

***The Illusion of Living God “Arahitogami” and “State Shinto”:* What did invoke Absolute God?**

Nitta Hitoshi

Part1 The Illusion of Living God “Arahitogami”

Chapter 6 “Arahitogami” as a “Invented Tradition”

A “Invented Tradition” on the Evaluation of Satō Nobuhiro

In this chapter, as an example of a "invented tradition" in the early Syōwa period, I will introduce the history of changes in the evaluation of two men who were hailed as "prophets of the times" in the early Syōwa period, namely, Satō Nobuhiro and Ōkuni Takamasa.

Satō Nobuhiro was an encyclopedic writer (1769-1850) who lived at the end of the Edo period and wrote a wide range of books on agriculture, mining, economics, national defense, and diplomacy. The most famous books of his political thought are *Kondōhisaku*(1823) and *Suitōhiroku*(1833, estimated by Usui Ryūji). The former recognizes that Japan have a mission to dominate the world and preaches that Manchuria, Korea, and China should be annexed as a means to do so. The latter explains the need for a state-controlled economy. Because of these writings, Nobuhiro was hailed as the "prophet of the Great East Asia War" during the last war.

However, his ideas had never been as highly regarded since his lifetime as they were during the Great East Asia War. And even after he died, his ideas had no impact on the Meiji Restoration. Even after the Meiji Restoration, his ideas were not used as a reference for the government's foreign policy, although there were some movements in the private sector to evaluate them. The reason is that both of his major books, *Kondōhisaku* and *Suitōhiroku*," were initially "secret books" that only a few disciples were allowed to read and copy. And since his writings were not published until after 1887, his ideas could not have influenced the Meiji Restoration. Furthermore, even after his writings have been published, his reputation had changed variously with the changing trends of the times.

The first person who paid attention to Nobuhiro immediately after the Meiji Restoration was Oda Kansai, who served as an official in the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of Agriculture & Commerce. He worked diligently to publish the writings of Nobuhiro. However, his reputation for Nobuhiro was not that of a pioneer of the Meiji Restoration, but that of an agricultural policy scholar (Perhaps as a result of this his efforts, in June 1882, by the government, Nobuhiro was awarded as a person of agricultural merit). Oda's efforts were completed in 1896 with a book named *Satō Nobuhiro Kagaku Taiyō* [the Compendium of the Sato Nobuhiro's Writings] .

However, reflecting the victory in the Russo-Japanese War, Nobuhiro's reputation changed. In other words, since then, he became regarded as the man who foresaw the Meiji Restoration and the victory of the Sino-Japanese War and the Russo-Japanese War.

In addition, some Japanese intellectuals who were beginning to show interest in socialist thought, began to take an interest in Nobuhiro from that perspective. Matsuzaki Kuranosuke, a professor of the Faculty of Law at Tokyo Imperial University, described Nobuhiro's thought as "close to socialism" in his article "Nihon no Kameralisuto [Japanese Cameralist] " (*Kokka Gakkai Zasshi* [Journal of National Science]) in 1887. Kawakami Hajime, who later became a leading pre-war Marxist, described Nobuhiro as "an imperialist and a socialist at the same time" in his article "Bakumashu no Syakaisyugisya Satō Nobuhiro [Sato Nobuhiro, the Socialist at the End of the Tokugawa Period] " (*Kyōto Hōgakkai Zasshi* [Kyōto Law Society Journal]) in 1902.

From 1924 to 1927, *Satō Nobuhiro Kagaku Zensyū* [The Complete Collection of Satō Nobuhiro's Writings] was published (Tokyo: Iwanami Syoten, in three volumes). Later on, he came to be treated as a "Japanese thinker". And when Nobuhiro's writings were included in various collections, *Kondōhisaku* and *Suitōhiroku* always became to be included in them.

The book that had a decisive influence on the reputation for Nobuhiro as a thinker was *Satō Nobuhiro no Risōkokka* [Satō Nobuhiro's Ideal State] written by Ōkawa Syūmei in 1927 (later recounted in *Nihon Seishin Kenkyū* [The Study of the Japanese Spirit] in 1939).

In this essay, Ōkawa describes Nobuhiro's thought as "clearly National Socialistic" (ibid.,p.59) and also says, "In its insistence on a very purely Japanese national transformation, it is very valuable today for those who are serious about the Japanese nation, and it teaches us a great lesson and prompts us to earnestly reflect" (p.60), " Nobuhiro's thought is based on the traditional spirit of Japan, and by organizing and spreading this spirit, he seeks to build a nation in Japan that embodies justice" (p.80) and " The belief of Nobuhiro are indeed the very same Japanese spirit held by Prince Syōtoku and Emperor Tenji. Only a great soul can understand this spirit. He grasped the ancient and majestic Japanese spirit that had existed behind the superficial phenomena of stagnation and decay" (p.84).

Through this process, Nobuhiro's thought was placed at the core of "traditional spirit" or "Japanese spirit". And after the Manchurian Incident, it came to be celebrated in the trend for a uniquely Japanese ideology. In 1934, the magazine *Rekishi Kōron* [The Public Discussion about History] featured Nobuhiro, and historians or Shinto researchers such as Mikami Sanji or Kōno Seizō began to praise him. Since then, there is no end to the number of articles that have been written in praise of Nobuhiro (Usui Ryūji, *Satō Nobuhiro: A Reappraisal of His Thought*, Tokyo:Taimusu-sya).

As a result of this trend, Nobuhiro was finally included in elementary school history textbooks. Descriptions of Nobuhiro's political thought appeared for the first time in 1941 in *Syōgaku Kokushi* [The National History for Elementary School Students] II. In the section titled "Jōi to Kaikō [Exclusionism and Port Opening] ," the textbook states, "Scholars like Honda Toshiaki and Satō Nobuhiro advocated the urgency of opening ports to the outside world and the need to expand the country's national power by actively acquiring colonies abroad" (p.81). Educational historian Kaigo Tokiomi explains the significance of this statement: "It will reveal that the advocacy of Japanese overseas expansion had already begun in the Edo period and historically support the expansion of Japan into Asia in the Syōwa period" (*Rekishi Kyōkasyo no Rekishi* [The History of History Education, p.161). Thus, Nobuhiro's ideas, which had little or no impact on the Meiji Restoration, were given a firm position as an ideological "tradition" to justify Japanese thought and action in the Syōwa period.

A “Invented Tradition” on the Evaluation of Ōkuni Takamasa

The situation is similar with regard to the evaluation of Ōkuni Takamasa (1792-1871), Kokugakusya [a scholar of Japanese classics] at the end of the Edo period, who was called "the champion of faith in the emperor" and "the prophet of the century", during WW II. He was hailed during it due to his "Tennō Sōtei Ron [The Emperor Totalitarianism]," which argued, in essence, that the Japanese emperor was a step above the kings of the world and would eventually become only summit above them as a matter of historical necessity. It sounds like an ideology that strongly advocate Japanese conquest of the world, but according to the research of Matsuura Mitsunobu, a professor at Kogakkan University, this is not the case.

According to Matsuura, Takamasa's fundamental motivation for constructing his theory was to "rationally explain the reality of dual rule in Japan" by explaining that "the shogun is the ruler of Japan and the emperor is the ruler of the world" in anticipation of the logical question that would eventually be raised by Western powers as to whether the emperor or the shogun was the ruler of Japan. Therefore, Matsuura says, Takamasa had no intention of even changing the status quo of Japan by abolishing the shogunate, let alone changing the status quo of world by having Japan unify the world. And when, contrary to his expectations, the shogunate disappeared and the Meiji government emerged, he wrote as follows: "Although foreign countries may not revere our emperor as the only summit above them, we should bide our time with proud, without being overbearing and angry, dealing with foreign countries without being rude." (Matsuura, *Ōkuni Takamasa no Kenkyū* [The Study of Ōkuni Takamasa] , Tokyo:Taimeidō, pp.168-169,p.213).

Such carefree ideas could not have influenced the diplomatic path of the Meiji Empire, and were forgotten by many people except for some of his disciples, such as Fukuba Yoshishizu, who was active in the early Meiji period. This situation was truly unfortunate for those who respected Takamasa, and the work to honor him continued in the Meiji and Taisyō Eras. According to Matsuura, there was an unspoken agreement among the disciples involved in the honorary work not to mention the fact that Takamasa had been a supporter of the shogunate before the Meiji Restoration. It seems that Fukuba Yoshishizu tried to hide this fact, even

falsifying historical records. When this falsification was pointed out by Nomura Denshirō, the editor of *Ōkuni Takamasa Zensyū* [The Complete Collection of Ōkuni Takamasa's Works] , he said, "If Master Ōkuni were here now, he would not say that 'I support the shogunate'" (Matsuura, *ibid.*, pp. 203-204).

It seems that the forgotten achievements of Takamasa suddenly began to attract public attention after Yamaguchi Einosuke, a court advisor, wrote an article titled " Ōkuni Takamasa to Nihonseishin [Ōkuni Takamasa and the Japanese Spirit] " in the newspaper "Nihon" in May, 1927.

In this article, Yamaguchi begins by stating, "It is very regret that Ōkuni Takamasa, Japanese greatest thinker and scholar of national study, has been almost completely forgotten and buried academically. Next, he declares that "he was the first person who laid the foundation for the Meiji Restoration" and explains that "he has been forgotten because he was buried academically as a result of the ideological struggle between 1887 and 1875". Then he introduces Takamasa's theory of the Emperor's Totalitarianism and concludes by lamenting, "If the great spirit of Ōkuni Takamasa and his theories were adopted and flourished during the Meiji Restoration, Japan would not be in the unfortunate situation as today."

Since this article, Yamaguchi wrote a series of writings in praise of Takamasa, such as "Meiji Boshin no Saiseicchi no Goseido Gokaihuku [The Restoration of the Unified System of Ritual and Politics in the First Year of Meiji" (Shintō Gakkai Zasshi [Journal of Research on Shinto] , October 1928) and "Meiji Goisshin to Ōkuni Takamasa Sensei no Shisō [The Meiji Restoration and the Idea of Master Ōkuni Takamasa " (Shimane Hyōron [Shimane Review] , October 1944).

Riding on the current trend of reevaluating Takamasa, *The Complete Collection of Ōkuni Takamasa's Works*, edited by Nomura Denshirō, had been published from 1937 to 1939. However, all of his papers in this *Collection* with a definite date of writing, were written after his age of 43. According to Matsuura's research, Takamasa's thought went through four stages of change, "starting from Confucianism (Zhuoziology), moving to the study of Japanese classics about poetry and then establishing a linguistic-philosophical academic thought, on which he developed a theological study of Japanese classics after his early

forties" (Matsuura, *ibid.*, pp.1-2). These changes are not readily apparent in *The Collection*. For this reason, the fact remained unknown to the public for a long time, that Takamasa in his youth regarded "the portions of the *Kojiki* and *Nihonshyoki* telling about Kami" as "the first of the novels of our country" (the origin of the fiction), even though he later came to regard them as "a true explanation of the world creation," (Matsuura Mitsunobu, *The Idea and Life of Ōkuni Takamasa*, 'Expanded Edition of *The Complete Collection of Ōkuni Takamasa's Work*,' Vol.8, Tokyo:Kokusyo-kankōkai, p 308).

Now, what was the highest point of the pre-war evaluation of Takamasa that had been formed in this way? It can be seen in the book "*Ōkuni Takamasa*" by Ōsaki Katsuzumi (1943). Ōsaki, while superficially inheriting the reputation of Takamasa as a forgotten figure, wrote the following:

"Few men in Japanese history have been as great as he was, yet ignored or neglected. Although he made such a great ideological contribution at the time of the Meiji Restoration, his ideas were so profound and expansive that they were almost completely erased from the history of the Meiji Restoration so far. It is not surprising that the history of the Meiji Restoration, which ignored his ideas, could not clearly describe its world-revolutionary character. By rewriting the history of the Meiji Restoration in the light of his ideas, it will gain new world historical significance in the future. In this way, his thought has lived on consistently from the Meiji Restoration to *Kōdō Sekai Ishin* [The World Revolution by Japanese Imperial Way] of today."(p.4)

It is hard to accept the theory that ideas so forgotten as to be almost completely erased from the history of the Meiji Restoration have lived on consistently from the Meiji Restoration to the Great East Asia War, but I would like to introduce some more of Ōsaki's arguments.

"The idea of the unity of the world with the Japanese emperor at the center" is something that has been passed down through the generations of *Kokugakusya* [Scholars of Japanese classics] . However, "the idea was not originally created by *Kokugakusya*, but discovered by them, and was the very founding principle of Japan and the longstanding aspiration of the Japanese people. Transforming the world floating in darkness into something immovable is the will of *Amatsukami* [the deities in heaven] and the command they issued to their descendants.

And 'Uniting the surrounding nations to make a capital city and make them one family' was, awe-inspiringly, the grand plan to world history that Emperor Jinmu had in mind. *Kokugakusya* only accepted this far-reaching founding principle as it was, clarified it academically, and raised it to national consciousness. In other words, the works of *Kokugakusya* led to the rediscovery of Japanese profound and expansive founding ideals that encompassed the entire universe and clarified the original world-historical mission of the Japanese people. The worldview given by *Kami*, which has been flowing unconsciously through the depths of the soul of the Japanese people since ancient times, has been consciously brought to the surface of consciousness through the achievements of *Kokugakusya*. What *Kokugakusya* discovered was not the discovery of the ego, but the discovery of *Kojiki*, the discovery of the true Japan. The true and purely Japanese worldview, consciously discovered by them, was the only ideological driving force that tied the Meiji Restoration directly to the antiquity of Emperor Jinmu and made this Restoration dare to take place in a world-historical perspective."(pp. 11-12).

According to Ōsaki, among *Kokugakusya* who " raised the grand plan to world history to national consciousness", the one who "most boldly declared Japanese world-historical mission, most vividly advocated the global nature of the Japanese emperor's politics, and most accurately predicted Japanese world-historical development, was indeed Ōkuni Takamasa." (p.13).

"Time does not have the power to banish his thought to the past. Rather, time is created by his ideas. His ideas are a worldview that transcends time and is forever fresh. "(p. 15).

In this way, the idea of "Hakkō-ichiu [The World Unification by Japan] " which emerged on the surface of Japanese society in response to the needs of the Syōwa Era, was combined with the ideals of the Meiji Restoration and, farther back, the founding principles of Japan through *Kokugakusya* represented by Takamasa, finally, the "invention of tradition" around Ōkuni Takamasa was completed.

Authorizing and Fixing "Invented Tradition" during the Occupation

I said earlier that the traditions invented in the Showa Era were imprinted as true in the minds of the intellectuals who experienced the 1940s. It means that a "dark sentiment" for the emperor, based on the stifling memories of this era, may have

given the "invented traditions" as the illusion that they were true. Takeyama Michio also wrote, "There are many judgments that are overwhelmed by the harsh impressions of those days and, influenced by resentment towards them, have lost correct perception of the history" (*Syōwa no Seishin Shi* [A History of the Spirit of the Showa Era] , p.19). In addition to these circumstances, the "endorsement" given by the occupation forces would cause the "sense of history" to be lost further.

As is well known, the occupation forces issued the so-called "Shinto Directive" on December 15, 1945. This directive determined that it was "militaristic and ultra-nationalistic propaganda" that deluded the Japanese people and led them into wars of aggression. The term "militaristic or ultra-nationalistic ideology" was defined as follows: "the doctrine that the Emperor of Japan is superior to heads of other states because of ancestry, descent, or special origin": "the doctrine that the people of Japan are superior to the people of other lands because of ancestry, descent, or special origin": "the doctrine that the islands of Japan are superior to other lands because of divine or special origin": "Any other doctrine which tends to delude the Japanese people into embarking wars of aggression or to glorify the use of force as an instrument for settlement of disputes with other peoples. It severed the link between the state and Shinto and also ordered a ban on the use of terms such as "Great East Asia War" and "Hakkō-ichiu", based on the interpretation that they were inseparable from "State Shinto", "militarism" and "ultra-nationalism."

On January 1, 1946, the occupation forces issued the so-called "Emperor's Declaration of Humanity," in which the emperor himself had to say the following; "The bonds between me and you, my people, are bound from beginning to end by mutual trust and respect, and not by mere myth and legend. It is not based on the fanciful notion that the Emperor is Akitsumikami [Living God] , and that the Japanese people are a people superior to all other peoples and destined to rule the world."

Furthermore, at the International Military Tribunal for the Far East, which opened on May 3, 1946, the prosecution accused the Japanese military circles as planning and carrying out a "joint conspiracy" with Germany and Italy to dominate the world militarily, politically, and economically. In addition, GHQ

fundamentally rejected the Japanese national system since the Meiji Era, and even ordered the abolition of the Imperial Japanese Constitution and the enactment of a new constitution.

These occupation policies were compounded by censorship of speech and all other forms of expression, with no room for dissent. Thus, it came to be regarded as an indisputable fact that the fanatical ideology of "Arahitogami" and "Hakkō-ichiu" covered the entire modern period of Japan.

The Amplification of "Invented Tradition" in the Postwar Era

For the Marxists who dominated Japan's postwar thought and speech circle, the worse the image of the emperor, the target of their overthrow, the better. The general landscape of postwar psychohistory in Japan has been one, in which "dark sentiments" backed by suffocating memories are combined with the authoritative power of the occupation forces and the ideological interests of the revolutionists, and this trinity of tacit agreements has stifled empirical research. Joining this trend and amplifying the "Invented Tradition" were Murakami Shigeyoshi in the field of religious history, Miyazawa Toshiyoshi in the field of constitutional law, and Maruyama Masao in the field of political thought.

I have already mentioned Murakami at the beginning of this book, so I will skip him. Miyazawa Toshiyoshi was a disciple of Minobe Tatsukichi and knew that Tennō-Kikansetsu [The theory that the emperor is one of the organs of the state and sovereignty lies with the state as a legal entity] was the prevailing theory until 1935. Nevertheless, he argued, "In the Meiji Constitution, the fundamental principle was that the Emperor had sovereignty and that the basis for the sovereignty was the divine decree" (*Zentei Nihonkoku Kenpō* [The Constitution of Japan, Revised Completely], Tokyo: Nihon Hyōronsha, p. 44). And he sprinkled the postwar constitutional academy with the following fantasy; Under the Meiji Constitution, there was a fundamental limit to the freedom of religion: It was "not to repudiate the belief that the emperor's ancestors were Kami - their representative was Amaterasu - and that the emperor himself, as a descendant of Kami - as 'Arahitogami' -, had divine status." (*Kenpō II - Kihonteki-Jinken* [The Constitution II : Fundamental Human Rights], Tokyo: Yūhikaku, p.349).

Maruyama Masao also, in his famous article, "Cyō-Kokka-Syugi no Ronri to Shinri" [The Logic and Psychology of Ultra-Nationalism] (1946), wrote the following; "In Japan, the private has never before been recognized as purely private. The author of *Shinmin no Michi* [The Way of the Vassals] says, 'In the end, what we call our private life is the practice of the Way of the Vassals and has public significance as acts of the vassals to assist the emperor's mission given by Kami.-(omission)- In this way, even in our private lives, we must not forget the idea of obeying the Emperor and serving the Nation.' This ideology did not emerge with the totalitarian trend, but was inherent in the structure of the Japanese state itself."(Zōhobam · Gendai Seiji no Shisō to Kōdō [The Thoughts and Actions in Contemporary Politics, Expanded edition] ,Tokyo: Miraisya, pp.15-16). " 'Tenjōmukyū' (Kami's guarantee for the eternal existence of the Japanese nation) guarantees the unlimited expansion of Japanese values, on the other hand, the expansion of 'Kōkoku-Butoku'(the idea that Japan, with the emperor at its center, is superior in military power) strengthens the absoluteness of centered values—This cyclical process was spirally accelerated from the Sino-Japanese and Russo-Japanese Wars, through the Manchurian Incident and the China Incident, to the Pacific War. " (ibid.p.28).

Even Yamamoto Hichihei, known for his unique ideas and penetrating insights, was not free from the "curse" of "invented tradition." He wrote a series of articles titled "Arahitogami no Sōsakusyatachi [The Inventors of Arahitogami]" in *Syokun!* [Ladies And Gentlemen!] with the aim of identifying the root of the "curse" of "Arahitogami." (from January 1980 to March 1982. Under the same title, published in *Yamamoto Shichihei Library, Vol.12*. Tokyo: Bungeishunjūsha,1997). However, he believed the arguments of the early Syōwa period and made the assumption that "Arahitogami" must have been invented by scholars of Edo period. Because of this, this series of articles ended up being an exploration of the thoughts of scholars of the Edo period, and although it is a laborious work on the "history of the formation of the idea of the veneration of the emperor in the Tokugawa period," it has not been able to answer the main questions of "who invented the concept of the 'Arahitogami'" and "who developed or perfected this concept?" The most decisive point is that although the articles cite a great number of historical documents of Edo period, the key word "Arahitogami" is not mentioned at all in words of the people of that time.

Matsumoto Kenichi, who wrote a commentary on Yamamoto's article, wrote in his praise, "'Arahitogami no Sōsakusyatachi' appears to be a study of the history of ideas from Syushigaku [Juziology] (Kangaku [The study approved by the Tokugawa Shogunate]) of the Tokugawa period to the Mitogaku [The study that emerged in the Mito domain controlled by a feudal lord who was relative of the Shogun] , but in fact it is an examination of the ideological soil of Japan that gave birth to the belief in *Arahitogami* before World War II (ibid. p.413). From my point of view, Matsumoto's compliment appears to be a painfully sarcastic expression that "despite Yamamoto's intention, in the end this paper does not succeed in capturing the subject." Because "soil" is just one of many conditions, not the seed itself that produces the fruit.

Yamamoto writes, "The lack of awareness of 'why I think the way I do' is what I call 'curse.' Those who are under the curse do not know the reason for it" (ibid., p.12). Yamamoto has proved the correctness of his insights about the curse by the failure of his own work.

There are still many commentators who accept the claims of famous scholars without examining them and develop frivolous arguments. There will always be people like them in every generation, and to some extent we have no choice but to give up on such a reality. Perhaps we should accept it with a tolerant heart. It is unfortunate, however, that many solid researchers are still stuck in the old perspective.

The recent trend in modern Japanese history research is for many scholars to base their arguments on the European-born theory of "Invention of Tradition," which was imported to Japan around the end of the 1980s. The basic argument of this theory is that "much of what we believe to be old tradition is in fact a fiction deliberately invented during the formation of the modern state in order to create a united national entity. In Japan, researchers such as Yasumaru Yoshio and Takagi Hiroshi have attempted this perspective to reexamine modern history. However, they have accepted the imported theory that "the tradition is invented at the beginning of modernity" without examining it. As a result, they have the preoccupation that "the tradition should be invented during Edo period or the Meiji Restoration," and they are unable to consider the hypothesis

that their a priori image of the emperor system may be invented in the Taisyō or Syōwa periods.

For example, Yasumaru Yoshio lists the following four as "basic concepts related to the modern emperor system(*Kindai Tennōsei-zō no Keisei* [The Formation of the Image for the Modern Emperor System] , Tokyo: Iwanami-syoten, 1992,pp.12-13). (1) The ideology that considers the eternal and unchanging lineage = the emperor as *Arahitogami*, and the absoluteness and immutability of the hierarchical order concentrated therein. (2) The theocratic principle of the unity of ritual and politics. (3) The mission of world domination by the emperor and the Japanese nation. (4) The Emperor as a charismatic political leader who spearheaded the development of civilization. He says that the concept of (1) is "the most central" and "has been around since Motoori Norinaga [One of the most famous scholars of Japanese Classics] at the end of the 18th century. He also recognizes that the concept of (3) "was also fostered in the growing awareness of external crises since the end of the 18th century" (ibid. p.13).

Takagi Hiroshi wrote *Kindai Tennōsei no Bunkashiteki Kenkyū—Tnnō Syūnin Girei · Nencyū-Gyōji · Bunkazai* [A Study of the Modern Emperor System in Perspective of Cultural History: The Emperor's Inaugural Rites, Annual Events, and Cultural Properties] , in which he discussed "the formation of a nation-state called Japan and invention of a culture unique to 'Japan'." (Tokyo: Azekura-syobō, 1999, p.11). He also professes to be in the same position as Yasumaru regarding the origins of *Arahitogami* by stating, "My work overlaps with the work of Yasumaru Yoshio, such as *Kindai Tennōsei-zō no Keisei*, in which he elucidated that the basic concepts of the modern emperor system (*Arahitogami*, civilization, unity of ritual and politics, etc.) were invented during the formation of the nation-state by mediating the ethnic elements from the early modern period to the modern state" (ibid.p.12).

The Re-examination on “Arahitogami” and “Hakkō-ichiu”

As results of the arguments so far, it would have become clear that the following statement is a mere "Invented Tradition" and a complete "Illusion"; "Japanese people had been taught since the Meiji Era that the emperor was a

living god, and this idea had led them to harbor delusions of world domination and to be driven to insatiable war." It is important to note, however, that it is not the same as saying that it is false to associate "Arahitogami" and "Hakkō-ichiu" with the traditions since the Meiji Era and modern education in Japan, and as thinking that the role played by these concepts in the Showa Era was completely meaningless or even completely harmful. I believe that the evaluation of the ideological and practical meanings of "Arahitogami" and "Hakkō- Ichiu" in the Showa Era should be re-examined in light of the complex circumstances of the time and the traditional moral values of the Japanese people. Therefore, I do not support the claim that "'Daitōa-Kyōeiken [The Great East Asia Co-Prosperity Bloc] ' and 'Hakkō-ichiu' are nothing more than childish 'stories' and have nothing to do with morality" (Matsubara Tadashi, "Hosyu towa Nani ka?-Kobayashi Yoshinori Shi wo Shikaru(2) [What is Conservatism?: Scolding of Mr. Kobayashi Yoshinori (2)," *Getsuyō Hyōron* [Monday Review] , September 2000, p.24).

Rather, when I think about why the Japanese leaders could not explicitly talk about "conquest" during "the Great East Asia War" as the German leaders did, but were forced to preach "liberation," I think the following assessment by Asizu Uzuhiko may be right on target: "If I were to be somewhat critical of Japanese leaders during the war, I would say that not a few of them preached the doctrine of 'liberation' with the ambition of 'conquest'. But they were never able to assert the rights of the powerful as uninhibitedly, frankly and boldly as Hitler did. The Emperor's spiritual authority did not allow them to do so. This is a big difference between Japan and Germany. Even if those who had the ambition of conquest acted in a manner that hid their ambition, they could not always ignore the doctrine of liberation. There was a great self-limiting force at work. Moreover, the Japanese people could exercise their loyalty, courage, and fierce fighting spirit only insofar as they believed in the doctrine of liberation. We must not lose sight of the fact that the consciousness of the people, combined with the spiritual and traditional authority of the emperor, exerted great unseen pressures and constraints on wartime leaders, albeit indirectly." (*Meiji-Ishin to Tōyō no Kaihō* [The Meiji Restoration and the Liberation of the Orient] , Mie: Kogakukan University Press, p.219).

"What was the spirit of "*Daitōa-Kyōeiken* [The Great East Asia Co-Prosperity

Bloc] " of the Japanese Empire? It is hard to say that there was no shadow of Japanese invasive colonialism there. It was a natural and powerful part of the nature of the Japanese government and military, which had grown up with the goal of becoming a new European-style empire in the East. At the same time, however, we must not ignore the fact that a sense of Japanese morality and a longing to liberate Asia also existed unceasingly among the Japanese people. There, the pure and high and the muddy and low flowed together in a complex and conflicting way." "The history of the Great East Asia War written by the Japanese must not be disrespectful to the creed of the loyal heroes who gave their lives manfully for the independence and liberation of our country and the Orient." (ibid., pp. 221-222).

Indeed, recent studies have gradually revealed the fact that the actions of the Japanese people, soldiers, and leaders were deeply influenced by ideals such as the elimination of racial discrimination and the liberation of the Orient (e.g., Uesugi Chitoshi, *Yudaya-Nanmin to Hakkō-Ichiu* [Jewish Refugees and Hakkō-Ichiu] ,Tokyo: Tendensya).

Increasing Attention to the Emperor System as “the Rising of an Ancient Layer of Historical Consciousness.”

Why is it that at the end of the Edo period, at the Syōwa period, or at times of crisis, Japanese people become more conscious of the existence of the emperor? This question also leads to the question of how to evaluate the theories of the Emperor and the national identity that have appeared one after another throughout Japanese history. For now, I think the key to solving this question lies in the idea that Maruyama Masao arrived at in his later years, which posits "archetypes," "ancient layer," or "insistent bass" at the bottom of the Japanese historical consciousness, or the assumption of the "collective unconsciousness" as postulated by Jungian psychology.

Before I finish the first part, I would like to introduce three specific reasons why I have come to have the aforementioned assumptions. On August 24, 1999, at a time when the question of whether or not Japanese national flag and national anthem should be legally defined again was being debated, a certain senryū [a humorous or satirical seventeen-syllable poem] was

published in the Asahi Shimbun [Asahi Newspaper] : Kunitami wa Chiyo ni Yachiyo ni Sazareisi [The people will be nothing but pebbles in pieces for a thousand and eight thousand years [or forever]] . The editor who adopted the poem added the comment, "A series of dangerous bills." Perhaps, the author was against the legalization of the national flag and national anthem, and used the word "Sazareisit [pebbles in pieces] " in the lyrics of the national anthem in an ironic way, thinking that political leaders disregarded the opinions of the people. However, I found it to be a masterpiece that unintentionally expressed the subconscious of Japanese people. The lyrics of the national anthem are as follows : Kimigayo wa Chiyo ni Yachiyo ni Sazareishi no Iwao to nari te Koke no musu made [May the era of the Emperor's reign last for a thousand and eight thousand years, until the pebbles come together to form a big rock and moss grows on it] . If you read the aforementioned poem with the lyrics of this national anthem, it is saying that without the emperor, the "people" will forever remain disparate pebbles and will never be a united "rock" (the nation). The senryū is exactly the paradoxical explanation of the significance of the emperor in Japan contained in the lyrics of national anthem.

In August 2001, in the last issue of the photography magazine *Focus*, which was discontinued with its 1001'st issue, there was an article that began with the sentence, "It was a sight that made me want to call her 'Kokubo [the mother of our nation] .' This is a comment on a scene in which a woman cried and clung to the Empress as she visited the areas affected by the Hanshin-Awaji Huge Earthquake with the Emperor, and the Empress firmly accepted her and offered words of encouragement. "Our Majesties the Emperor and Empress walk with our people. This is a heartwarming scene that captures a moment when we can see the fact," the article concludes. Even in this day and age when The "Nation as Family" Theory has long since ceased to be taught, the word such as "Kokubo" naturally appear in our consciousness when we encounter such situations. I have seen similar attitudes of the victims of the East Japan Huge Earthquake, who showed to Our Majesties the Emperor and Empress during their visit to the affected areas.

The birth of Her Imperial Highness Princess Aiko in 2001 led to a growing arguments, in the private sector, as legal acceptance of a female emperor. It was not until January 25, 2005, when the Prime Minister, Koizumi Junichirō,

established the "Expert Committee on the Imperial Household Law" (chaired by Yoshikawa Hiroyuki, former President of the Tokyo University) as his private advisory body, that this problem became a concrete political agenda. This Expert Committee was expected to be an advisory body that would "have a conclusion beforehand" on the "legal acceptance of emperors of female and mother's lineage. As expected, on November 24 of the same year, the committee submitted a report to the prime minister that outlined the following points that would drastically change the tradition of the succession to the throne: "The legal acceptance of emperors of female and mother's lineage" and "The priority given to the first child." Prime Minister Koizumi, who received the report, said at a round-table meeting of cabinet ministers, "I believe it is a reasonable conclusion. I will submit the bill to the next ordinary Diet session, and since there will be various opinions, I would like to listen them humbly and compile them as the consensus of the people." And on December 1 of the same year, in preparation for the submission of a bill to amend the Imperial Household Law to the next ordinary Diet session, the Imperial Household Law Revision Preparatory Office (headed by Shibata Masato, Cabinet Secretary) was established in the Cabinet Secretariat. On January 20, 2006, in his policy speech at the beginning of the ordinary Diet session, Prime Minister Koizumi clearly stated that he would "submit a revision bill in accordance with the report of the Expert Committee so that the throne can be passed on in a stable manner." Moreover, on the evening of January 26, he had dinner with the members of the Expert Committee at the Prime Minister's official residence and said, "I will pass this bill in this Diet session. Don't worry."

In the midst of such an upsurge toward the legal acceptance of emperors of female and mother's lineage, those who wished to maintain the father's lineage were placed in a very disadvantageous situation. But, since November 2005, there has been direct and indirect opposition to the acceptance from the Imperial Family and former members of the Imperial Family, led by Prince Tomohito of Mikasa Family. Next, in November 25, Jinja Honcyō, which unites the majority of shrines, expressed its desire to maintain the father's lineage of throne succession in the form of a "talk by the president." Furthermore, in February 2006, Nippon Kaigi [the Japan Council], a private conservative organization, held an emergency meeting against the "hasty revision" of the Imperial Household Law, which was attended by 107 Diet members and more

than 170 signatures of Diet members, and the opposition against the revision were released at the meeting.

However, even in the face of these developments, Prime Minister Koizumi said, “I believe that if the bill is prepared and discussed thoroughly, they will agree with it. I can get the support of the people. For the stable succession of the throne, it would be better to pass the bill as soon as possible.” Yamazaki Taku, former vice president of the Liberal Democratic Party, and Katō Kōichi, former secretary general of the Liberal Democratic Party, also expressed their support for the prime minister (*Sankei Shimbun* [Sankei Newspaper] , February 5 in 2006). Furthermore, even Tanaka Takashi, who was an ancient history scholar with a conservative stance, announced that the Imperial Household Law must be amended to allow for emperors of mother’s lineage in the current Diet session. If the situation had remained unchanged, the bill would have been presented to the ruling party in late February 2006 and submitted to the Diet in early March. If it had happened, the debate about the bill would have divided the conservative school, but in the end, the ruling party members could not have opposed Prime Minister Koizumi, whose leadership was strengthened by his victory in the general election after the dissolution for postal problem, and the Kōmeitō [The political party in coalition with the Liberal Democratic Party] and the opposition parties would have agreed with him too. In the face of the popularity of Princess Aiko and the fact that no male member of the Imperial Family had been born in 41 years since Prince Akishino, public opinion should have supported the prime minister. This was the situation at the beginning of February 2006.

However, on the afternoon of February 7, the day Prime Minister Koizumi reiterated at the Budget Committee of the House of Representatives that “I will make every effort to have the bill passed during this Diet session,” the Imperial Household Agency announced that “Princess Kiko of Akishino is showing signs of pregnancy.” In response to this announcement, on February 9, Prime Minister Koizumi, discussed the matter with Chief Cabinet Secretary Abe Shinzō and, at last, decided not to submit to the Diet at the session the bill to amend the Imperial Household Law. That is why, if a male child was to be born, the revised law would effectively deny him to succeed to the throne. On the other hand, if the child to be born was a girl, it was easy to imagine that the argument that

"even after all these years, not one boy was born, so the only way to maintain the Imperial line is to accept emperors of female and mother's lineage " ,would have irresistible power. One's surprise! On September 6, 2006, in defiance of the current trend to accept the revision, and just one step ahead of the acceptance of the bill, a male entitled to succeed to the throne was born after a lapse of forty-one years. In this way, the debate on the revision of the Imperial Household Law was dropped and Abe Shinzō, who had been negative about the revision, became the prime minister.

The fact that a prince was born blew away so many doubts as to why female emperors should not be allowed, and numerous theories as to why emperors of mother's lineage would be fine, and this fact made the people aware of the mysterious power of tradition. Thus, a large number of the people began to appear who accepted this fact as the divine will to "strive to maintain father's lineage" and uttered the words, "A divine wind has blown." The consciousness of sensing the divine will (the will of something beyond human beings) in historical events and their accumulation has been revived in the Japanese people through the hardships and celebrations of the Imperial Family. To me, it looks like "the upsurge of an ancient layer of national consciousness." What form do we give to the emerging archetypes within the national unconscious? This will be a significant issue that will determine the future of Japan.