This paper concerns the discourses of two Japanese Zen Buddhists, Suzuki Daisetsu and Inoue Shūten, through analyzing their writings in a Buddhist journal called Shin Bukkyō, in order to examine their presentations of the role of Buddhism at the turn of the twentieth century and how their transnational contacts influenced the construction of their religious ideas. As Itō Hirobumi’s annotation to the Meiji Constitution described, religion in modern Japan witnessed the division of religion into “outward” practices and “inner” religious belief. The Kōtoku Incident (1910–1911) also played a crucial role for Japanese Buddhists in terms of their social engagement, and around this time Suzuki’s discourses in particular began to show a polarization of social criticism in Shin Bukkyō on the one hand, and reflections on spirituality in other journals on the other. Inoue, who was suspected of having a hand in the Kōtoku Incident, wrote critical commentaries and pacifist essays from a Buddhist point of view. In this study, I attempt to uncover the various factors that constructed their religious ideas so as to exemplify the Buddhist responses to rising nationalism and the restriction of freedom of religion and thought.
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Suzuki Daisetsu 鈴木大拙 (a.k.a. D. T. Suzuki, 1870–1966) and Inoue Shūten 井上秀天 (1880–1945), though not official representatives of either the Rinzai or Sōtō schools, had several things in common. In addition to having overseas experience, a good command of English, and a positive understanding of Christianity, both contributed to the journal Shin Bukkyō 新仏教 (“New Buddhism”; published 1900 to 1915). The most striking difference between them, however, was the public attention they received, especially in Western scholarship. While it is hardly necessary to go over the details of Suzuki’s life, Inoue seems to be little known among scholars who read English but not Japanese. While the former published numerous books and articles in English, Inoue wrote only in Japanese, even though he did assist in translations by American Christian missionaries or British writers of their own works. His writings in Shin Bukkyō revolve around pacifism and resistance to nationalist ideas from a Buddhist point of view. Therefore, despite Suzuki’s contribution to the dissemination of Buddhism in the West, I believe that other practitioners like Inoue also need to be studied and discussed among a wider circle of scholars in order to illustrate the multifaceted history of modern Japanese Buddhism. Moreover, despite having some things in common, both showed a contrasting stance when dealing with the role of religion on social justice, war, and rising nationalism. They introduced and translated works in English with some interesting comments, expressing their own evaluations and thoughts. This present study, however, is concerned with what kind of ideas they preferred and how they selected them, when they published their essays, and how they described the significance of these works.

* An earlier version of this paper was presented at the panel on “Local Buddhasms and Transnational Contacts, 1868–1945” (IAHR, 30 March 2005), as “Japanese Zen on the State: A Comparative Study of D. T. Suzuki and Inouye Shūten, 1898–1915.” My sincere appreciation goes to the participants in the session: Ishii Kōsei, Richard Jaffe, Donald Lopez, Thomas Tweed, and Wayne Yokoyama, as well as the audience at our panel, for their invaluable comments. I am indebted to the discussions and e-mail exchanges with the participants after the conference, and to anonymous readers of this paper for their constructive comments. This study was supported in part by Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (Program B, No. 16720014).

1. Although Suzuki wrote his name as “Daisetz” and Inoue as “Inouye,” I use the Hepburn style to transliterate both.
2. Suzuki started contributing his essays to the journal from October 1900 until June 1915, which number fifty-seven in total, while Inoue contributed eighty-seven essays from January 1906 to August 1915. They sometimes wrote two essays at a time.
This paper deals with the period from the late 1890s to the turn of the twentieth century, a time that saw an upsurge of reactionary nationalism, following a couple of decades of a pro-Western atmosphere. Christianity, as a “religion from the West,” faced a storm of serious criticism, as in the well-known lese-majesty case in 1891 that forced a Japanese Christian, Uchimura Kanzō 内村鑑三 (1861–1930), to resign from Dai-ichi High School in Tokyo. In this respect, it is worth considering how the contacts of both Suzuki and Inoue with Westerners might have affected the construction of their religious ideas, as well as their views on the state and rising nationalism.

Social Setting of Buddhist Modernization

Following the severe condemnation of Buddhism by Confucian and Kokugaku (National Learning) scholars, as well as that contained in the Chinese translations of critical discourses by Christian missionaries during the late Edo period, early Meiji Buddhism was subject to political turbulence and a nationwide anti-Buddhist campaign, known as haibutsu kishaku 廃仏毀釈 (KASHIWAHARA 1973a, pp. 519–23; Thelle 1987, Chaps. 1–2; Ketelaar 1990, Chaps. 1–2). On the other hand, the colonization of Japan’s neighboring countries by Western powers and the unequal treaties made with them were seen as grave threats, even after Japan became a member of the international community. Motivated by the fear of being colonized, together with the persecution of Christians throughout the Tokugawa period, it was still the norm for Japanese Buddhist scholars to study Christianity prejudicially, regarding it as an “evil religion” (jakyō 邪教). By engaging in nationalistic political activism and discussing the Buddhist role of protecting the nation, these concerned Buddhists were also anticipating reformist movements within the Buddhist order (KASHIWAHARA 1973b, pp. 544–49). Given the situation, both externally and internally, the significance of Western scholarship of Buddhism became apparent in Japanese academia. Buddhist denominations started dispatching students overseas as well as delegations that accompanied the Meiji government’s official envoys to Europe (HONGANJI SHIRYŌ KENKYŪJO 1969, pp. 270–83; Thelle 1987, pp. 78–82).5

4. For more details on the historical transition of nationalism from the late nineteenth to twentieth-century Japan, see for example, Maruyama 1992 and Matsumoto 1996.

5. Owing to financial stability, Jōdo Shinshū played a leading role in the overseas mission. As is widely known, its strongholds mostly survived the assaults. Mori Ryūkichi states that the new policy of confiscating temple property did not affect the Honganji denominations (both Higashi and Nishi), because their capital depended solely on donations from members, which enabled them to save extraordinary amount of wealth (Mori 1976, pp. 406–7). In 1887, the Society for Communication with Western Buddhists (Obei Bukkyō Tsūshinkai 欧米仏教通信会) was founded by teachers of the Futsū Kyōkō, which was later renamed the Buddhist Propagation Society (Kaigai Senkyōkai 海外宣教会) (HONGANJI SHIRYŌ KENKYŪJO 1969, pp. 311–12). The following year saw the publication of the Japanese periodical, Kaigai Bukkyō jijō 海外仏教事情 (1888–1894), which reported the
In 1886, a group of students from Futsū Kyōkō (present-day Ryūkoku University) established the Hanseikai (known as the “Temperance Association” in English, which is an unusual title for Jōdo Shinshū especially as its teaching does not prohibit the drinking of alcohol). It seems that these students perceived temperance as something that symbolized “civilization” and “moral conduct” because this was encouraged by Christian missionaries who worked as agents representing the “civilized” West. Therefore, it is most likely that they formed this group as a reaction to the religious practices at Dōshisha (present-day Dōshisha University), a Christian theological and English school in Kyoto, whose location was close to their own campus. In this sense, Notto Thelle describes the Hanseikai as “the first representative association of young Buddhist reformers” (1987, p. 201).

Just as the young Tokutomi Sohō 徳富蘇峰 (1863–1957) coined the term Tenpō no rōjin 天保の老人 (“elders of the Tenpō [1830–1844] era”) to distinguish his own generation, born around the Meiji Restoration, from the people who became involved in the construction of the foundation of the new government (Maruyama 1986, pp. 33–36),7 the younger Buddhists, who did not actually experience life under the regime of local feudal lords (daimyō 大名), played a vital role in the Buddhist modernization movements in the 1890s (Mori 1976; Yoshida 1992). It should be noted that both Suzuki and Inoue were born after the Restoration and in terms of their perception of Christianity, this generational gap offered them another approach to the “Other” of the West through similarly criticizing Christianity, while presenting the role of religion within a new paradigm of civilization and enlightenment, social progress, as being rational and scientific.

Some Hanseikai members and quite a few Tetsugakukan 哲学館 (present-day Tōyō University) graduates later founded a lay-oriented Buddhist group called the Bukkyō Seito Dōshikai 仏教清徒同志会, or Buddhist Puritan Society, in 1899 (its name was changed to the Shin Bukkyōto Dōshikai 新仏教徒同志会, or New Buddhist Society, in 1903).8 As the name indicates, there was some Christian

---

7. Tokutomi Sohō (a.k.a. Tokutomi Iichirō 猪一郎) is quite well known as one of the Kumamoto Band students who studied at Dōshisha and later became a nationalistic journalist. For a detailed historical study on the idea of “generation,” see also Kōsaka 1961.
8. Despite the fact that the name seems to have altered quite a lot in the English translation, it is common for historians of modern Japanese Buddhism to call them “Shin Bukkyōto” (new Buddhists) and their movements “Shin Bukkyō undo,” (new Buddhist movements), which I similarly follow. For details of the dates and names in English, see Thelle 1987.
influence on the Buddhist reform movements, particularly among the younger generation whose motivation was to reform the hierarchical structure of institutional Buddhism (Mori 1976, pp. 410–14; Thelle 1987, pp. 196–213). This Society published a monthly journal, Shin Bukkyō, which offered an opportunity for Buddhists (especially the laity) to exchange ideas with other reform-minded people. Their rationalist and non-sectarian mission statements stressed “sound Buddhist faith,” “radical reform of society,” “free discussion on Buddhism and other religions,” “extermination of all superstition,” “not [recognizing] the necessity of preserving traditional religious systems and ceremonies,” and “rejection of all sorts of political protection,” which were almost identical with those of the Japanese Unitarians as can be seen in their journal, Rikugō zasshi 六合雑誌.10

Meanwhile, Yoshida Kyūichi reveals the New Buddhists’ connection with the socialists and the Kōtoku Incident 幸徳事件, or the so-called “High Treason Incident” (Taigyaku jiken 大逆事件) (1992, Chaps. 5–6).11 Prior to this occurrence, after the promulgation of the Imperial Constitution in 1889, whose Article 28 defined freedom of religion as “within limits not prejudicial to peace and order” (Tanaka 1976, p. 19), Itō Hirobumi 伊藤博文 (1841–1909) published an annotation to this, defining these limits to assert that while “inner” religious belief would not be restricted, “outward” practices in the public sphere should be controlled and not to violate the law (Itō 1889, pp. 52–53). Inoue Kowashi 井上毅 (1843–1895) was much clearer in his definition, dividing religious practice into “inner mind” (naisō 内想) and “outward practice” (gaiken 外顕), permitting the former and restricting the latter (Inoue 1966, p. 10).12 This helps to explain Uchimura’s enforced resignation due to his “disrespect” for the Imperial Rescript on Education in 1891, and the Kōtoku Incident, whose impact on Japanese society
was extraordinarily serious. Brian Victoria shows that the incident caused the Sōtō, Rinzai, and Jōdo Shin denominations to issue numerous directives to each of their affiliated temples, and statements apologizing for “not having adequately controlled” their priests in the said incident (1997, pp. 49–52).  

Concessions to political control over that of religious freedom coincided with the following attributes in the late nineteenth century and the turn of the next. Maruyama Masao states that the late Meiji through to Taishō periods saw a non-political “individualism,” derived from social apathy and a “convergence” of loyalty to the emperor system (Maruyama 1992, pp. 77–103; see also Kamishima 1961, pp. 195–246). In sum, the Buddhist link to Christian socialists and the Kōtoku Incident played quite a crucial role in the new Buddhist movements (Yoshida 1992, Chap. 6;  Ama 2005, pp. 220–41). In the next section, I apply Maruyama’s analysis, though with some modifications, as it is useful when examining the cases of both Suzuki and Inoue, particularly in regard to their presentations of spirituality and stances on socio-political issues.

Findings from Suzuki’s Discourses

Suzuki translated two addresses of Shaku Sōen’s 釈 宗演 (1859–1919) into English for the World’s Parliament of Religions in Chicago while still a student at Tokyo Imperial University and, later, Paul Carus’s Gospel of Buddha into Japanese. In 1897, with a recommendation of Shaku, Suzuki “went to Carus to learn from him the various skills required to disseminate knowledge of Buddhism to the West” (Snodgrass 2003, p. 260). Prior to his move to the United States, however, the young Suzuki had written extensively on religion and society for several major journals and expressed his opinions on social issues and rationalist perceptions of religion. He was critical of the magnificent temple buildings for symbolizing “monuments of ignorance,” and held that imposing rules for individual faith, which would limit freedom of thought, is “extremely oppressive and bureaucratic” (Suzuki 1894, p. 154).

Such a rationalist stance presents quite a contrast image of his ideas as he would later translate several works by a Swedish mystic, Emmanuel Swedenborg...
in the 1910s. This variation indicates that his main concerns shifted from time to time, and hence it is significant to take a look at them within their historical contexts.\(^\text{16}\) Thomas Tweed (2005; see Tweed in this issue) interprets this complexity as several “phases” of Suzuki’s intellectual and religious developments in his long life of over ninety years, which did not necessarily follow a logical or linear progression. Rather, they quite often intertwined and overlapped each other. I will focus on the shift from the phase of the above-mentioned critical discourses that might be coined Critical Suzuki to what Tweed regards as Occult Suzuki, which exemplifies his penchant for Swedenborgianism and Theosophy.\(^\text{17}\)

KIRITA Kiyohide examines Suzuki’s writings including those not contained in the old edition of the *Suzuki Daisetsu zenshū* 鈴木大拙全集, revealing “his attitudes towards the state and society,” and finds that “Suzuki was much clearer in his views on the state and society following his move to the United States in the late 1890s” (1994, pp. 51, 54). For example, his essays were quite disparaging of “hypocritical” ultranationalists who “manipulate the weakness of the Japanese people, embracing the imperial family and the imperial rescripts and attempting to imbue them with a religious significance” (*SUZUKI* 1898, p. 71, partially quoted in KIRITA 1994, p. 54). In addition, he publicly expressed his sympathy for socialist ideas while in America. Although he never met with any Japanese socialists there, Suzuki wrote an essay from LaSalle disapproving of the prohibition of the Social Democratic Party in Japan, criticizing the government’s action as “reckless,” and neglecting “social progress” (*SUZUKI* 1901, p. 43). Here below, are his ideas for the best possible society:

The greatest possible motivation we can have for organizing our society is the chance to develop our natural abilities freely and apply them toward the advance of society as a whole…. The basis of society lies on no-self, the secret of progress is derived from “the vow to save all sentient beings without exception.”  

(*SUZUKI* 1901, p. 45, partially quoted in KIRITA 1994, p. 56)

Thus, his “religious aspiration” was to achieve equal opportunity in both education and employment in an “unjust” society (*SUZUKI* 1901, p. 47). He also wrote to Nishida Kitarō 西田幾多郎 (1870–1945) saying he could derive “socialism from [his way of understanding] religion,” because it is “more comprehensive than morality, hence it flows into politics, institutions, self-discipline,” whereas morality does not go beyond personal practice (*Suzuki* to Nishida, 3 December 1902, *SDZ* 36, pp. 225–26). It should be noted that he told Yamamoto

---

\(^{16}\) Two sources that deal positively with Suzuki’s impact on Western Buddhists/sympathizers are FIELDS 1992 and HAGIWARA 2001. For the role of nationalism on Suzuki’s Zen thought, see ICHIKAWA 1975; SHARP 1994 and 1995; VICTORIA 1997.

\(^{17}\) Apart from the above phases, Elsa I. Legettimo Arias kindly mentioned the Philological Suzuki to evaluate his numerous translations of sutras and commentaries, although this will need to be discussed in another paper. Oral communication, IAHK, 30 March 2005.
Ryōkichi 山本良吉 (1871–1942) about the philanthropic activities of Christian churches in Chicago, as well as criticizing those who overemphasized the imperial rescripts in order to confine freedom of thought in Japan (Suzuki to Yamamoto, 14 June 1898, SDZ 36, pp. 150–51).

When speculating on the reasons for such harsh statements, it is also helpful to remember his educational background. Although he entered Tokyo Imperial University, he was not enrolled as a regular undergraduate but as a senka 選科 student, which did not allow him to follow the full curriculum regardless of paying the same amount of tuition (Tōkyō Teikoku Daigaku 1932, pp. 474–80). Such unfair treatment, as well as his experience of poverty in spite of receiving elite education, might explain his criticism of bureaucracy and hierarchy within Japanese society and his “critical spirit” in general (Kirita 1996, pp. 128–32).

In this respect, it is beneficial to consider his other writings on social issues. For instance, he reports from LaSalle that the American public is sympathetic to a Japanese victory over the Russians (Suzuki 1904a, p. 412), while in a separate essay he evaluates a soldier who fights without “ego” as “spiritual,” and concludes by stating, “Let us then shuffle off this mortal coil whenever it becomes necessary, and not raise a grunting voice against the fates.... Resting in this conviction, Buddhists carry the banner of Dharma over the dead and dying until they gain final victory” (Suzuki 1904b, pp. 181–82). Although this argument seems contrary to his thoughts on social progress based on “no-self” published three years earlier, it actually is consistent in terms of the “comprehensiveness” of religion that “flows into politics,” but perhaps except for the “vow to save all sentient beings.” As a university student, exemption from military service was the norm, and therefore he never went to the battlefield, which could be another reason for such uncritical expressions on warfare. Having no military experience, it is likely that he learned such ideas from Shaku Sōen, whose articles in Open Court, which Suzuki later included in Sermons of a Buddhist Abbot (1906), contained similar arguments on a Buddhist view on war (Victoria 1994, pp. 109–10).

What is significant for the purposes of this present study, however, is that Suzuki makes this political issue a kind of personal practice. Such an individualization of spirituality without a socio-political context is crucial because this would be how he later defined religion as something “mystical” (shinpi 神秘) that transcends scientific analysis, going beyond the “social order and national

18. Although it is beyond the scope of this paper, another important subject to think about is how much the bushido ideology influenced Suzuki in his construction of such an aggressive image of Zen. Victoria deals with this topic as well (1997, pp. 105–12), but actually Suzuki had not said much about swordsmanship prior to the publication of Zen and its Influence on Japanese Culture in 1938, although he added a chapter on this subject in the 1959 Bollingen edition. Considering the long absence of militant discourses on Zen until the death of his wife Beatrice in 1939, it appears he refrained from expressing his inclination toward bushido, at least while she was alive. I am grateful to Richard Jaffe and especially to Wayne Yokoyama for reminding me of Beatrice’s influence, and that of bushido, on Suzuki.
interests” or various ideas like “socialism, nationalism, or individualism” (Suzuki 1900, pp. 58–59). Despite working under the “rationalist” Paul Carus (Tweed 2000, p. 60), his letters to his friends in Japan repeatedly expressed his penchant for “mystic, uncommunicable [sic] experience” (Suzuki to Nishida, 19 March 1904, SDZ 36, p. 248, English in original). He was more attracted to Swedenborgianism through Albert J. Edmunds (Yoshinaga 2005, pp. 37–43) or a book like The Varieties of Religious Experience by William James (Suzuki to Nishida, 23 September 1902, SDZ 36, p. 222). The question here, which I will examine later, is how his inclination toward individualistic “mystical” experience could be related to evaluating militant action more than spiritual humanitarianism.

After returning to Japan, Suzuki became a board member of the New Buddhist Society, and continued to contribute several essays, mostly on social issues, to its journal. In 1909, he found a teaching job at Gakushuin 学習院 as well as at Tokyo Imperial University. However, considering the political implications of publishing in this journal, particularly as the prisoners of the Kōtoku Incident, who were on death row, subscribed and contributed to it, it must have been quite a challenge for a Gakushuin professor to be an active member of this Society, though he did not criticize the imperial family as he had done in previous essays. He wrote in a personal letter to Paul Carus in 1911, however, as follows:

The Japanese are very narrow-minded. The government seems to be trying to suppress every new doctrine that may conflict with the old notions of loyalty or patriotism. Since the war reactionaries are in full power, and militarism runs wild.

(Suzuki to Carus, 23 February 1911, SDZ 36, pp. 343–44, English in original)

Suzuki’s essays in Shin Bukkyō during the 1910s were mostly critical commentaries on Japanese society and its “uncivilized” customs (Suzuki 1910b; 1910c). By comparing this journal with Zendō 禅道, a Zen monthly under Suzuki’s editorship (published from 1910 to 1923), Kirita uncovers “a clear difference in his approach to the two publications” (1994, p. 58). Suzuki states in Zendō that analytical classification is an “enemy to Zen life” because it terminates the source of life as in scientific experiments (1911c, pp. 8–9). He even dealt with “Christian Zen” (Kikyō Zen 基教禅) in order to try to find some common ground with Zen in a mystical unification of God and a person with no ego or non-dualistic expressions of spirituality (Suzuki 1911b, pp. 2–4).

Such a division of labor in religion might be a reflection of his “spirituality” that urged him to write conservative commentaries for Shin Bukkyō, which had been banned occasionally. Still, he delivered a speech before his students

19. Edmunds was a librarian at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania and once worked at Open Court for a short period. He first met Suzuki in LaSalle in the summer of 1901 (Tweed 2005; See Tweed in this issue).

20. Shin Bukkyō was banned in September 1910, October 1913, and May 1914.
concerning the role of the elite in society and the necessity of being mindful of the poor in order to build a fairer society (Suzuki 1911a). Naturally, as a teacher, he writes about the need to put more money toward education rather than the military by comparing this with American millionaires, who donated enormous amounts of money to educational and cultural facilities. He also stresses the necessity of educating young students with a new kind of morality that teaches them “how they can achieve the complete spiritual personality” and “let them acknowledge their national culture and its origin,” instead of just showing loyalty to the emperor (Suzuki 1910a, pp. 711–12).

In sum, we can see Suzuki’s gradual division of the presentation of religion into phases of rationalism, social criticism, and non-political, individualistic spirituality. When he stated, “Zen does not allow assumption or presumption, but needs actual experience” (Suzuki 1912, p. 2), he probably did not consider what he had said about the Russo-Japanese War in 1904. These seemingly contradictory statements on Buddhist social engagement reflected his definition of religion or spirituality derived from his own understanding of reality, which was crystallized into a concept that was separated from the logical world of practicality.

Inoue Shūten’s Critical Buddhism

Although not very many sources are available regarding the life of Inoue Shūten, Yoshida Kyūichi (1992), in his pioneering study, brings to light legal documents from the Kōtoku Incident investigation. Moreover, Akamatsu Tesshin (1989) reveals a detailed picture of his life, through interviewing Inoue’s wife and relatives. Ishii Kōsei (2004) has recently pointed out Inoue’s connections with a Chinese monk, T’ai Hsu 太虚 (1890–1945).22

Inoue was born into a merchant family in a village in Tottori prefecture, and was sent to a Sōtōshū temple in Kurayoshi in his childhood together with his younger brother. His family also moved to Kurayoshi, where Christian missionaries visited occasionally to spread the Gospel and teach English to the local people, and it was probably there, Akamatsu assumes, that Inoue first learned English (1989, p. 519). Missionaries of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions had been visiting Tottori since the 1880s, and had eventually opened the Tottori Mission Station in 1890 (Rowland 1890; Moriya 2004b).

21. This kind of conservative vision of the social structure was not unique to Suzuki. In fact, it was quite common for intellectuals of that time. See, for example, the case of Yanagita Kunio (Nakamura 1985, pp. 130–70).

22. Other studies on Inoue have also been undertaken by Fukushima Hirotaka (1976) and Sahashi Höyū (1982). T’ai Hsu is known for having written an appeal to Japanese Buddhists to act against the military aggression in China in the 1930s, only to receive a negative response (Nose 1997; Chūgai nippō 1997). For more on T’ai Hsu in English, see Welch (1968, p. 56) and Pittman (1993, pp. 71–83). I thank Lori Pierce for this information.
Inoue entered Sôtôshû Daigakurin in 1895, and then traveled around southern China, Ceylon, India, Burma with Riku Etsugan, and published a travel journal, *Indo jijō* (Inoue 1903, p. 2). It is most likely that while meeting Anagarika Dharmapala (1880–1933) (Inoue 1910b, p. 470), he was offered a job as a foreign correspondent for the Sinhalese periodical, *Sarasavi Sandaresa*. In 1904, he was drafted into the army, serving as an interpreter until his discharge (due to tuberculosis) the following year. He joined the New Buddhist Society while working at Kobe College, a Christian women's college. He was later employed at the United States and British Consulate-Generals, and also assisted the British Ambassador Charles Eliot and Consul Montague Paske-Smith with their books, *Japanese Buddhism* (Parlett 1969, p. ix) and *Japanese Traditions of Christianity* (1930) respectively.

Previous studies show that his thoughts centered on peace and non-violence derived from his studies of Theravada Buddhism. Such a course of ideas most likely led him to become sympathetic to the socialists who openly presented anti-war messages in their weeklies. He joined a socialist group, the Kôbe Heimin Club, in 1906, which eventually put him in the position of being classified as an important witness in the Kôtoku Incident in 1910. Although Inoue's education at the seminary may not be considered on the same level as that of Suzuki's, what makes it different in terms of an analysis of structural violence in society is his subscriptions to socialist newspapers as well as being a member of the socialist group (Taigyaku Jiken Kiroku Kankôkai 1964, pp. 596–97). Unlike Suzuki's abstract notions of warfare and the “spiritual” soldier, Inoue critically reports the cruelty and lack of spirituality among military officers as well as the fallacies of politicians during the Russo-Japanese War (Inoue 1906, pp. 84–85). Such pacifist ideas and a refusal to justify the use of violent means to realize social change might have made him decide not to...

---

23. While Yoshida reports that Inoue entered a college in India around 1896 (1992, p. 480), Akamatsu points out that this was unlikely to have happened to a sixteen-year-old student, and therefore it is more reasonable to say that he entered Sôtôshû Daigakurin in 1895 (1989, pp. 519, 547). Sahashi, on the other hand, assumes from a message of condolence for Inoue that his status at the seminary was probably as a *senka* student because he had graduated only from a junior high school in Tottori (1982, pp. 31–34).

24. I thank Ishii Kôsei for kindly showing me copies of this book.

25. Although previous studies have stated that he was a correspondent for this Sinhalese periodical, unfortunately I have been unable to find in it any of Inoue's essays in either English or Sinhalese.

26. While Yoshida and Akamatsu affirm his employment at Kobe College, the list of employees does not contain his name (Kôbe Jogakuin Gojûnen Shukugakai 1925). It is not known whether this was due to his religious affiliation, though he might have been only a part-time teacher there. For more on the history of Kobe College, see Ishii Noriko (2004).

27. Note that Suzuki's interest in socialism covered social progress and equal opportunity, not the anti-war claims by socialists during the Russo-Japanese War, which put them at constant risk of arrest on charges of social disorder by promoting peace.
associate with a Sōtōshū priest, Uchiyama Gudō 内山愚童 (1874–1911). Uchiyama had planned to meet him before being arrested in the Kōtoku Incident, though the meeting never took place because Inoue pretended to be out. Whether or not it was due to the news media’s depiction of the socialists is not known, but it might have been what Inoue had heard about Uchiyama’s radical views justifying the use of explosives so as to achieve revolution, which the latter made while touring the Kansai region (YOSHIDA 1992, pp. 421–24).

Around the time of the raid in September 1910, Inoue wrote a cynical essay on the overzealousness of a schoolteacher, who eventually died in a fire while attempting to remove a photograph of the emperor, the lack of freedom of speech and thought, as well as complaints about the police investigation (INOUE 1910d, p. 1097). Following the raid, he wrote a series of articles on peace and war, the first of which describes how appealing for peace in times of peace is “remarkably ordinary,” while demanding peace during wartime can be quite risky and problematic (INOUE 1911, p. 1107). He goes on to state:

War is the greatest sin, whatever the name be given to it…. In sum, war is an uncharitable act to make a profit out of it and commit murder…which is indeed far from humanity…. The true advocates of peace should stand between the warring nations to promote peace for the people as well as to remember “the tremendous evil-doing of war.” (INOUE 1911, p. 1108)

Inoue identifies his own stance as anti-war and peace-loving, and concludes that discourses on peace should be based upon religion so that it can be established in the minds of humanity. Such abstract and “ordinary” discourses do not see the reality of the arms race promoted by an expansionist economy. For this reason, he firmly states that Buddhism and Christianity share the same ideal, which is to create absolute peace without self-interest beyond borders (INOUE 1911, pp. 1110–14). Considering his help in the translation and Japanese notes for a book about the persecution of Christians (PASKE-SMITH 1930), we can find his perception of reality quite different from that of Suzuki’s. While the latter saw reality in light of religious/spiritual experience and, as Nakamura Akira

---


29. In his letter to Itō Shōshin 伊藤証信 dated 1 January 1908, Uchiyama expressed his dissatisfaction with the superficial arguments for reform by religionists, and went on to deal with the need to destroy the present government (KASHIWAGI 1979, p. 239). I do not, however, intend to illustrate Uchiyama simply as an assassin or a terrorist. Rather, I think it necessary to consider the desperate situations he and other socialists were forced into, especially after the Akahata jiken 赤旗事件 (Red Flag Incident) in 1908, during which fourteen socialists and anarchists were arrested.

30. This issue was banned, YOSHIDA assumes, partly because of Inoue’s critical article (1992, pp. 340–41). As Akamatsu has indicated, Inoue decided not to regard himself as a priest of a Sōtōshū presumably because of the subsequent reaction of the Sōtōshū headquarters to the Kōtoku Incident. (AKAMATSU 1989, p. 521).
describes, finally regarding “reality as a norm” (Nakamura 1985, pp. 123–26), Inoue’s harsh criticism of structural injustice shows that he considered the existing socio-political authority as secondary to the Buddhist teachings.

Through translating three chapters of *The Soul of a People* by Harold Fielding-Hall, a district magistrate in rural Burma after the third Burmese War, Inoue was able to introduce a Buddhist stance on peace and war. It was an ethnographic study on the Burmese people and Theravada Buddhism, which was quite a different approach from that of Suzuki who, while in America, expressed that it was the duty of “Japanese Mahayana Buddhists” to disseminate the significance of the Mahayana teachings and replace those of Theravada in Western academia (Suzuki 2002; Moriya 2004a).

Meanwhile, Fielding-Hall argues that one of the reasons for the success of British colonization was, “in this war religion had no place.... for all the assistance it was to them in the war, the Burmese might have had no faith at all.” He goes on to explain, “the teachings of the Buddha forbid war. All killing is wrong, all war is hateful; nothing is more terrible than this destroying of our fellowman” [sic] (Fielding-Hall 1906, p. 55). Inoue annotated the phrase “korosu nakare” [殺す勿れ] ([thou] shall not kill) with emphasis in his Japanese translation (Inoue 1912, p. 479), in order to interpret the sentence, “There is absolutely no escaping this commandment” (Fielding-Hall 1906, p. 55). What contrasts Suzuki’s illustration of the brave Buddhist soldier is the following description, which Inoue did not omit in his translation, namely, “No soldier could be a fervent Buddhist; no nation of Buddhists could be good soldiers; for not only does Buddhism not inculcate bravery, but it does not inculcate obedience. Each man is the ruler of his life, but the very essence of good fighting is discipline, and discipline, subjection, is unknown to Buddhism” (Fielding-Hall 1906, p. 76).

As a fluent speaker of English, Inoue was well aware of the works of Suzuki. He noted that besides Nukariya Kaiten 忽滑谷快天 (1867–1934), Suzuki was one of the best scholars with a thorough knowledge of Western scholarship (Inoue 1910a, p. 419) and that Suzuki “should not be working at a school like Gakushūin” (Inoue 1910c, p. 1001). Commenting on an article from Zendō, Inoue critically wrote that he was indeed surprised at the policy of the editorial committee, with “cosmopolitan” Suzuki as the chief editor, to have agreed to publish such an article (Inoue 1912, p. 1179). This article claimed that an ordinance was needed to demand newspapers and magazines “not to publicize your majesty’s photograph” in order to preserve the dignity of the imperial family, because such periodicals would be discarded without any care or respect (Shizetsu 1912, p. 7). From then on, Inoue stopped praising Suzuki and after Shin Bukkyō ceased publication in 1915, he openly criticized his understanding of Zen in the late 1910s and throughout the 1920s in Zendō or other publications. 31

31. For a brief sketch of the arguments, see Inoue 1918 and Suzuki 1918. The debate between
that Inoue, through his rationalist, ethical Zen, combined with a critical view on structural injustice, pointed out Suzuki’s ambivalent socio-political stance.

Conclusion

Having experienced the banning of the *Shin Bukkyō* several times in the 1910s, the editors finally closed it down in 1915. Nevertheless, Suzuki and Inoue continued to advocate Buddhism through other publications and public lectures. As this paper has shown, their individual presentations of this religion differed greatly. While in America, Suzuki realized the urgent “responsibility” of Japanese Buddhists to spread the Mahayana teachings among Westerners, whose perceptions had only been obtained up to then from what was called “Hinayana” in those days, which should demonstrate why he had such enthusiasm for producing so many works in English throughout his lifetime. His academic writings gradually shifted toward a more abstract but crystallized, non-political “spirituality” that would later display itself in the significance of Zen and its relationship with Japanese culture. His political statements were published separately from his religious essays, and became more moderate in tone from the time of the Kōtoku Incident, which occurred just after his return from America.

Inoue, on the other hand, respected Southern Buddhism highly for its absolute pacifism. Such admiration probably came from meeting with Theravada Buddhists during his trips to South and Southeast Asia and his recruitment into the army, for his discourses were mostly written out of his own experiences. In addition, his social analyses were based upon sound knowledge combined with egalitarian ideas acquired from socialism. His rationalist Buddhism taught him to be critical of unjust social structures, even though it meant that his profile would put him under incessant surveillance by plain-clothes policemen and military police over various reasons for the rest of his life. In this sense, Inoue’s spiritual transcendence proved to be effective in the political sphere.

Although neither Suzuki nor Inoue identified themselves as socialists, they both advocated equal opportunity and freedom for the welfare of the whole society. The difference was that while Suzuki’s stance was to find it “reasonable” for the authorities to restrict freedom to some extent (1913, p. 899), Inoue pointed out that it was the constitutional right to have freedom of thought and publication (1913, pp. 896–97). These different approaches to political authority, together with the contrastive perception of mystical/rational Zen, brought about rather emotional and exaggerated debates about the different understandings of Zen teachings and the interpretation of its classics (Inoue 1925, pp. 346–47).

In sum, it can be said that *Shin Bukkyō* exemplified itself as a “magnetic field” (Ama 2005, p. 225) among those Buddhists who sought for freedom of thought

the two from the late 1910s to the 1920s requires separate, detailed study. Ishii Kōsei is planning to conduct research on this issue.
and religion and resisted state oppression, most crucially symbolized by the Kōtoku Incident. However moderate they may have been, Suzuki’s discourses in this journal illustrated what he imagined to be the best possible society as opposed to the one in his day, which he saw as “narrow-minded.” In this sense, his experience in a foreign country enabled him to express himself publicly and freely. Inoue, as a radical critic of Japanese society, openly caricatured the Japanese nation and its culture as lacking in spirituality. In other words, it might be possible to conclude that Suzuki’s divided spiritual transcendence contributed to the deconstruction of the commonsensical world order through freeing one’s own self within a kind of chaotic conceptual world, whereas Inoue’s deconstruction was not separated from that of social engagement and therefore, he was able to reveal a sort of “anti cosmos” (IZUTSU 1989) thus replacing the existing order. The irony, however, is that Suzuki’s representation of Zen needed to be related to Japanese culture, while Inoue characterized Zen as a means to criticize the spiritless Japanese people.
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