# HOW CAN LITERATURE BE BENEFICIAL TO LIFE?
## — THE YAMAJI-KITAMURA CONTROVERSY RECONSIDERED —

**Graham SQUIRES**
University of Newcastle

**ITO Yushi**
Victoria University of Wellington

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In 1893 a debate took place between Yamaji Aizan and Kitamura Tokoku concerning the significance of literature. This debate has long been discussed by those with an interest in the history of modern Japanese literature. The objective of this paper is to reconsider this controversy. An attempt will be made to show that not only Kitamura but also Yamaji can be seen as a representative of liberal thinkers in the Meiji period.

Yamaji has been often regarded by literary critics as having a "vulgar" and "utilitarian" approach to literature because of his assertion that writing should be socially useful. The same literary critics have greatly praised Kitamura's view that the merit of literature does not lie in its practical usefulness but in its ability to express the "inner life *(naibu seimei)*" of the individual. It has been argued that Kitamura's concept of literature has laid the foundation for the development of modern Japanese literature and that Yamaji's utilitarian view of literature was an obstacle to its development and a hindrance to the liberation of human feelings.[1] This interpretation of the debate, however, has been criticised by those who have paid much attention to the work of Yamaji Aizan. They have suggested that Kitamura and Yamaji compromised with each other and, in the final analysis, belonged to the same school of thought.[2]

In fact, in the study of the Kitamura-Yamaji controversy, the work of Kitamura has been studied in detail while that of Yamaji has suffered neglect. This circumstance seems to have led to the conclusion that Yamaji, in contrast to Kitamura, did not greatly value the "inner life" of the individual.[3] In this paper it will be argued that if the thought of Yamaji is studied in detail and compared to that of Kitamura, then it will be realised that the difference between the two was not so great as is often imagined. Firstly, both opposed the conservative trends of the day and the excessive emphasis on rationality at the expense of human feelings. Secondly, if the broader intellectual context is examined, it would be found that Yamaji's real enemy at the time of the debate was not Kitamura but Inoue Tetsujiro, a professor at Tokyo University, who advocated the state interference in personal beliefs through national education.[4] It is doubtful if Yamaji was a state-oriented thinker who opposed the liberation of the spirit of the individual for the sake of the state.[5] Finally, it will be suggested that Yamaji and Kitamura were engaged in different literary activities in early 1893, which led to a clash of their

interests and provoked a debate between them as to the significance of literature.

## 2. OPPOSING CONSERVATISM AND INTELLECTUALISM

It has been asserted that Kitamura Tokoku tried to defend the spiritual independence of the individual against an "oppressive social order and its customs and thought".[6] On the other hand, Yamaji Aizan has been often regarded as Kitamura's opponent because of their debate over the significance of literature. As a result, it has not been appreciated that in many areas Kitamura and Yamaji held similar views. For example, it has not been fully recognised that both Kitamura and Yamaji argued not only against the conservative attitudes of the day but also against the excessive emphasis on human intellect at the expense of emotion.

In his paper on Kitamura Tokoku, the historian Ienaga Saburo has argued that Kitamura's thought was a symbol of anti-feudalism. Ienaga asserts that feudal society was based on a hierarchical social order under the control of the samurai class and that it was important for the feudal ruler to maintain the status quo.[7] Kitamura was critical of such a conservative attitude. In his "The nation and thought" (1893) he wrote:

> Is it good for the nation to stubbornly stick to the power of the past and to indulge in dreaming of dead history? Creative power is indispensable to any age. The vitality of a nation can be judged by its creative power. If a nation is conservative, then it is inflexible and is marching towards its own grave.[8]

In Kitamura's view, it was a mistaken policy to remain attached to the past because such an attitude could not create anything new.

Secondly, Ienaga has asserted that the idea of being "cosmopolitan" and that of "state" had not existed in feudal society but that Kitamura regarded himself as being cosmopolitan.[9] In fact, Kitamura wrote in June 1892 that "the divisions of the earth can be seen only on a political map of the world for there is no division as far as the spiritual world is concerned".[10] In Kitamura's view, "it is foolish to remain attached to eastern thought without reason, and it is also doubtful whether it is desirable to be unreasonably fascinated with western thought".[11] In this way, Kitamura saw the world as a whole without dividing it into areas and suggested that the merits of thought should be judged without regard for its geographical origin.

Thirdly, Ienaga writes that Kitamura opposed feudalistic Confucian morality in which rigid formality was excessively stressed.[12] Kitamura wrote in his "On inner life" (1893) that:

> Confucian morality was concerned with practical things and did not teach "human life". Being concerned with complicated manners and various ceremonies, Confucian morality fell into formality.[13]

Confucian moralists were not concerned with spiritual matters because they were only interested in adhering to formality and "preached loyalty, but they did not preach it with their whole hearts". Kitamura rejected Confucian morality because it did not pay attention to the heart of the individual.

In this way Ienaga has suggested that Kitamura had a critical attitude towards

retrospective, narrow-minded and formalistic ways of thinking. Ienaga, however, did not draw attention to the fact that, like Kitamura, Yamaji also opposed these things. In March 1892 Yamaji published an essay entitled "Has our country grown old?" in the *Jogaku zasshi*, in which he expressed his dissatisfaction with the conservative trends of the day.[14] In this essay Yamaji pointed out three characteristics of an ageing country. These were a tendency to look back upon the past, narrow-mindedness and an adherence to rigid formality. These criticisms of contemporary society are exactly the same that Ienaga found in the writing of Kitamura.

In a similar way to Kitamura, Yamaji asserts in his essay that people in an ageing country tend to look back on the past. Yamaji wrote:

> Young people do not indulge in retrospection. They are full of hope for the future. They do not live in the present. . . They have hope of attaining some great achievement in the future. . . The same is true of a country that is going to prosper.[15]

Yamaji was concerned about people being excessively retrospective in their thinking because this suggested that the nation was spiritually growing old.

Secondly, Yamaji wrote in the same essay that "cowardly people are easily affected by trifles and become frightened by small things. . . they cannot tolerate something that is different from them". Yamaji felt that people should be tolerant if they wanted their country prosperous. He regarded those who hated foreigners and rejected foreign things without reason as "cowardly". He also writes that those who are not tolerant of foreigners are also not tolerant of their own countrymen.[16] Japanese people should adopt a cosmopolitan attitude, he continues, and be tolerant of foreign culture. In another essay Yamaji wrote that "it is more absurd to preach a certain philosophy, set of feelings and beliefs exclusively for the Japanese people than to try and divide the clouds and winds".[17] In this way, like Kitamura, Yamaji emphasised the importance of tolerance and cosmopolitanism as a set of values for the Japanese people.

Thirdly, as with Kitamaru, Yamaji emphasised that if people remained attached to rigid formality, then it was a sign that the country was growing old. In Yamaji's view, "old people or spiritually-old people tend to worry over inconsequential formality too much". He did not mean by this that people should be impolite or behave in an outrageous way, but he felt sorry if people who had something to achieve in the future were unnecessarily restricted. For instance, Yamaji did not think that a new western hairstyle like the pompadour was especially elegant or that a newly-introduced greeting such as a handshake was particularly graceful. At the same time, however, he criticised educators who reproached their students for getting a pompadour hairstyle or who laughed at hand shaking. In Yamaji's view, if people rejected the pompadour hairstyle and hand shaking on the grounds that these things were contrary to old customs, it meant that people had become old and firmly attached to convention.[18] In this way, like Kitamura, Yamaji opposed conservative ways of thinking and the rigid maintenance of established customs.

Ienaga Saburo has suggested that Kitamura's thought was original in the sense that he emphasised the importance of human feelings in life.[19] Kitamura's emphasis on the spiritual

aspect of human life arose up in reaction to the intellectualism of the Enlightenment philosophers like Fukuzawa Yukichi. Kitamura asserted that Fukuzawa had not set up ideals for the nation although he had diffused the practical knowledge of the material world.[20] In Ienaga's view, both the intellect and human feelings were severely repressed under the feudal regime. Therefore, the rise of intellectualism and the emphasis on human feelings in the early Meiji period were two aspects of the movement against feudalistic constraint. The intellectualism of the Enlightenment period, however, did not satisfy young people who highly valued human feelings.

Although Ienaga has considered Kitamura's opinion on human feelings to be "original", it should be noted that Yamaji also expressed similar views. Yamaji regarded Fukuzawa Yukichi as the leader of only a party within Japan and not as the leader of the whole nation. In Yamaji's view, if one could be satisfied with things like staying in one's home village after having saved up money, occasionally giving money to the poor and building bridges and roads, then Fukuzawa was the best kind of teacher. People, however, were not simply satisfied with a good standard of material comfort. They also needed religion and philosophy. Because Fukuzawa did not teach these things, he could not satisfy the need rooted deep within people's hearts. Yamaji believed that because of their leader's teaching, Fukuzawa's followers tended to be too materialistic and were simply concerned with the utilitarian improvement of material life.[21] Yamaji criticised Fukuzawa for emphasising the intellect in advancing material progress and not sufficiently paying attention to people's spiritual needs.

Yamaji's attitude towards the intellectualism of the Enlightenment movement can be clearly seen in an essay entitled "The philosophy of soul *(Seimei tetsugaku)*" (1909). In this essay Yamaji criticised Spencer's agnosticism on the grounds that it did not attempt to explain the true form of things. In Yamaji's view, human beings have not only intellect but also a "soul". Human intellect could be satisfied with the idea that there are things unknowable in this world, but the "soul" could not endure such an idea.[22] Yamaji writes that no matter how advanced science becomes, it cannot solve all the mysteries in the world and so it cannot meet the needs of the human heart. Even in an age of science, therefore, there is mental agony within people's hearts. The soul searches for an interpretation of all things in the universe. If one comes to the conclusion that nothing of significance in the universe can be understood, Yamaji asserted, one's soul will be in spiritual agony.[23]

Not only being critical of the conservative attitudes among the people, but also did bothYamaji and Kitamura emphasise the importance of human feelings in reaction to the intellectualism of the Meiji Enlightenment. As can be seen from this, it is wrong to suggest, as Ienaga does, that Kitamura was completely alone and original in his emphasis on human feelings. It must be remembered that Yamaji's lifelong concern was also the liberation of the individual in a spiritual sense.

## 3. THE CONTROVERSY CONCERNING CHRISTIANITY AND EDUCATION

It has not been noted that when Yamaji Aizan and Kitamura Tokoku started to argue against each other about the significance of literature in early 1893, Inoue Tetsujiro's attack on Christianity had already started to arouse considerable controversy in education circles. Both Yamaji and Kitamura criticised the interpretation of the Imperial Rescript on Education given by intellectuals like Inoue Tetsujiro. Unlike Yamaji, however, Kitamura was not greatly concerned with Inoue's arguments over religion and education.[24] As a result, those who have studied the thought of Kitamura have not paid much attention to the thought of Inoue. It must be remembered, however, that Inoue was, in a sense, a representative of the Meiji Intellectuals and held an influential position as a professor at Tokyo University. The thought of Inoue, therefore, should not be dismissed if one wants to understand the trend of thought in the mid-Meiji period.[25]

Following the Meiji Restoration, western culture flooded into Japan and the traditional moral values based on Confucianism came to be questioned. The early Meiji period saw the transformation of Japanese society as a result of the adoption of Western culture. During the Meiji 20's, however, many young intellectuals who had grown up in the materialism of the Japanese Enlightenment became dissatisfied simply with material progress and wished to discover the meaning of life in a spiritual sense.[26]

It was under these circumstances that the Meiji government issued the Imperial Rescript on Education in 1890 in order to provide a foundation for the spiritual development of young people. Inoue Tetsujiro, a young professor at Tokyo University who had just returned from six years study in Germany, was requested by the Ministry of Education to write a commentary on the Imperial Rescript on Education to elucidate its meaning. In this commentary Inoue discussed the idea of "national education" which he believed should be the spiritual basis for the Japanese.[27] By comparing Inoue's views on one hand with those of Yamaji and Kitamura on the other, we can see that Yamaji and Kitamura held similar views on two important issues. Firstly, unlike Inoue, neither believed that Japan was a unique country possessed of a unique spirit. Secondly, while Inoue stressed the importance of the state, Yamaji and Kitamura emphasised the spiritual freedom of the individual.

**‹National Morality and Japanese Uniqueness›**

It must be noted that Inoue did not entirely neglect the idea of "universal morality". In his "National morality and universal morality" (1905), Inoue suggested that national morality should be harmonised with universal morality. In his view, national morality was necessary to make the state strong enough to resist the threat to life and property from foreign invasion. Inoue also recognised, however, that universal morality should not be neglected because the state could gain respect from other nations through the respect of universal moral principles such as "philanthropy, humanity, justice, fidelity and honesty". In his view, "it is always necessary that national morality should be improved to make it conform to universal morality". It would be a mistake, however, to emphasise universal morality at the expense of

national morality. Although asserting that "the moral ideal was harmony between national morality and universal morality", Inoue believed that Japan's national spirit manifest in such as Bushido should not be injured as it was the basis of national morality.[28]

Inoue Tetsujiro also remained attached to the idea of a unique national spirit when he wrote about the integration of eastern and western civilisations. In 1911 he wrote in an essay entitled "What is the integration of civilisations?" that Japan should adopt the best aspects of eastern and western civilisations while fostering the Japanese national spirit. For Inoue "the integration of eastern and western civilisations was Japan's mission to the world". Eastern civilisation had good moral principles such as loyalty and filial piety but lacked scientific thought and the idea of human rights which had originated in the west. Inoue claimed that eastern and western civilisations should be selectively adopted and integrated with the Japanese spirit in order to create a higher civilisation.[29]

Inoue argued, however, that Japan should introduce the good aspects of western civilisation only so long as people did not lose their unique Japanese spirit. In his essay entitled "The past and future of Japanese civilisation" (1911), Inoue also asserted that western individualism might be accepted to a certain degree because "the introduction of new ideas would enrich Japanese civilisation". Inoue did not think, however, that the state could support absolute individualism because this would disturb the existing social order and would subvert the state itself. It was necessary, he argued, that the Japanese spirit be preserved as the essential factor for maintaining the balance between individualism and social order. Inoue regarded the unique Japanese spirit as the basis for the assimilation of western civilisation into Japan.[30]

In contrast to this, although both Kitamura and Yamaji were also interested in the question of how to harmonise eastern and western civilisations, they did not emphasise the uniqueness of Japan. In his "A kind of exclusionism" (1892), Kitamura argued that people should not thoughtlessly admire Western thought but he also warned people against being excessively exclusionist. In his view, the world was becoming smaller and various forms of thought were coming into greater contact and mingling together, so there was no point in trying to exclude foreign thought from Japan.[31] Yamaji also wrote that "Western civilisation would not destroy old Japan but rather would wake up old Japan which is about to sleep" and he asserted that Japanese people should introduce western culture so that they could enrich Japanese civilisation.[32] Unlike Inoue, neither Yamaji nor Kitamura argued that the unique Japanese spirit should be the basis for harmonising western and eastern civilisations.

At the heart of Inoue's idea of "national morality" was the belief that all nations developed a unique national character as a result of their geographical and historical experience. In the case of Japan, unlike Yamaji and Kitamura, Inoue believed that its unique national character centred on loyalty to the state as embodied in the Imperial House which he believed had reigned in Japan from ancient times to the present without interruption. Throughout his career Inoue searched through Japanese history to try and discover those elements which could be regarded as uniquely Japanese. Inoue also devoted his energy to

attacking those elements which he believed were incompatible with Japan's unique national character and foremost amongst these was Christianity. Inoue attacked Christianity because he believed it taught only universal morality and made light of national morality and the state.[33]

**‹The State and the Individual›**

In January 1891, Uchimura Kanzo hesitated to bow before a copy of the Imperial Rescript on Education at a school ceremony because he believed this act was in conflict with his Christian beliefs. As a result, he was accused of disrespect for the imperial family. This "Uchimura Incident" led to a bitter controversy about the relationship between education and Christianity. In 1893, two years after the Uchimura Incident, Inoue Tetsujiro published an essay entitled the "Clash between education and religion", in which he attacked Christianity on the grounds that it was in conflict with the idea of loyalty to the state as expressed in the Imperial Rescript on Education. Inoue argued that because Christianity did not teach loyalty to the state and emphasised universal morals, there was a conflict between Christianity and moral education in Japan.

Yamaji Aizan sharply attacked this idea. Three months after the Uchimura Incident, Yamaji gave a public speech entitled "On loyalty", in which he criticised "short sighted and cowardly educators" who wished to force people into empty formalities which gave the appearance of loyalty to the Emperor. In Yamaji's view, the state trying to create the spirit of loyalty through authoritarian commands could only be done at the expense of genuine love and would simply create people who pretended to be loyal. Therefore, it was not wise for educators to force people to adopt social conventions.[34] As was expressed in his comment on Inoue's public lecture on the meaning of life, Yamaji could not accept Inoue's idea that the aim of life was to serve the state.[35]

In 1906 Yamaji gave his interpretation on the Imperial Rescript on Education in an essay entitled "On education"[36] This essay does not seem to have received attention in the previous studies of Yamaji's thought but one can find in it that Yamaji defended the free will of the individual against state interference. Yamaji first raised the question of whether the state should try to disseminate a particular doctrine to the people through the national education system. According to Yamaji, Inoue Tetsujiro and people with similar ideas employed in the Ministry of Education believed that education should be based on a particular doctrine. On the other hand, Fukuzawa Yukichi and like-minded people at Keio Gijuku advocated the "English" style of education in which state interference was kept to a minimum and educational independence was maintained. Yamaji did not agree to this policy of non-interference in education for he believed that the existence of the state was necessary to protect people from foreign invasion and to maintain internal equality. In order to maintain the existence of the state, he continued, people had to be educated on the basis of a particular doctrine through which this goal could be attained. Therefore, Yamaji agreed with Inoue Tetsujiro and the Minister of Education that "all educational institutions should function in accordance with standards which have been established in order to educate the citizens of the

state".[37]

Yamaji differed from Inoue, however, over "how loyal citizens should be educated". In Yamaji's view, education should not be based on statism and loyal citizens could not be produced through state authority or government orders. Yamaji believed that all individuals possessed "human instinct". If an individual was exposed to external pressure beyond a certain point, a spirit of resistance would develop. Some people believed that eastern people had a tradition of submission to the state but "human instinct" was a common characteristic of all people. Yamaji gave evidence from Oriental history to prove that human instinct had not endured excessive pressure from government power.[38]

Yamaji suggested that people could not be controlled by government orders if the government did not sufficiently explain the reason why its orders were given. He accepted the Imperial Rescript on Education as the textbook for moral education but he asserted that human instinct should not be killed for the sake of loyalty and patriotism. In Yamaji's view, it was natural for young people to be unable to grasp the meaning of life and experience mental agony. There was no point in preaching to young people about loyalty and patriotism while school teachers neglect their mental anxieties. He argued that "teachers should give some good idea of making young people satisfy their religious and philosophical needs" and that such needs should not be suppressed by government order.[39]

Although attempting to give the protection of human instinct against state interference, Yamaji did not defend the complete freedom of the individual from the state on the grounds that "human beings could not be completely free as individuals" because they were social animals. Yamaji wrote that

> education is an attempt to harmonise the instinct of the individual with the requirements of the society. If human instinct were not suppressed and at the same time social order maintained, then this would be the ideal of the state and the ideal of education.

In this way Yamaji's view of education lay midway between the statist view and an attitude of non-intervention in education.[40]

It should be noted that Kitamura also searched for a compromise between the freedom of the individual and the order of the state. In an essay entitled "The nation and thought" (1893), Kitamura asserted that "solid spiritual activities are necessary" in order to maintain the life of the nation. In his view, all nations had their own spirit which served as the source of the nation's activities over a long period of time. Kitamura wrote as follows:

> All nations are living human beings. They have their own will. They have the desire to seek liberty. They tend to defend the independence of the will within the limits of state restrictions."[41]

Thus, Kitamura asserted that the independence of the will should be maintained within "state restrictions". Without national spirit, Kitamura suggested, the state would not survive the struggle for existence in the world.

As has been suggested by Hiraoka Toshio, it can be said that the concept of the nation played an important role in the thought of Kitamura and Yamaji.[42] Odagiri Hideo has failed to

note that a similar view of the relations between the state and the individual was expressed by these two intellectuals.[43] They avoided going to the two extremes: one extreme was Inoue's view that the aim of life should be to serve the state, and the other was the defence of the unbounded liberty of the individual.

**‹The Yamaji-Kitamura Controversy›**

In many ways, the thought of Yamaji Aizan and Kitamura Tokoku were similar. Like Kitamura, Yamaji criticised conservative attitudes and attempted to liberate human feelings from the bondage of old customs and the domination of intellectualism. In this regard they were both in the same camp. This can be clearly seen when they are compared and contrasted with someone like Inoue Tetsujiro. Then, it remains an unsettled question of why Kitamura and Yamaji disagreed about the significance of literature.

In order to answer this question one should note that when Kitamura raised the question of whether literature should be a practical "enterprise" or not in early 1893, Inoue Tetsujiro's "Clash between education and religion" had already caused considerable controversy within education circles. Yamaji took both the Uchimura Incident and Inoue's attack on Christianity very seriously and immediately criticised Inoue's statist view of education. On the other hand, although Kitamura also wrote an essay entitled "Dr Inoue and the Christians" in 1893, he did not throw himself into this controversy to any great degree. In this essay Kitamura did not criticise Inoue's statism itself but simply suggested that it was unfortunate that Inoue tried to have immediate practical results in his "enterprise" even if he had to work for the government. In Kitamura's view, the aim of a scholar should not be to exercise a direct influence on society but should be to make an enduring contribution. Kitamura wrote that "if one wanted to dedicate one's life to scholarship, one should not be concerned whether one's opinions were accepted by the public or not" because in such a way a man will not die as his "enterprise" will live on and he will gain an eternal life.[44]

In this way, Kitamura was a mere observer in the controversy over Christianity and education in which eminent intellectuals like Yamaji Aizan, Takahashi Goro, Uchimura Kanzo and Uemura Masahisa were involved. Kitamura's main concern in early 1893 was not the statist interpretation of the Imperial Rescript on Education but the liberation of the individual feelings through literature. This was the purpose of the magazine *Bungakukai,* which he began publishing in January 1893.[45] On the other hand, it is understandable that Yamaji did not accept Kitamura's view that the immediate social relevance of literature was not important because he was using "literature" to attack Inoue's views on education at that time. It was necessary for Yamaji to claim that "literature" should be a practical "enterprise" to fight against enemies like Inoue Tetsujiro.

## 5. CONCLUSION

Although the Kitamura-Yamaji controversy has been an object of study for a long time, the work of Yamaji has been strangely neglected by those critics who have praised the

thought of Kitamura so highly. The praise of Kitamura's view of literature and the underestimation of the work of Yamaji have been accompanied by the total negligence of the thought of Inoue Tetsujiro, who was a powerful opponent of both Yamaji and Kitamura. This unbalanced approach seems to have hindered the development of a good understanding of Yamaji's thought and its place in the Meiji intellectual world.

If attention is focused solely on Kitamura's position within the Kitamura-Yamaji controversy and the environment in which the controversy took place is ignored, then it seems that the gap between the two was very great. If one takes a broader perspective, however, it becomes clear that Yamaji and Kitamura had many points in common. As has been discussed, they both opposed conservatism; the tendency to place excessive emphasis on rationality at the expense of human feelings; and the state-oriented education espoused by Inoue Tetsujiro.

The main difference between the two is clearly revealed in their attitudes towards the controversy on Christianity and education. Yamaji continued to oppose the philosophical and educational ideas of Inoue Tetsujiro and this led to his stress on the idea that writing should be a socially useful "enterprise". In contrast, Kitamura started to publish the *Bungakukai* and rather emphasised that the value of literature lay in the expression it gave to the inner life of the individual. Although being different from each other in approach to literature, Yamaji and Kitamura were like-minded intellectuals and aimed at liberating human feelings through their writing activities.

## Notes

1 Nakano Shigeharu, *Geijutsu ni kansuru hashirigakiteki oboegaki (1929);* Odagiri Hideo, "Sannin no seinen sakka — Kitamura Tokoku, Ishikawa Takuboku, Kobayashi Takiji —" *Hikari* (February, 1947), in Odagiri Hideo, *Zoho Kitamura Tokoku ron* (Tokyo: Yagi shoten, 1970); Nakayama Kazuko, "Tokoku to Aizan — Bungaku gainen no tairitsu o megutte —", *Bungaku* (December, 1967).

2 Katsumoto Seiichiro, "Tokoku no bungakuteki tachiba", in *Kitamuru Tokoku* (Tokyo: Yuseido, 1972), p.20; Hiraoka Toshio, *Kitamura Tokoku kenkyu* (Tokyo: Yuseido, 1967).

3 Katsumoto Seiichi, "Kindai no zasetsu", in *Kitamura Tokoku* (Tokyo: Yseido, 1972), p.277.

4 Cf. Yushi Ito and Graham Squires, "Conflicting images of Japan in the late Meiji period — Yamaji Aizan and Inoue Tetsujiro —". *Proceedings of the Seventh Biennial Conference of the Japanese Studies Association of Australia, Australian National University, Canberra,* vol.2 (July, 1991), pp. 97-104.

5 Imanaka Kanji, "Yamaji Aizan", in Imanaka Kanji ed., *Nihon no kindaika to ishin* (Tokyo: Perikansha, 1982), p.277.

6 Odagiri Hideo, *Zoho Kitamura Tokoku ron* (Tokyo: Yagi shoten, 1970), p.142.

7 Ienaga Saburo, "Kitamura Tokoku ni okeru kindai shimin seishin", in Nihon bungaku kenkyu shiryo kankokai ed., *Kitamura Tokoku* (Tokyo: Yuseido, 1972), p.26.

8 Kitamaru Totoku, "Kokumin to shiso", *Hyoron* (July, 1893).

9 Ienaga, "Kitamura Tokoku ni okeru kindai shimin seishin", p.27.

10 Kitamura Tokoku, "Isshu no joi shiso", Heiwa (June, 1892).

11 Kitamura, "Kokumin to shiso".

12 Ienaga, "Kitamura Tokoku ni okeru kindai shimin seishin", p.24.

13 Kitamara Tokoku, "Naibu seimei ron", *Bungakukai* (May, 1893).

14 Yamaji Aizan, "Waga kuni oitaruka", *Jogaku zasshi,* no.309 (March, 1892).

15 Ibid.
16 Ibid.
17 Yamaji Aizan, "Rokoku oyobi Torusutoi haku", *Dokuritsu hyoron* (February, 1913).
18 Yamaji, "Waga kuni oitaruka".
19 Ienaga, "Kitamura Tokoku ni okeru kindai shimin seishin", pp.28-36.
20 Kitamura Tokoku, "Meiji bungaku shi kanken", *Hyoron* (April 1893).
21 Yamaji Aizan, "Meiji bungakushi", *Kokumin shinbun* (7th May, 1893).
22 Yamaji Aizan, "Seimei tetsugaku", *Dokuritsu hyoron* (3rd June, 1908), pp.9-10.
23 Ibid., pp.18-19
24 As will be argued in this paper, Kitamura published one article on Inoue Tetsujiro, but Kitamura's concern in this article was whether literature should be an enterprise useful to life or not. Cf. Kitamura Tokoku, "Inoue hakushi to Kirisutokyoto", *Heiwa* (May 1893).
25 Watanabe Kazuyasu, *Meiji shisoshi* (Tokyo: Perikan sha, 1978), p.100.
26 Cf. Kenneth B. Pyle, *The new generation in Meiji Japan: Problems of cultural identity,* 1885- 1895 (Stanford: Stanford University Press).
27 Cf. Yamazumi Masami, *Kyoiku chokugo* (Tokyo: Asahi Shinbun sha, 1980), pp.106-107.
28 Inoue Tetsujiro, "Kokkateki dotoku to sekaiteki dotoku", *Teyu rinrikai rinrikoenshu,* no.28 (January, 1905).
29 Inoue Tetsujiro, "Bunmei no toitsu to wa nanzoya", *Toa no hikari,* vol.6, no.5 (1st May, 1911).
30 Inoue Tetsujiro, "Nihon bunmei no kako oyobi shorai", *Toa no hikari,* vol. 6, no.6 (1st June, 1911).
31 Kitamura Tokoku, "Isshu no joi shiso", *Heiwa* (June, 1892).
32 Yamaji Aizan, "Saionji monsho ni atau", *Sekai no Nihon,* no.24 (1st February, 1898)
33 Cf. Yamazumi, *Kyoiku chokugo.*
34 Yamaji Aizan, "Chukun ron", *Yasei hankyo,* No. 7 (20th June 1891)
35 Yamaji Aizan, "Inoue Tetsujiro shi ni atau", *Gokyo* (15th April, 1893).
36 Yamaji Aizan, "Kyoiku ron (Jo)" *Dokuritsu hyoron,* No. 7 (3rd July, 1906), pp.8-29
37 Ibid., pp.8-11
38 Ibid., pp.12-19
39 Ibid., pp.21-22
40 Ibid., pp.26-29
41 Kitamura Tokoku, "Kokumin to shiso," *Hyoron* (July, 1893)
42 Hiraoka Toshio, *Kitamura Tokoku kenkyu* (Tokyo: Yuseido, 1967), pp.204-216.
43 Odagiri, *Zoho Kitamura Tokoku ron,* p.140
44 Kitamura Tokoku, "Inoue hakushi to Kirisutokyoto", *Heiwa* (May, 1893).
45 Cf. Odagiri, *Kitamura Tokoku ron,* pp.78-79.