing world responsibility, Uchimura cut himself off from contacts with the wider world which his direction of a major newspaper had given him. He had given up hope for improvement in society through human institutions and rested on the conviction that social change for the better could result only from the reform of individual human souls. To those who approached him and met his strict conditions, he gave careful and inspired leadership. The work continued until he died in his sleep in 1930, one year before the Japanese army’s incursion into Manchuria so complicated Nitobe’s life.

As with Nitobe, the best insight into Uchimura’s attitude toward internationalization comes from his works in the English language. Two works are particularly important in this respect: his early How I Became a Christian and the short devotional paragraphs published in Seisho no kenkyū and an English-language journal he published for a few years in the 1920s. Many of these short devotions, published first between 1913 and 1922, were reprinted in book form in 1922 under the title Alone With God and Me. In contrast with the searching expressions of dependence in How I Became a Christian, these later articles distill in eloquently simple English his mature ideas.

In terms of ideas toward the rest of the world, or “internationalization,” the English-language works of Uchimura’s youth and middle age share a common characteristic: the desire for respect for the convert who has met the demands of membership in the Christian community and so should be considered a sibling of other Christians. The underlying assumption of Uchimura’s work is the basic equality in faith of all individuals, regardless of national origin.

The first expression of this claim to equality appears in Uchimura’s description of the founding of the student church in Sapporo and its members’ dedication to independence. A number of missionaries from differing denominations had worked with the students. Each wanted these active and able individuals enrolled in his own denomination. This ran counter to the desires of the youthful Christians who hoped to band together in one church. The missionary representing one of the denominations inadvertently tested their resolve when he demanded the quick repayment of funds he had already provided for the young men to build a church. When the members of the church refused to identify with the missionary’s denomination, he felt he could not subsequently support them. The story of their successful repayment of the money within twelve months became one of the heroic traditions associated with Japanese Protestantism and its independence from foreign assistance (3:59–65).

Later Uchimura describes his arrival in the school for mentally retarded children. He says, “Let me here note that I entered a hospital service with somewhat the same aim as that which drove Martin Luther into his Erfurth convent” (3:59–65).

Here Uchimura identifies himself with the most important figure in the Protestant Reformation who at age twenty-two entered the monastic life because of his fear of death. One suspects that if those who knew Uchimura at the time had sensed his identification with one of the key figures in world religious history, they would have considered his attitude somewhat cocksure. How could a young convert, only six years into his faith and from such a different culture, identify with Luther?
These are but two of the numerous assumptions made by Uchimura in *How I Became a Christian*. He seems to be saying that from the moment of their baptism the new converts share equally in the kinship of Christians, particularly in regard to the form that their faith will take in their home culture. Uchimura interpreted disagreement on related issues as lack of respect for himself as a Japanese Christian. Uchimura's resulting opinions with regard to individuals from Western nations and the methods with which one approaches Westerners differ greatly from the accommodation of Nitobe.

CONCLUSION

Some generalizations about the differing attitudes expressed by the two men concerning Japan's place in the world conclude this discussion.

The first is that, from the very beginning, the difference of opinion finds expression in the first major interpretive works written by the two writers. Nitobe's *Bushido*, published when the author was thirty-seven, attributes his work to a chance comment by a Belgian jurist to whom Nitobe remembers having mentioned that Japanese education made no reference to religion. To this, the jurist is said to have replied, "No religion. How do you impart moral education?" Nitobe goes on to tell the reader that this question turned his attention to an analysis of how Japanese did impart moral ideas. In response, he formulated a specific view of traditional Japan shaped around its feudal institutions which he lumped together as "bushido." The last few pages of the book predict that bushido has served its ends in feudal society and would be superseded by Christianity. In this conclusion, Nitobe fit into the preconceptions of Christian Westerners. In contrast to Nitobe's sense that Japan would conform to the world scheme as it developed, Uchimura in the dedication to his *How I Became a Christian*, despite a declaration that the author is "the chiefest of sinners," does not mention his nationality but simply expresses his thanks to "all the goodly souls" who have helped his quest for faith (3-4). The vast majority of these individuals happen to have been American, yet it was not their nationality but their character to which he alludes. He speaks as a junior member of the world community of Christians but as a member in full standing nonetheless. He further assumes that the Christian siblings in the faith who read him want to hear of his experience since he made the momentous decision to become one of them. He assumes that the Christian sense of kinship will motivate the reader to put up with any complaints Uchimura may have against his fellow believers in the English-speaking world. Christian kinship, Uchimura seems to say, enjoins him to make those born into Christian families understand the turmoil that opting out of traditional faith causes the convert. His aim is not to accommodate readers in their previously held perceptions but to inform them about the nature of assuming Christian belief. Where Nitobe went more than half way across his bridge to meet readers, Uchimura expected them to come to him.

In fact, this difference in basic points of view toward those whom the authors address seems to reflect basic differences in personality. Nitobe hardly ever lost his temper. His daughter remembers that only on one occasion did she ever observe her parents argue. Nitobe's own writings only record one instance where he showed anger. Retaining his sense of humor and invoking his flair for languages, Nitobe retreated to common ground with words of self-deprecation when disagreement threatened to escalate beyond civilized recognition of difference. In contrast, Uchimura's demand for respect from others in the faith led him in his old age to an almost childlike petulance. At sixty-six, a chance and well-meant comment about his theology from a retired mis-
sionary led him to launch a prolonged and acrimonious written debate with the lady in question. Internal evidence suggests that more than three decades earlier she had read *How I Became a Christian* in manuscript form and had not liked it. She did not remember the incident, but he did. He resented her treating him, now a respected and distinguished scholar, “as she would treat school children, …in her familiar, ‘school-ma’am’ style” (Takeda 1972, 122).

Other comments about missionaries showed Uchimura to be very cordial if they offered him respect, but quite biting if they seemed to lack respect for him and what he represented. Both authors’ attitudes toward Westerners thus reflected their basic personalities.

The attitudes of the two toward foreigners who were not Westerners also reflected the perceptions toward what is in the late twentieth century called the “international community.” Miwa Kimitada demonstrates how Nitobe came to his internationalism through reference to a very different system of ideas than Westerners had about relations between nations (Howes 1995, 159–175). Over the centuries preceding Western expansion into Asia, Europe had developed a system of international relations in which each state was equal, with the Pope exercising a kind of official, impartial leadership over the relations between states. This attitude toward relations between nations thus resembled the European attitude toward relations between individuals: each was equal in the sight of God. The Japanese system of international relations derived from a very different set of presumptions, those which governed the relations of China as the “Middle Kingdom” with the lesser powers arranged around China’s borders. These were all seen as inferior and dependent on China. China extended various forms of benevolence to these lesser powers in return for their recognition of its superior position. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, political theorists in Japan had developed ideas which pictured Japan as the “middle kingdom” in its relations with the areas adjacent: largely Korea, Taiwan, Okinawa, Hokkaido and the islands to the north. Japan had a duty to help the people of these satellites develop their standard of living and achieve a Japanese-style culture. They could never be considered equals, but all could benefit from the largess of Japan.

When Nitobe trained himself for the development of Hokkaido and later assisted the development of Taiwan, he used as models what he had learned through courses in agronomy, but he worked with Japanese who took for granted what almost a hundred years later would be considered racist attitudes toward the peoples who became part of the Japanese empire. His writings on Taiwan in particular bespeak an avuncular concern for education and sanitation which came all the more easily to Nitobe because it resembled the British idea of the “white man’s burden.” Even in his final years, he saw Japanese-dominated Manchuria in terms of what Japan could do for the Chinese there rather than what the Chinese wanted for themselves. This sounded quite like the claims of the Japanese military that it acted in the best interests of the Chinese. Nitobe does not seem to have considered true independence for any of these peoples.

Uchimura’s different attitude shows up best in his attitudes to Koreans. In his final decade Uchimura came to know a number of students from Korea who were studying in Japan. When he mentions nationalism in his lectures, he remarked that “Those who listen with sweated palms are the students from Korea” (32:58). One of these students returned home to become the “Korean Gandhi” (Satō, 41).7 Uchimura identified with the Koreans’ desire for respect for themselves and their homeland as a reflection of his own feelings about himself as a Japanese. In this he also anticipated late
twentieth-century attitudes toward nationalism where boundaries between states are becoming less important.

Finally, the two men differed in their attitudes toward their own national roots. Internationalism, as Uchimura had often pointed out, required that individuals first have a strong sense of nationality. Only after they knew themselves and their people, could they hope to understand those of other cultures. The Japanese of the Meiji period who merely aped Western clothes and conventions could not, Uchimura believed, be considered "international" unless they had a deep sense of their own tradition.

As they aged, Nitobe and Uchimura came to differ in their reactions to their own pasts. In 1910, Nitobe united with Yanagida Kunio, considered the father of Japanese ethnography, to found a society to study the traditional folkways of Japan. He later joined with relatives to preserve family records and artifacts in the city which his father and grandfather had founded. After returning to Japan from Geneva in 1927, he spent much time in the area where he had grown up in a simultaneous attempt to modernize it and try to preserve the best of its past. Uchimura did not share these inclinations. In 1910 he wrote that he no longer had a "hometown" and felt almost as if he had been "taken captive in a foreign land" as he worked in the suburbs of Tokyo (17:297-98). With the passage of time he came to feel that the Christian increasingly identified his or her home in Heaven rather than on earth. In a sense thus deracinated, Uchimura lived in contemporary Japan but felt little identity with its traditions and institutions which seemed to him increasingly corrupt.

Ultimately, history has treated the legacies of Nitobe and Uchimura differently. Neither has received the place in their nation’s history which a rational assessment would accord them. Nitobe was almost entirely forgotten until his likeness appeared on the new 5,000 yen-note in 1985. Though it is not generally recognized, Nitobe also lives on in the many developments toward internationalism which have truly changed Japan over the half a century since the end of World War II. If there is one institution that more than any other commemorates his work, it is the International House of Japan (Kokusai bunka kaikan) in Roppongi. Nothing in its publications attributes its inspiration to him, but its facilities which permit scholars of all nations to study and talk together in congenial surroundings and its program which constantly stands on the cutting edge of international cultural relations proclaim aims similar to his own. The presence of large numbers of his disciples on the early Board of Directors seems to confirm this influence. The current mood in which Japanese have finally turned to confront their past excesses in Asia may mean that they will begin to pay more attention to their foremost prewar internationalist.

Uchimura enjoyed a great vogue for about twenty years after the end of World War II when Japan’s numerous excesses in World War II troubled many thinking persons of good will. He is not as well-remembered today. Perhaps that is because he remained to the last so demanding of himself and others. In a short note students discovered posthumously among his unpublished manuscripts, he disavowed any connection with Mukyōkai, the attitude toward church organization which his disciples saw as his major contribution to world thought. He seems to have feared that Mukyōkai would become yet another denomination. This refusal to identify with earthly institutions, along with his earlier increasing alienation from contemporary Japan, further inclined him to see the Christian’s true home in Heaven. Had he lived a few years longer, perhaps this attitude would have made it easier for him to behold the destruction which later befell his beloved homeland.
NOTES

1 Exception for specific references to the works of Uchimura, material in this article comes from research over a number of decades which awaits publication. I have written numerous general articles on Uchimura, the most recent of which is “Japanese Christianity and the State.” in Kaplan 1995.

2 Exception for specific references to the works of Nitobe, material in this article comes from Howes, ed., Nitobe Inazo (1995).


4 “Moral Traits of the Yamato damashii.” This article is dealt with in detail in my “Two works by Uchimura Kanzō until recently unknown in Japan” (1958).

5 Letter to David C. Bell, 6 March 1891. Beginning in 1933, numerous multivolume collections of Uchimura’s works have appeared. The Iwanami collection is the most complete. All citations to Uchimura’s works in this article refer to this collection, hereafter Uchimura zenshū. For a fuller quotation from this letter see Ryusaku Tsunoda, W. T. deBary, and others, (1959).


7 This excellent article reflects the high level of contemporary scholarship on Uchimura.
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