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Preface

To make this short treatise I have been led from three following reasons: namely, first, to outline my thought for my future benefit; secondly, to obtain an assurance from the authority concerning my conviction; thirdly to express my gratitude toward them to whom I owe my morals and its philosophy.

At the threshold of practical life man naturally asks himself as to the attitude which he, as a member of its one of its members, should rightly assume toward society. To what extent he must sacrifice himself for social solidarity and inheritance; and what innovation he must introduce for the sake of both social and individual progress; and when thus thought, whether essential interest of individual really can be coordinate with those of society under existing conditions; these are the questions as important as they are natural. This importance I begin to realize as I approach the end of my school life and to face the larger field of practice.

In order to avoid any academic discussion on this subject, I first observed present conditions of Japanese society to which I belong and have to serve. And finding many irrational and immoral practices I trace their legitimate cause to the so-called-Bushido, a moral code written traditionally in the heart of Japanese. It has been so practiced so inherited that it has been thought, thought—mistakenly, that the social solidarity of Japan can not be maintained without this social code. Mr. Nitobe, a prominent leader of Japanese educators and the author of "Bushido" its professed defender: he defends Bushido as if the important question of concerning the religious education of Japanese student, put by his inquirer, was satisfactorily disposed of. For my part, however, to take such an attitude as he takes toward Bushido is impossible; may, even more, I am an opponent and I call myself a critic.
when I see no ultimate common interest on the plane of Bushido, between society and myself except degradation and moral suicide. Criticism is, then, my attitude toward Japanese society. I do not, however, pretend to be as such for the sake of mere polemic contentions or partisan spirit. I would destroy such prejudice and narrowness which has hindered perception of truth and advancement of society and individuals.

Being deeply convinced of right to correct wrong, I may overlook any censure laid against me as disloyalty or treason in assuming an attitude of criticism against national inheritance. Prudence suggests that I should once more review my thought before authority and obtain its approval. There was a time when I was myself an admirer of Bushido as is Mr. Nitobe. But it was so by virtue of entire ignorance of the better nature of humanity, which, when discovered, has made it impossible to submit to Bushido practices. From that ignorance to enlightenment I have been brought by my much revered Professors into whose personal influence providence has led me. These three years of study with them has undone my inherited scepticism and convinced my better life to life devotional and religious. Hence it my privilege and joy to collect my scattered ideas and to express to them my gratitude and thanks.
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Introduction

The field of ethics is persons. Morality does not hang in the air floating age after age and from place to place. It must have some definite personal subject to whom it belongs. For moral relations exist between person and non-person; man can not be said to have any obligation to animals or things. In all cases of moral activity, either social or individual, the necessary presupposition is the existence of a person or persons as the subject. Ethics must, therefore, be conceived on the personal plane.

Some of those who are aware of this fact are still apt to step out unconsciously into impersonalism. The failure is due to the unclear thought of human nature. Man as the subject of rationality has two fold nature of universality and individuality. This is equally true as the subject of morality. If either of these two fold meanings of man is obscured, necessary outcome will be an upbuilding of an ethical sphink.

Moral devastation is great when the universal man is ignored. Fichte rightly defined man as three fold, namely, sense, intellect, and will. The definition has been more or less mentioned by ancient as well as modern philosophers. But it does not seem to influenced public conscience of old and even yet it has not convinced our time as it should, because the common sense man is emperisists in this matter who advocate the conception of the sense man alone, while the scholastics are eager to follow nothing else but intellect. The former are near-sighted and the
latter are too abstract and thus both fail to see the significance of human will where the universal man is found. The natural result of such shortcoming is the moral atomism, and the formation of aristocracy either in wealth or in prowess or knowledge, because there can be no equality apart from the universal man.

The importance of the universality of man could not be, then, too much emphasized in the face of this inherent tendency toward aristocracy. Meanwhile we must remember that the true universality of man is to be secured only by recognizing the fact of individuality of the moral subject. Neglect of this point lands us into moral mysticism which is in the end no better than moral atomism. History has proven how often the universal man has lost footing in the individual man and wrought mischief in the field of humanity. Moral individuality, therefore, is no less necessary than its universality, but in the abstract form both principles conflict and no solution can be found. The only way out is to conceive them on the personal plane and to reach the universal through the individual in which the universal is implicit as its ultimate end.

Any ethical system worthy of consideration must observe the above two fold nature of man. In examining Bushido, as a moral code of Japan, therefore, the same should be the standard by which its value is to be determined. The field of investigation, however, may not be limited
to the formal codes alone, but also it extends to the underlying beliefs as its source, and even to its efficiency in the modern society. In so doing, I am conscious that I cannot give an exhaustive treatment of this nature but a bare outline which may be filled sometime in the future.
Bushido as a Precepts of Knighthood

Speaking broadly Bushido may mean the moral codes of feudal Japan. More particularly, however, as the very name suggests, it is a precepts of knighthood. The establishment of the political institution of feudalism, late in the twelfth century, gave to the Samurai, the military class, great honor and privileges and hence corresponding responsibilities. This superior place accorded to Samurai above all other classes soon made them feel the need of a common standing of behavior. And, as a result of the necessity of satisfying this demand, Bushido became existent. Previous to this both these codes and the military class had existed for centuries. What the new establishment essentially added was the formation of aristocracy of prowess and the monopoly of the moral codes for the Samurai-aristocrats.

For the Samurai Bushido arose. They are thought as an inseparable combination, as a substance to attributes. From its very outset the latter presupposed the former as its legitimate subject with whom it exists and without whom it disappears. The inner light of Samurai is the sense of Bushido, and apart from it there could be no true Samurai. Whatever the contents of codes may have been, this is a sorry combination in its moral practice since the presupposed subject implies a class distinction which
in itself irrational and debased idea. That one should be moral on account of his occupation is another way of saying that the sense of duty arises solely from his profession. Such a theory may have weight for the metaphysical realist who advocates that the moral idea is the mere product of environments. But a little reflection helps us to reveal more innate nature of moral idea. The sense of duty never arises in man because he has Samurai/ship; it arises from the fact that he has a soul whose inward worth commands him to serve his righteous life. It is evident that one's soul as such could be no more soul than that of others on account of his profession. This becomes more convincing when we understand the fact that men had existed before Bushido sprang. Hence, the soul of Samurai could be no more moral subject than those of others, though Bushido fails to see this truth since itself has been born in and for the aristocracy.

That a man should be more moral because he is Samurai is to monopolize the right to be "soul" within that class and to exclude the common society from the moral practice. At the rise of Monasticism in the middle ages no one told that that the public should neglect itself morally; yet in fact such one sided stress as, laid upon monastic life deprived the secular society of their self assertive moral dignity
and initiative heroism of self-reform. Spiritual self which lost footing in the common society might find in some sense purification in the monastery, it should be done so only at the expense of public morality. In like manner it is true that Bushido never prohibited any one to conform to its codes, but the rigorous assertion of Samuraihood, which Bushido invariably maintain as if "only condition of moral existence—pressed the sense of self-sufficiency and independence of the common society—the sense indispensable for the moral health and progress of both individual and society. "The flower of flowers the cherry blossom is: "says a wild Japanese poet, comparing Samurai with non-Samurai in their moral capacity, "so the man of men the Samurai is." Whatever good Bushido may have produced for Samurai it can never be set free from its responsibility for the degradation of the common society caused by its moral monopoly.

Thus Bushido broke the law of universal in morals. Existence of duty is due to the reality of soul. Wherever normal soul exists there must be duty in and for it. To be moral is an intrinsic right of such soul which no human artificiality can ignore without a devastation of humanity. Individual is by nature endowed and even obliged to insist upon the inalienable right to be a "soul", in this fact law of universality or
equality of men consists. Bushido, as we have seen in the preceding discussion, evidently transgresses this law by presupposing Samurai as only subject of moral practice. The cause of this transgression is not far to seek when we understand the fact that Bushido was born in the flesh of aristocracy and sought its perfection also under the wing of aristocracy, and thus misses spiritual meaning of man which alone secures equality. In short the transgression is, therefore, due to the unclear conception of humanity.

When moral Codes held by partisan, morals sink into a mere etiquette, Artificial aristocracy can have no iron bond whereby it may secure its members from falling away; and, therefore, it becomes simply matter of taste whether one should remain within his sect and conform to the imposing duty or he should take a refuge into common society and escape from the binding rule at his convenience. In spite of an apparent sternness in dictating duties, Bushido could be no exception to this failure. For there existed two ways which release Samurai from the rule of Bushido, namely, "ochibito" and "nenjo". By the first Samurai becomes a common man and by the latter he enters into priesthood. With Samurai as its subject, and aristocracy implied which breaks the law of universal, Bushido at last must lose its driving force and thus
degrades into a mere etiquette.

Bushido as a Duty Ethics

Ethical stability consists in the sense of duty. Kant's categorical imperative "Thou shalt, thou shalt not" is the indispensable element in morals. What saves morality degrading into a casuistry and inward dishonesty of English utilitarianism is this sense of duty. With it, morality exists and without it, morality disappears, and therefore, it can not be too much emphasized. This categorical imperative Bushido finds in loyalty which is its fundamental motive—the motive to devote oneself to a cause. With loyalty as such no morals can dispense without having its foundation crumbled; yet it is great fallacy to think that this motive of loyalty alone exhausts concrete morality, because it is quite possible for one to practice wrong with good intention. The defect of Bushido lies in this fallacy.

The stern dictate of Bushido loyalty never secured the sanity of moral practice. This is plainly seen when Bushido prescribes an absolute homage to superiors, and when it dictates man to serve to abstract principles. Defending the fidelity of feudal vassals to their lords against American criticism, Mr. Nitobe says that such fidelity is injustice, perhaps, because it is not taste of American. But I am not fully
convincing in of the truth of his remark: inspite of its keen sarcasm. 
The reason of injustice of such fidelity is not because American says so or Irish man thinks so; but because it is fundamentally erroneous and obsures the intrinsic worth of the individual. Individuality of man is not a mere taste of the West—which may rightly be altered on one side of the Pyrenese while remaining on the other: it is rooted deep in the nature of man; it is living truth which no human artificiality can obscure without making humanity degrated. Man may be poor in wealth and knowledge, yet in his very nature lies a dormant right that entitles him to be a "soul". By virtue of reality of this right he is independent and hence individual. It is highly absurd, therefore, to submit ones soul to his superior and thus to ignore his individuality. Fidelity to the feudal lords, which Bushido commands to Samurai to observe, is no less absurd and irrational, before the right of humanity, than the most debased idea of slavery.

With loyalty as its motive Bushido dictates absolute obedience to the abstract moral principles. The need of principles is imminent for the existence of morality just as its motive; but, when their value is set above that of humanity itself, they become not only useless but destructive. Hugh Brack is quite right in saying that "Sacrifice, which looks
upon the restraint as a good thing in itself, and which is not undertaken explicitly for some other end, is the barrenest and the most dangerous object, can set before him. It is dishonoring both to man and to God, man, because it means useless impoverishment of life, to God, because it implies that the mere suffering of body, or the denial of reason, can in themselves please him. Yet this is the besetting temptation, which asceticism has never been able to avoid. The fact that Bushido abstracts its principles is plainly seen in justifying suicide for then, as Lady Masako nobly complained, at the voluntary death of her seven years-old son, "Whence is it that to die is to be loyal!" "Suicide was invested with romantic interest," says H.S. Nash, "Socrates had condemned it on the ground of loyalty to Athens, but patriotism as a motive had lost well-nigh all its power. The empire found nothing to put in its place. The church however, replaced it with the infinite worth of humanity as made in the image of eternal. Suicide was accounted a deadly sin. To overcome the romantic charm with which it had been closed, it was treated as if worse than murder." Neither Socrates nor church stated the exact measure of sin in suicide, but there is in the latter undeniable truth that estimates humanity above all things. The moral principles are for man and not man for principles. In \( \text{Metaphysics} \) while being can not exist apart from
its attributes, still the former is the logical presupposition of the latter; so in the field of morality, while moral person does not exist without moral principles, yet existence of person is presupposition of morality. Therefore humanity is the first, all else must exist for it. To exist is no less duty than to live—nay, even more that there can be no living without existing. This being so, it is plain that suicide is an intolerable sin against humanity for which alone moral principles may have any value. In fact Bushido justifies suicide and even demands it in many cases for the sake of loyalty to principles—where repentance but not suicide is needed.

With pathetic devotion to both superiors and abstract principles Bushido has wrought innumerable absurdity and has greatly devastated humanity. Thus it has failed. The failure, however, is not so much due to lack of will or motive as to the lack of moral insight. For no moral motive has ever been exercised more vigorously than Bushido—loyalty, perhaps, while few moral codes have likely possessed less insight than Bushido. According to Aristotle, there can be no moral virtue apart from intellect since virtue is relative to man who is not only intellectual but also volitional. In his ethical system Aristotle takes somewhat apparently lower ground than Plato inasmuch as the latter investigates what is good,
the former what is good for man; nevertheless, owing to this very difference, the system of Aristotle is more practical than that of Plato. The failure of Platonism is the Bushido that seeks good in abstraction. If man is constituted in will alone any imaginal practice will do for his edification provided that it proceed from right motive; but this is far from the truth because man is great deal more. He has sense, intellect as well as will; hence no mere good will can have security to find true good—the good for a concrete man and not for a mere will; not for the barren abstraction but for the living humanity which is full of love that seeks truth to know and to live, a source of inspiration and higher ideal whereby life wins a wreath of beauty and a crown of glory. It is plain that Bushido needs to deepen and clarify self-consciousness that leads to the true definition of man.
Bushido and Religion

As we have seen in the previous chapter, moral ideals need external sanction in order to transcend Ethical solipsism and to reach the spiritual from the physical. Despite Mr. Fukumawa saying that religion is like tea, it serves social purpose and nothing more, religious sanction of moral ideals is inevitable—it is inevitable because man is religious by nature as well as moral. The manner in which we conceive god must determine our conception of man and hence our moral ideal. If God be taken as a blind force, man will be defined as a mechanism and fatalism will result in morals; if he be thought of a living person, man becomes a free agent and a sense of certain responsibility is awakened in him. In either case, significance of religion for morality is vital.

Bushido Bushido has received its sanction from Buddhism and Shintoism. Originally it accepted Confucian codes; but, since formal codes in themselves are mere language and have no meaning unless man imports certain contents into them, and these latter will vary in accordance with the degree of his self-awareness. Codes are determined by man's estimate of himself and this latter is shaped by his religion. Hence the theory that Bushido being simply reproduction of Confucianism, the religion of Japan has little influenced her moral practice is intelligible.
only until a holder of theory understand the real meaning of morality and the religion and their inter-relation.

The influence of Buddhism on the definition of man is two fold: namely, pantheistic and deistic. Theoretical Buddhism taught that the identity of the individual is to be found in the identity of Nirvana, a fundamental world ground, and that the diversity of the universe is but diversity which is in reality one and the same. This is a plain pantheism as a Saint Iku sang:

From rain to hail, from ice to rain,
The world does hold its way.
With little and little gain,
With little purpose and much pain.
The stream flows day by day.

In this view of the universe man lose his spirituality, because there can be no qualitative difference between him and the monkey or any other thing, since they are equally parts of the common source from which they emanate and to which they return. Man's spirituality is due to the qualitative worth of the inner self; but since this is not found on the plane of Bushido, spirituality of man is missed altogether. And when this spiritual significance is gone the future has no meaning for him.
because it is only spiritual man who can transcend the present and look for the future. Hence in this pantheistic scheme, man comes to be defined simply as "is" and "will be" disappears entirely.

To lose spirituality is to lose moral inspiration, for apart from it evil as well as good is necessary existence. Where all are necessary there can be no meritorial choice and therefore moral indifference is the inevitable result. Qualitative distinction once being annihilated, entire man sinks into phenomena: with such a mere phenomenal man, moral practice, at the best, can never advance beyond the utilitarianism of Mr. Adam Smith who has said that push pin is as good as poetry, provided, there is qualitative equality. Thus pantheism strips man of his best self and takes away the capacity for moral aspiration.

Inspite of that that Buddhism taught theoretically a pure pantheism, practically it inculcates somewhat of a deistic notion of the universe. This is seen in its soteriology. It teaches that existence itself is the chief of all evils. Instead of longing for eternal life the Buddhist longs for annihilation, for salvation, according to him, is accomplished not by self-perfection but through self-denial and discipline. The heaven it offers is absorption in the Nirvana—the loss of personal identity and practical annihilation. In this view of
salvation, there is a distinct notion of two different worlds, the world that now is and the world to come, the former is illusory and the latter is real. Each is incompatible with the other since the real is found in the annihilation of the illusory and this is gained at the expense of the other. Between them there is no connection. The self that knows this world is evil and the self that realizes the other world is good; but these world are separated hopelessly so also these selves become separated. Spiritual man taking lofty flight from physical man the actual loses potential; thus at last once more man sinks endlessly in the world of illusion which makes asceticism its highest principle of life.

Investigating the source of Bushido - conception of man we can not omit Shintoism without doing injustice. But a mere reference to the result of discussion on Buddhism may suffice our purpose. Since all polytheism is in the end some sort of pantheism, and Shinto being itself polytheism, Nature worship together with ancestor worship, the worship makes "immensee" the whole meaning of universe; and, none of the gods being able to give absolute freedom to their worshipers, man practically as well as logically degrades into a mere sensual being. Hence in spite of apparent difference shintoism as Buddhism has done away with spiritualty
of man.

Bushido sanctioned by these religions conceives of man in such a slim fashion that its reality is almost doubted. It has lost the higher self in seeking it either in heaven alone or on earth merely. We shall not, therefore, be surprised at finding lack of sublimity in Japanese literature, which consists mostly of lyric poem and few religious songs: the hidden glories of the soul could not be the theme of its literature. Among the famous "Hundred Poems" sang by the Japanese Saints and the learned, there is found only one sacred poem which tells us that God is all. Neither genius of Bokin nor talent of Chikamatsue ever has produced a high adoration of humanity such as "In Memoriam" or "the Paradise Lost" of the West.

The same may be said with regard to Japanese art. Ancient Greeks thought that art had no other calling save to imitate nature; accordingly their heroes and even gods had exact human form. This characteristic of them is said to have served as a foundation of development developing their individualism. In Japan art has not aimed so much to bring a full fledged reality but rather in outline. Japanese art approaches western caricature. This difference between the two nations' races betrays at least lack of a realistic spirit of Japanese mind if not entirely due
to the lack of defining power. Bushido's conception of man will more vividly and plainly seen as we examine its social phenomena, but to this aspect we shall devote another chapter.
Bushido and Social Progress

The existence of society is an undeniable fact and the existence of individual is no less so: neither can be dispensed with without destroying the other. This being so the principle of social progress must be one: namely, there must be some kind of universalism and also some kind of individualism. Meanwhile it is not immediately clear how these apparently opposing principles can be reconciled. Hence historically two different theories: some held that the universal is only real and the individual is hypothetical—according to this view communism is the principle of progress. While some others held the opposite view advocating that pure individualism is the fundamental item in society. Both parties earnestly held and practiced their own view but they equally failed proved and failure. The cause of their failure is due to the separation of the universal from the individual of the latter from the former. In abstraction they conflict they conflict but in concrete they life, are inseparable. Opposition is apparent and in reality both are inseparably found in the nature of man. It is plain, then, that the perfection of the individual man implies also the perfection of the universal; and the progress of man is the progress of society; and, therefore, neither absolute communism nor pure individualism is the principle
of progress but personalism that seeks perfection of humanity in which universal and individual are implicit.

According to Bushido this truth is reversed; the state being everything and the individual nothing. The individual has no right to become universal and to participate in the state; he must remain as he is, while the state, with Bushido, represents the only universal man which has lost its proper ground, namely, the personal unit. Since this abstract universal man is identified with emperor himself by the traditional deification, whatever he commands his subject must obey absolutely as the body responds to the dictate of the brain. "We must not suppose"

Commenting on the Japanese constitution, Mr. Yamaguchi, professor of history in the Peeresses school, says, "that the sovereign power of a state has been transferred to the Imperial Diet. On the contrary, it is still in the hands of the Emperor—according to our ideas the monarch reigns over and governs the country in his own right and not by virtue of virtue; rights conferred by the constitution, our Emperor possesses real sovereignty and also exercises it. He is quite different from other rulers who possess but a partial sovereignty——he has inherited the rights of sovereignty from his ancestors. Thus it is quite legitimate to think that the rights of sovereignty exists in Emperor himself——
The Empire of Japan shall be reigned over and governed by a line of Emperors unbroken for ages eternal."

A communism that does not root in a concrete individualism is mysticism and lacks driving power in publics; but why such has not been the case in Japan. The answer must be simply this: that because the public consciousness has been too low to realize their true self. Such undeveloped-self-consciousness owes greatly to the existing institutions which confined so long, but more fundamentally due to the inherited belief that underlies them. Mr. DE Coulange says that the nature of ancient institutions is a sealed volume to us until we understand beliefs. The same thing will be said with regard to Japan; the existence of her social phenomena can not be well understood until her religions are investigated. But we need not enter into the details since in the previous chapter we have discussed their nature at some length; here simply we shall point out their bearing on communism.

Shintoism if not the originator of Japanese communism at least its fundamental sustainer from time immemorial. The deification of Emperor which is based on the belief of Shintoism according to which imperial line traces back to the heaven-revealed-son who descended from on high lighting upon the land, Mikado and was destined to be a ruler over
all Japan — put individuals in infinite lowness and deprived them of their freedom and initiative. It has been thought on the part of people/individuality is hereby and treason. While thus Shintoism has served directly a mighty bulwark for communism; Buddhism contributed almost as much to the strengthening the idea of communism for it does not attribute to self any worth, and has never modified the social order in individualism, because of its doctrine of illusion made history itself a non-ethical progress. Both religions directly or indirectly have—protested against individualism and it should not be too much saying that personal freedom will be never realized and social progress will prove impossible as long as these beliefs have influence over the people. Bushido seeks a growth of society through communism; but for that very reason it degrades the individual and hence society itself.

Mr. Fujioza, professor of the Interior University, remarks dwelling on the characteristic of Japanese literature, "Personality is annihilated in Japanese literature by the communistic order, but this is not important character of Japan—because individual progress is not the national progress growth. Loss of individuality is nothing characteristic."

In this he is sadly mistaken and wrong because there can be no nation apart from individual. If it is the progress of individual can
not be the progress of nation, what is the progress of state where the
former is the fundamental constituent of the latter? If it be said that
there is a distinction between nation and individual so also must be a
distinction between their respective progress, the answer will be that
the distinction is simply logical existence and in reality there can
be no such separation. Nation exists only through and in individuals.
Further quibble in this point will be an exhibition of personal
ignorance and nothing more.

A communistic state need communistic members; naturally family becomes
a social unit. Such family exists in loyalty to state. This being
logically so, more historical consideration suggests that Bushido
conceived it as loyalty to religion.

With the ancient religion was the constituent principle of the family
and this has been equally true with the Japanese. The background of her
patriarchal family was the belief of the dead, the worship of their
ancestors. "The care of supplying the dead with the substance was not
left to the caprice or to the variable sentiments of men; it was obliged
obligatory. "says Mr. De Coulanges," Thus a complete religion of dead
was established,— the dead were held to be sacred beings. To them
the ancient applied the most respectful epithets that could be thought
of; they called them good, holy, happy. For them they had all the veneration that man can have for the divinity whom he loves or fears. In their thought the dead were gods." Though Japanese did not believe like western ancients, that the lives of the dead wholly depend upon a material offering of living generation, still they believed that the welfare of the dead was much relative to the continuation of the family through which the prayer for them is offered by the posterities. This belief aided by the general human tendency to venerate the past established the religion of ancestor-worship. Upon this belief Japanese family exists; and extinction of family is a great disaster and dishonor to the dead.

The family thus established is communist, for the manners and beliefs of ancestors being the creeds of family, wisdom and imagination of individual members is useless and forbidden. Each must serve to the dead regardless of his own interest. Family tie is not love but reverence: the head, being a high priest and a monarch of the family, has absolute power and dignity over his members; and they must serve him with reverence and fidelity. Seniority is next standard of reverence: child reveres parents; the younger revers the older brothers or sisters. In all these orders love is exercised only from the higher to the lower and
reverence when the former to the latter is concerned. The family is far more important than the individual and the chief aim of marriage is the maintenance of the family line—adoption of child and polygamy necessary because no greater misfortune can be conceived than, for the home, to become extinct. There is no sense of individuality in this conception of family—which frees man from an iron grip of the past and tosses himself above all surroundings in order to advance in the faith of humanity that is made after image of the most high; but determined and hence degrading both individual and society.

It would be highly instructive for Bushido to observe the Christian conception of family as held in the west. I could not better do here than to quote Professor Bowne who says in his "The Ethics of the Family", "From the general moral relations which obtain among men we now pass to somethings more distinctly human. This is the institution of the family, the fundamental moral institution of the race, and the one above all others sacred. It arises from the peculiar forms of human existence, and especially from the forms in which human life begins. The long period of human infancy, physical and mental, makes a family necessary of human development. It is not a universal moral relations, but only a human one. It stands, however, in such important relations to the moral and
physical well-being of the race that, if not a form of universal morality, it is a very significant form of human morality. "It is clear, then, that family does not exist for the dead; but for the interest of living humanity, it is not for a mere perpetuation of itself, but for the development of individual man; when this significance is obscured and family stands for its own good, it is nothing but absurdity, which must be annihilated.

Another effect wrought by Bushido on the social economy has been the most despotism inasmuch as it despises idea of money-making. In ancient Greek resaid of commodity or taking interest on money was conceived unnatural on the ground that money can produce nothing. Hence commercial life come to be regarded somewhat as worthless occupation, and consequently little virtue was found in it. With some difference, yet in parallel thought Bushido condemned commerce as destructive to high moral attainment, as Mr. Nitobe admits, "It is true that thrift was enjoined by Bushido, but not for economical reasons so much as for the exercise of abstinence. Luxury was thought the greatest menace to manhood and severest simplicity of living was required of the warrior class, sumptuously laws being enforced in many of the class."

Both views ignore the significance of wealth for the obtainment of
high moral development. Culture has no small part of morality and it costs high price since it requires good means to attain: good surroundings, good living, and good education—all these increase our well-being; but they can not be expected without wealth. Moreover negative consideration upon immensity of destructive power of poverty convinces us of the need of money for moral perfection. The poor exhausts his energy for earning his bread and has little time for learning truth or meditating upon his soul. Hence natural result is ignorance and moral indifference and thus at last self-degradation. To quote Professor Marshall, "Although then some of the evils which commonly go with poverty are not its necessary consequences; yet, broadly speaking, the destruction of poor is their poverty, and the study of causes is the study of the causes of degredation of large part of mankind." Better we learn of the nature of man and the conditions, more we become convinced that wealth has no less significance than good will of man for attainment of high ideal morality.

The failure of both Greek and Japanese is due to their realistic view of economics: the former conceived wealth as real apart from person and the latter took wealth itself as the real cause of evil. The philosophical explanation of their failure is due to the oversight
of the social and temporal side of nature—upon which idea of economy is based. As long as we have physical organism in our constitution, the economic must be great agency of social progress as well as the religious.

Importance of education for society needs no further comment; it is a vital precondition of progress. What has made our age so different from the bygone epochs is education and what has pushed the occident so far ahead of the orient is also education; therefore it would not be too much to identify education with the cause of social progress. But this importance itself does not always secure us right educational principles. Hence it is left for us to choose a right one as well as to realize its importance.

There are two different principles in education, namely, professionalism and humanitalianism. If the purpose of education were to produce a mere professional man, the former will be sufficient; but if it aims to develop humanity the latter must be adopted. Inspite of existing divisions among educationalists regarding this matter, the truth must be in the latter, because the real meaning of education is not to make man simply fit for work in order to earn his bread, but to put him in such a state of mind as shall enable him to realize his true self and its relations toward others. In short it must aim to clarify the consciousness of
Such meaning of education was too airy for bushido, which required for the maintenance of samuraihood a simple art of riding, fencing, and if anything more, that will be that they should practice hand-writing and some reading of Confucian Ethics. Sad as it may seem to think that such a low conception should have been entertained by our forefathers, yet their ignorance may be forgiven: but it can not be overlooked nor tolerated, for a Japanese modernist, who would claim learning, to say that professionalism should be the principle of education. It is intolerable, yet it is an actual fact in Japan. In the last number, the Japanese Christian advocate has rightly criticized "Tunnel-learning" of imperial university—it was quoted from one of the students in that institution, who said "I am stepping through tunnel of learning that I shall be able to get through this world with the least effort and the least time." It did not trouble Irish wit to give to that kind of institution its proper name, for a Chinaman has already named it as "Japanese school shop".

In fact the real meaning of education and its value has not as yet been realized in Japan. This is plainly seen in Mr. Fukuzawa's own saying, that the first step in the reform of the family and establishment...
of monogamy is to develop public sentiment against prostitution and plural illegal marriage and the way to do this is first to make evil practice secret. This, he says, is more important than to give woman higher education.

Why is it that to-day in the face of so much light there still exists in Japan such irrational social phenomena? The answer to this question will be self evident to those who are familiar with the Bushido definition of man which I have tried to bring out in the previous chapters. It is due to a mistaken conception of real humanity which neither Shintoism nor Buddhism correctly defined and hence Bushido could not see. Necessity of reforming the existing society is immanent, but it is not so easy to say how; yet it seems there is no other way except one that is to realize real self—the self that can free itself from the grip of the past, and transcends existing social conditions in a hope for a better future. It is freedom that creates imagination and lift man up from surrounding conditions; and thus freedom provides for the social progress. Hope to increase man's freedom is to reform society and this can be hoped through the inculcation of Theistic principles.
Conclusion

Theistic Belief as the Remedy

The Sophists advocated man are the measure of all things— which Solrato
corrected and said that man is the measure of all things; but ultimate— and
consummation was left with Plato who declared "God should be the measure
of all things." This truth found in Plato we now better realize as we
are about to bring out true meaning of man; the real significance of
human life never be understood until it is sought in the purpose of
Divine will. Therefore upon our conception of the divine will depends
the estimate and value we will put upon man and these in turn will
largely determine the direction which human life will take. We have
seen already that the neither the Buddhist conception of God nor
the Shintoïstic aid us to realize true humanity and give satisfaction to
our life— even more that we are convinced that our soul, if being
committed entirely to their guide; will degrade and end in eternal
destruction. To rescue ourselves from this caracality I propose Theistic
belief as the only remedy—the belief in which I have been taught and
in which I have, however little it may be, a divine assurance that is
irresistible.

The influence of Theistic belief upon man is four-fold; it universalizes
of morals; it produces spirituality in man; it rationalizes man; and it moralizes him. To begin with the conviction, that the ultimate is one should root out the phenomenal ground of aristocracy, a chief cause of social corruption. Having same God above all men, individual soul becomes a direct citizen of the divine kingdom and every one is as good as every body else judged by his intrinsic right; it is a soul that has worth before his sight and neither wealth nor prowess. Thus the unity of God must eventually authenticate to reason and conscience the intrinsic right even of the lowest man to be revered and counted.

To conceive God as transcend above all things is recognize that the divine purpose is greater than the present. There must be, then, a loftier purpose for the existence of mountain than its towering precipices; a deeper meaning for the existence of the ocean than its fathomless bosom and so also there must be a diviner providence for humanity other than the life which now is. Consideration of this kind increases a sense of spirituality and makes the world pliable to man; and thus he comes to realize a freedom of self. Meanwhile notion of immanence makes life serious and treats in man a truth searching heart inasmuch as the notion puts law in prominence. Two and two makes four and this truth no one can doubt at will; so surely no man can do right without affecting
the entire universe, nor he can make error without suffering consequence of it. It becomes necessary, therefore, to know law in order to live our normal life, thus the notion of immanece meets with our intellectual need. In short the notion of transcendence deepens the sense of dependence filling man with all reverence, the notion of immanece increases the sense of independence inspired by the thought of divine nearness. On the one hand the universal and on the other the individual—thus progress in personality is at bottom an ethico-religious.

The theistic believer is not dreamer who chases after a rainbow in a fairy land, nor is he a wise man who dwells in a castle built of a logical quibbles. But he is a struggler and a living personality and he seeks the realization of his true self. The conviction that the ultimate is the moral being strengthens his moral muscles to fight life's battle to win a crown of glory. It is life that witnesses life's worth. Neither tragedy nor awe, nor yet difficulties can quench his burning soul after righteousness where once he is brought into contact with reality that gives him inward satisfaction and peace and whereby he realizes the intrinsic worth of humanity. Life starts with darkness, after while a star appears, then stars and moon, and at last a dawn and a day-light. It ever struggles, but ever becomes inspired, and
forever endears itself in the joy of Divine fellowship as J.R. Lowell

beautifully sang;—

O Power more near my life than life itself,—
Or what seems life to us in sense immured,—
Even as the roots, shut in the darksome earth,
Share in the tree-tops joyance, and conlieve
Of sunshine and wide air and winged things
By sympathy of nature, so do I
Have evidence of Thee so far above,
Yet in and of me! Rather Thou the root
Invisibly sustaining, hid in light,
Not darkness or in darkness made by us.
If sometimes I must hear good man debate
Of other witness of Thyself than Thou,
As if there needed any help of ours
To nurse Thy flickering life, that else must cease,
Blown out, as were a candle, by men's breath,
My soul shall not be taken in their snare,
To change her inward surety for their doubt
Muffled from sight in formal robs of proof;
While she can only feel herself through Thee,
I fear not Thy withdrawal; more I fear,
Seeing, to know Thee not, hoodwinked with dreams
Of signs and wonders, while, unnoticed, Thou,
Walking Thy garden still, communst with men,
Missed in the commonplace of miracle.

—Closing lines of "The Cathedral."